Leaders' prototypical images of effective followers vs. followers' actual behavioral repertoire: An exploratory mixed-methods field study using survey- and video-data

Author: Madelon Wind
University of Twente
P.O. Box 217, 7500AE Enschede
The Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Based on the idea that followers represent a crucial component in creating effective organizational outcomes, this study examines the extent to which leaders' prototypical images of an effective follower matches the actual behavioral repertoire of effective followers. A mixed-methods design is adopted which entailed 1) minutely coded, video-based data of followers' behavioral repertoire in the field (n = 1492), and 2) leaders' effectiveness ratings as well as their images of an effective follower, the latter gathered via an open survey question. As expected, a large mismatch was revealed between leaders' prototypical images of an effective follower (n = 113) and their followers' actual behavioral repertoire. Whereas leaders' perceptions were predominantly relation-oriented in nature, effective followers showed most frequently task-oriented behaviors. Also, an even larger mismatch seemed to exist between these so-called LIFTs and the ineffective follower behavioral repertoire. The specific behavioral differences between the most and least effective followers pertained to: individualized consideration; transactional; counterproductive; and showing disinterest type of behaviors. In the discussion, the results of this study are reflected on and some practical implications and limitations are highlighted. Finally, areas for future research are sketched.

Supervisors:
Drs. A.M.G.M. Hoogeboom
Prof. dr. C.P.M. Wilderom

Keywords

Implicit Followership Theories (IFTs), actual (effective) follower behavioral repertoire, mixed-methods design, video-based observation, survey-based assessment, follower effectiveness, follower actual behaviors, follower non-following behaviors.

1. INTRODUCTION

Although followers have been present (as passive influencers) in leadership research for several decades, only recently scholars focused on studying and understanding followership (e.g. Collinson, 2006; Sy, 2010; Carsten et al., 2010; Hoption et al., 2012). However, followership research was already introduced in the leadership field without leading to further recognition in 1955 in a study authored by Hollander and Webb about the relationship between leadership, followership and friendship. This study came to the conclusion that "the effective leader demands a follower equally effective, and therefore it may be considerably more realistic to consider characteristics of followership as one functional component of good leadership" (Hollander and Webb, 1955, p. 167). More recently, studies acknowledged this idea and addressed the urge to gain in-depth knowledge about followers and followership represented by constructs like follower characteristics and behaviors (e.g. Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Baker, 2007). Furthermore, the notion that followers represent a crucial component of the leadership equation in creating effective organizational outcomes within the general dynamic constitution of the workplace (e.g. Lappiere and Carsten, 2014; Shamir and Howell, 2000; Baker, 2007; Howell and Mendez, 2008; Lord, 2008), shows the definite need to become aware of 'the effective follower'. Some scholars even argued that leadership is only able to emerge when followership is present, i.e. some individuals taking up the follower role (e.g. DeRue and Ashford, 2010; Shamir, 2007, 2012; Uhl-Bien and Ospina, 2012). However, the study of followership, and especially effective followership, has largely been missing in leadership literature (Baker, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Within the followership literature, a new line of research adopting an information processing view has emerged out of ILT research: Implicit Followership Theories (IFTs) (Epitropaki et al., 2013). Several studies within the social cognition field have found that information complexity is handled by the adoption of cognitive simplification schemas (i.e. implicit images) (e.g. Fiske and Taylor, 1991). These socio-cognitive mechanisms are also hypothesized in IFTs and thus organizational settings (Epitropaki et al., 2013; Sy, 2010). Besides, individuals can adopt different IFTs (Sy, 2010). For example, different IFTs seem to be adopted by transactional and transformational leaders or Theory X and Theory Y leaders (Goodwin et al., 2000; Wofford and Goodwin, 1994; McGregor, 1960). Also, individuals' implicit schemas –often in an unconscious manner- influence judgments and respondents to followers (i.e. IFTs represent frames of references that result in "action tendencies") (e.g. Epitropaki et al., 2013; Sy, 2011). Furthermore, a small amount of studies within an emerging area of research examined the link between (possible) consequences and/or work related outcomes and IFTs (Epitropaki et al., 2013; Junker and Van Dick, 2014). For example, performance expectations seem to be influenced by leaders' IFTs (e.g. Eden, 1990; Whiteley et al., 2012; Johnson et al., 2008; Lord and Maher, 1993). However, until now only two studies have been empirically conducted on examining IFTs' content (Sy, 2010; Carsten et al., 2010). This while Sy (2010, p. 1) stated that research on IFTs "address a major gap in the leadership literature on how leaders and followers perceive, decide, behave, and take action". As can be concluded from the above, and especially from the influence of IFTs on work related outcomes and individuals' action tendencies, gaining in-depth knowledge of IFTs is of high relevance.

Strikingly, a study comparing those IFTs (of effective followers) with actual (effective) follower behavior is completely absent in the followership field. Calls for certain studies have been presented by Hoogeboom and Wilderom (2015). Such a comparison would provide insights in the similarities and difference between IFTs and the actual behavioral repertoire, and is of high relevance since it is argued that an individual may be more effective when he or she fits better with the existing prototype. In the Pygmalion theory (Eden, e.g. 1990, 1992) it is stated that implicit images may be leading to Pygmalion effects when leaders' positive prototypical images are fulfilled by followers (Sy, 2010). Thus, leaders' IFTs might eventually influence followers' performance outcomes (Sy, 2010).

Whereas very little research examined the content of IFTs and a comparison between IFTs and followers' actual behavioral repertoire is missing, also very scant knowledge is present on the actual behavioral repertoire of (effective) followers. Within the followership literature, follower typologies are often used to get an impression of critical follower characteristics that can be used to distinguish among different types of followers (Oc en Bashur, 2013). However, whereas some of these typologies contain a 'best exemplar' (e.g. Kelley, 1992), they all show different follower schemas a follower might adopt. Multiple other studies focused on a certain follower behavior, like organizational citizenship, resistance or voice behavior (e.g. Smith et al., 1983; Tepper et al., 2001, 2006). On the basis of a literature review of this research body, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) proposed 9 follower behaviors for the study of followership which are more active in nature as well as include "non-following" behaviors. This latter study clearly highlights that more knowledge needs to be gained about effective follower behaviors by raising the question "What do patterns of leading and following look like in effective leadership and followership?" (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 99), and thus not only focusing on individual behaviors but also on the full behavioral repertoire. Besides, several studies within the leadership field called for a simultaneous examination and comparison of leadership, followership, and the associations existing between both (e.g. Van Gils et al., 2010). Therefore, this study uses Yukl's behavioral taxonomy (Yukl, 2012) as underlying categorization to enhance the future ability of examining leadership and followership in congruence.

Furthermore, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) indicated that there is scant knowledge about actual following and especially non-following behaviors, due to a predominate focus on survey data capturing mere perceptions (e.g. Baumeister et al., 2007). This study therefore responds to the suggestion "to include a range of methodologies, and not just survey measures" (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 99) by adopting a mixed-methods approach of both surveys and a video-based observational method. Such an observational method provides a more objective insight in the behavioral repertoire of an effective follower (e.g. Fairhurst and Uhl-Bien, 2012; Hoogeboom and Wilderom, 2015). Due to this mixed-methods approach, strong theory can be built in order to advance followership theory.

This study aims to contribute to the followership literature in several ways. First, this mixed-methods study offers the first (empirical) comparison of leaders' prototypical images of an effective follower with the actual behavioral repertoire of followers. Thereby, Shondrick et al.'s (2010) notion that perceptions do not accurately reflect actual behavior is examined. Second, this study objectively examines the nature of the actual behavioral repertoire of effective and ineffective followers by the use of observational data, thereby adding to the scant literature on actual (effective) follower behaviors (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Third, also adding to the scant literature on followership, this study examines whether significant differences exist between the actual behavioral

repertoire of effective and ineffective followers. Fourth, this study provides the first empirical examination of LIFTs below the superordinate level, thereby responding to calls from Epitropaki et al. (2013) to examine IFTs at different levels of analysis; thereby filling a major gap in the leadership literature (Sy, 2010). Lastly, this study adds to the followership theory in general by empirically exploring follower constructs and variables, and leaders' implicit follower images that exist; therefore gaining a better understanding of followership (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

To conclude, the research question is: *"To what extent do leaders' prototypical images of an effective follower match the behavioral repertoire of their effective followers?"*

2. THEORY AND PROPOSITIONS

2.1 A way to (Implicit) Followership

2.1.1 The emergence of Followership

As previously noted, an active field of followership research only emerged recently. According to Uhl-Bien et al. (2014, p. 89, p. 96) studying followership "involves an investigation of the nature and impact of followers and following in the leadership process" and is defined as "the characteristics, behaviors and processes of individuals acting in relation to leaders and/or in contexts in which individuals identify themselves in follower positions or as having follower identities". Within this study of followership, followers are adopted as primary focus (Carsten et al., 2010). Nowadays, it is generally acknowledged that leadership will not be entirely understood without examining how followers and followership contribute to (or detract from) the leadership process (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). The study of followership enhances the understanding of leadership in various ways. First, it adds descriptions of follower styles and behaviors to the leadership field (Carsten et al., 2010). Secondly, it examines the complex ways in which the leadership equation is affected by follower identities (e.g. Collinson, 2006; Lord and Brown, 2003; Lord et al., 1999). Third, it explores followers' active role in forming reciprocal relationships between followers and leaders, thereby ultimately shaping organizational outcomes and effectiveness (Shamir and Howell, 2000; Moore, 1976). Lastly, knowledge can be gained about followership as predictor of leadership and leadership effectiveness (e.g. Dvir and Shamir, 2005; Avolio et al., 2009). The above, and especially the link between followers and (leadership) effectiveness, highlights the urge of gaining an in-depth understanding of followers and followership.

Within this field of followership, a distinction is made between the constructionist view and the role-based view (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). According to the constructionist view, leadership and followership are co-constructed by a reciprocal and social influence process in the (relational) interactions and engagements between people in context (e.g. DeRue and Ashford, 2010; Fairhurst and Uhl-Bien, 2012). On the other hand, the role-based view focuses on the leader as moderating or receiving follower influence in producing leadership and organizational outcomes (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

To start with the constructionist view, DeRue and Ashford (2010) state that leadership and followership can only emerge when some individuals show leadership identity claims, and other individuals show follower identity claims or granting behaviors. Shamir (2007) proposed another constructionist view: 'co-production'. In this approach, leadership is an outcome of leaders' and followers' mutual attempt of co-producing leadership outcomes by creating effective leadership relationships (Shamir, 2007). The above reasoning clearly

shows the importance of followership in the leadership equation and the need to gain a more in-depth understanding of the role of followers.

Other scholars have used a role-based approach, in which the 'lens is reversed' by viewing leader behaviors and characteristics as being dependent upon or being moderated by followership (Shamir, 2007). Issues as follower characteristics and style; followership role orientations; follower identities; how follower identities and behaviors shape leader attitudes, behaviors and effectiveness; and also IFTs are considered within this view (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Again, if followers are considered to be causal agents in creating important leader outcomes, the role of followers needs to be studied.

2.1.2 Followers in Leadership Research

Before the emergence of followership, the recognition of followers' role in the leadership process was long established (e.g. Parker Follett, 1949; Haythorn et al., 1956; Clifford and Cohn, 1964). According to Uhl-Bien et al. (2014, p. 88), "a clear progression has been made from leader-centric, to follower-centric, to relational views" within the leadership research. First, the leader-centric view approaches followers as being moderators or recipients of leader's influence in outcome producing (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Crossman and Crossman, 2011). Second, the follower-centric view focused more on followers' shaping leadership and leaders (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Third, the relation-centric view states that followers and leaders engage together in a reciprocal influence process (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Starting with the leader-centric view, several studies accessed the role of followers as moderators of leaders' influence (e.g. Shamir, 2007; Zhu et al., 2009; Pillai and Meindl, 1998). For example, followers are within the contingency approach considered as a situational factor that moderates leaders' influence in gaining specific and effective outcomes (e.g. Vroom and Jago, 1978; Kerr and Jermier, 1978; Barrow, 1977).

More recently, scholars accessed leadership as being constructed by followers. This follower-centric view is in line with Meindl et al. (1985), who described leadership in their evolutionary work as a social construction established by followers. Besides, within the field of Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTs), a follower-centric approach is adopted when implicit images of leaders are captured by followers' naïve conceptions about the patterning of leadership variables (for example qualities and behaviors) (e.g. Eden and Leviatan, 1975; Offerman et al., 1994; Keller, 2000). Another follower-centric view, the social identity theory of leadership, formed a bridge to the relational view by arguing that leaders' effectiveness is dependent on followers' willingness to work together with the leader (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Lastly, Hollander early adopted a relational view by acknowledging leadership as relational process and addressing problems of neglecting "the *process* of leadership" (Hollander and Julian, 1969, p. 389). Another relational view is LMX, which is a process through which working relationships between supervisors and employees are negotiated over time through a series of interactions or exchanges between them (Dienesch and Liden, 1986; Gerstner and Day, 1997; Graen and Scandura, 1987; Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995).

The progression towards relation-centric views shows an increasing focus in the leadership literature on followers and their role in the leadership equitation (i.e. followership). Consistent with this, the field of IFTs recently emerged, building on the insights from ILT research (e.g. Epitropaki et

al., 2013; Whiteley et al., 2012). The study of "this exciting field" (Epitropaki et al., 2013, p. 1) together with the notion that followership in general "has remained an undervalued and underappreciated concept among management development practitioners and researchers" (Agho, 2009, p.159) shows the urge of studying IFTs.

2.1.3 Implicit Followership Theories (IFTs)

Sy (2010, p. 1) defined IFTs as "the cognitive structures and schemas (i.e. individuals' personal assumptions) about the traits and behaviors that characterize followers". Within this field of IFTs, both leaders' perceptions (i.e. LIFTs) and followers' perceptions (i.e. FIFTs) are explored, however with a mere focus on the former (e.g. Sy, 2010; Van Gils, 2010). Besides, the different levels of analysis available for assessing the implicit prototypical images need to be taken into account since IFTs may comprise of both universal dimensions and context specific dimensions (van Gils et al., 2010; Epitropaki et al., 2013; Sy, 2010). Sy (2010) proposed three hierarchical levels at which IFTs may be examined, based on Lord et al. (1982). According to Sy (2010), IFTs can be focused on the superordinate level (i.e. followers in general), the basic level (i.e. specific follower types, e.g. political or business), and the subordinate level (i.e. different types of followers within a particular context, e.g. automotive manufacturing or IT). Epitropaki et al. (2013) suggested that IFTs might be further described at three levels within the organizational context. They distinguished between the company, group and even individual level (Epitropaki et al., 2013). With the use of the above levels of analysis, contextual factors (e.g. organizational culture) likely to influence IFTs can be taken into account, and thus differences between IFTs resulting from context.

As previously noted, research on IFTs address a major gap in the literature. Since the first article on IFTs in *The Leadership Quarterly* in 2011, only 11 were written about implicit followership. This seems to be paradoxical considering previous notions that followership is a crucial part of leadership (e.g. Lappiere and Carsten, 2014). However, especially IFTs may provide a better understanding of leadership when comparing the outcomes with ILTs (Van Gils et al., 2010; Avolio et al., 2009). Furthermore, Junker and Van Dick (2014) provided, based on a literature review, a set of constructs that are (possibly) influenced by IFTs: (1) leader liking, (2) leader trust, (3) follower performance rating (e.g. Pygmalion effects [e.g. Eden, 1992]), (4) follower job satisfaction, (5) follower liking, (6) follower voice, (7) follower constructive resistance, (8) follower organizational citizenship behavior, and (9) LMX. Epitropaki et al. (2013) besides stated that IFTs are an element in determining leaders adopted leadership style. It thus can be concluded that implicit images of followers affect a broad range of variables, thereby emphasizing the need for understanding implicit follower images.

Despite the above mentioned need for studying IFTs, only few scholars actually examined the implicit follower image. Carsten et al. (2010) offered the first empirical examination of IFTs content out of followers' own perspective (i.e. FIFTs). This exploratory study using a qualitative approach described followers' beliefs about their views and enactment of followership roles, and the contextual elements and individual qualities associated with (in)effective followership. Their results about followers' prototypical image of personal qualities and behaviors included the following attributes: (1) team player, (2) positive attitude, (3) initiative/proactive behavior, (4) expressing opinions, (5) obedience/deference, (6) flexibility/openness, (7) communication skills, (8) loyalty/support, (9) responsible/dependable, (10) taking

ownership, (11) mission conscience, and (12) integrity. Furthermore, Carsten et al. (2010) suggested that contextual factors may affect both followership constructions and behavior in the follower role.

Sy (2010) did not only take followers' views of followership into account in a study about the content, structure and consequences of IFTs, but also leaders' views. Leaders were asked to report traits and behaviors characterizing followers. In the discussion, it is suggested that IFTs are best represented by a first-order six-factor structure including: (1) Industry (e.g. hardworking, productive, goes above and beyond), (2) Enthusiasm (e.g. excited, outgoing, happy), (3) Good Citizen (e.g. loyal, reliable, team player), (4) Conformity (e.g. easily influenced, follows trends, soft spoken), (5) Insubordination (e.g. arrogant, rude, bad tempered), and (6) Incompetence (e.g. uneducated, slow, inexperienced). IFTs can also be accurately represented by a second-order two-factor structure: (1) Followership Prototype (Industry, Enthusiasm, Good Citizen), and (2) Followership Antiprototype (Conformity, Insubordination, Incompetence). Moreover, the study suggested that LIFTs are associated with the interpersonal outcomes relationship quality, trust, liking and satisfaction (Sy, 2010).

The previously noted goal-derived prototypes are also investigated within Implicit Performance Theories (IPTs), defined as followers' performance expectations (Sy, 2010). For example, Engle and Lord (1997) included the following effective follower attributes: (1) interested in work, (2) conscientiousness, (3) gives suggestions, (4) hard-working, (5) honest, (6) thorough, (7) independent thinker, (8) takes suggestions, (9) qualified for job, (10) communicates effectively, (11) reliable, (12) punctual in meeting deadlines, (13) self-motivated, (14) follows through one tasks, (15) enthusiastic, (16) cooperative, and (17) competent. When assessing goal-derived prototypes and IPTs, it becomes clear that only effective expectations of followers (i.e. positive attributes) are reflected (Sy, 2010). This is in contrast with general IFTs, which consist not only of positive attributes and thus present a fuller follower representation (Sy, 2010).

As stated above, general implicit follower prototypes (i.e. GIFTs) comprise both negative and positive characteristics (Sy, 2010). For example, Goodwin et al. (2000) made a distinction between the perceptions of transformational and transactional leaders. Transformational leaders included follower attributes as: (1) self-reliance, (2) innovativeness, (3) initiative, (4) loyalty, (5) self-confidence, (6) trust, (7) overall purpose, (8) individual uniqueness, (9) intellectual capability, and (10) creativity. In contrast, transactional leaders included follower attributes as: (1) commitment to goals, (2) expectancy of goal attainment, (3) expectancy for rewards, (4) the need for role clarity, and (5) work assignment. This study supports the notion that IFTs are an element in determining leaders' adopted leadership style (Epitropaki et al., 2013).

As can be seen, only a few studies have investigated implicit follower prototypical images. Sy (2010) was the first to address not only the effective follower prototype, but also the ineffective image. Whereas the work of Goodwin et al. (2000) focused on the general implicit follower prototype, Sy's (2010) Followership Prototype, and the studies of Carsten et al. (2010) and Engle and Lord (1997) comprise the implicit images individuals have about ideal follower prototypes (i.e. follower effectiveness). When taking these three latter studies into account, a remarkable difference appears. Whereas the current studies of Sy (2010) and Carsten et al. (2010) show a definite focus on relation-oriented attributes, the work of Engle and

Lord (1997) show a predominate focus on task-oriented attributes. The results from the recent studies support an assumption made by Van Gils et al. (2010), arguing that IFTs not only consist of performance-or task-related characteristics. This assumption might also explain Engle and Lord's (1997) focus on task-related attributes, since their work belongs to IPTs and therefore defined performance expectations for effective followers. The above definitely shows that the follower role is way broader than long expected (Carsten et al., 2010). Concluding on the recent work of IFTs, the prototypical image of an effective follower mostly consists of relation-oriented attributes, and the least of external-oriented attributes. Hence, it is important to examine if leaders' implicit effective follower prototype consists of a broader range of traits or behaviors which can be categorized in relation-, task-, change-, or external-oriented traits or behaviors. This is important since such a categorization is able to explicitly show that leaders' implicit image of an effective follower might be broader than being performance- (i.e. task) oriented. Furthermore, this categorization of task-, relation-, change- and external-oriented is very common in the leadership literature. Such a solid ground across both leadership and followership is a major requirement for enhancing the future ability of comparing followership and leadership, and thus IFTs and ILTs.

2.2 Dimensions/Current categorizations of follower behavior

Various follower typologies have been developed in order to categorize the behaviors exhibited by followers, and highlight that followers can adopt different schemas (e.g. Carsten et al., 2010; Kellerman, 2008; Chaleff, 2003; Howell and Mendez, 2008; Kelley, 1992; Collinson, 2006; Lipman-Blumen, 2005; Zaleznik, 1965; Steger et al., 1982; Potter and Rosenbach; 2006; Jaussi et al., 2008). Beneath, a short overview of the typologies of Zaleznik (1965), Kelley (1992), Kellerman (2008), and Chaleff (2003) is given.

Zaleznik was among the first researchers arguing that followers are important, that there were distinctions among them and that those distinctions were theoretically and practically of high relevance (Kellerman, 2008). Zaleznik's typology consists of two dimensions: (1) dominance-submission, and (2) activity-passivity. While the former dimension measures the extent to which a person wishes to be in control, the latter measures the extent to which an individual wishes to initiate action. Along these dimensions, four types of followers emerge: Compulsive, Impulsive, Masochistic, and Withdrawn. Compulsive followers try to control individuals, however in a passive manner. Those Compulsive followers are often indecisive and deny responsibilities for their actions. Impulsive followers like to challenge authority, sometimes acting courageously or spontaneously. Masochistic followers are deferent and obedient. Lastly, Withdrawn followers are inward focused and do not participate actively in the work or organization. Since interest and trust are lacking, being influenced by leaders may be difficult.

Kelley (1992) also categorized followers along two dimensions: (1) independent/critical thinking, and (2) engagement. The typology consists of five types of followers: Alienated, Conformist, Exemplary, Passive, and Pragmatist. Alienated followers score high on independent/critical thinking and low on engagement, whereas Conformist followers score low on independent/critical thinking and high on engagement. In Kelley's model (1992), Exemplary followers are the ideal type, scoring high on both independent/critical thinking and engagement. They are believed to be competent independent thinkers who are willing to challenge leaders when needed,

even in the face of challenges. Passive followers score low on both independent/critical thinking and engagement. Lastly, Pragmatist followers score in the middle of both dimensions.

Unlike the above two mentioned typologies, Kellerman's typology (2008) only consists of one dimension: engagement. Five types of followers are distinguished: Activist, Bystander, Diehard, Isolate and Participant. An Activist is highly engaged and viewed as eager, hard working, and energetic. By being deeply devoted, an Activist can either go above and beyond to support his/her leader, or oppose his/her leader. The Bystander is not very engaged and consciously chooses to stand by and watch. The Diehard is characterized by his dedication: totally engaged. Being a Diehard is all-consuming. This type of follower is highly engaged in his leader, or in contrast, ready to remove the leader from positions of power, authority and influence by every means necessary. The Isolate is in contrast an individual that is completely detached. Isolates are very disaffected and show low levels of enthusiasm. Lastly, the Participant is fairly engaged, however this engagement is not always positive.

Lastly, Chaleff (2003) proposed a follower typology along two dimensions: (1) challenge, and (2) support. Four types of followers emerge: Implementer, Individualist, Partner and Resource. An Implementer shows high support, but scores low on challenge. Implementers might be characterized as team focused, respectful of authority, trustworthy, and compliant. Contradictory, the Individualist shows high challenge and low support. Furthermore, a Partner shows both high challenge and support. Sometimes, Partners are characterized as risk taking and mission conscious. Concluding, Resources are followers who display low support and low challenge. According to Chaleff (2003), a Partner can still improve by demonstrating the five behaviors considered as critical for a 'Courageous Follower': (1) the Courage to Serve, (2) the Courage to Participate in Transformation (3) the Courage to Challenge, (4) the Courage to Assume Responsibility, and (5) the Courage to Take Moral Action.

As can be concluded from the typologies, some followers adopt a more proactive schema in their role construction (i.e. co-constructing and actively contributing), while others adopt a more passive schema (i.e. deferent and obedient) (Hoogeboom and Wilderom, 2016; Carsten et al., 2010). This conclusion is supported by the 9 Followership Behaviors incorporated in the "Theoretical constructs and variables for the study of followership", as proposed by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014, p. 97). However, they focus only slightly on the more passive role a follower can adopt. Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) conclude that the more classic view on follower behavior, which is associated with deference and obedience, is not in line with the current dynamic constitution of organizations and the shift to knowledge economies. Besides, Lord (2008) argued that followers, and particularly specialists and highly skilled knowledge workers (Howell and Mendez, 2008), are increasingly supposed to adopt more independent roles. Those changes demand different followership behaviors like proactivity, empowering, accountability, resistance and - sometimes- even behaviors classically associated with leadership (e.g. Grant and Ashford, 2008; Tepper et al., 2001, 2006; Shamir, 2007; Day, 2002, 2004; Owens et al., 2011). This is reflected in the followership behaviors included by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014): (1) proactive behavior, (2) initiative taking, (3) obedience, (4) resistance, (5) upward influence, (6) voice, (7) dissent, (8) feedback seeking, and (9) advising. These 9 behaviors could be further complemented with behaviors found to be adopted by followers, for example organizational citizenship behavior (Smith et al., 1983). With defining and

identifying the theoretical constructs proposed in the first formal theory about followership, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) have definitely advanced followership research.

Also, instead of using the division of proactive versus passive, the previously mentioned categorization of task-, relation-, change-, and external-oriented might be adopted. Within task-oriented actual behaviors of followers, a further distinction can be made on the basis of Bass and Avolio's transactional behavior (2004) and Fleishman and colleagues' (e.g. 1953, 1955) initiating structure. First, transactional behavior is associated with two core attributes: 'constructive' (i.e. contingent reward) and 'corrective' (i.e. management-by-exception, active and passive) transactions (Bass and Avolio, 2004). According to the transactional style, expectations/performance objectives are defined and performance is promoted to achieve certain goals/levels of outcomes (Bass and Avolio, 2004). For example, monitoring of operations (i.e. task monitoring) can be seen as key transactional behavior (Bass, 1990). Second, initiating structure reflects "the extent to which group interactions are defined or facilitated towards goal attainment" (Fleishman, 1953, p. 2), and include behaviors like structuring the conversation and task delegation. Although these categories have not yet been used in followership studies, followership theory acknowledges that followers and leaders might show similarity in behaviors, and thus followers engaging in behaviors classically seen as belonging to leaders (e.g. Carsten et al., 2010; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Carsten et al (2010) found that proactive followers expressed the desire to take initiative and accountability. Besides, theories about shared leadership and self-management also support this view by examining similarities between role constructions of followers and leaders, and the performance of leadership behaviors by multiple members of the team (e.g. Carson et al., 2007; Nicolaides et al., 2014; House and Aditya, 1997; Millikin et al., 2010; Manz and Sims, 1980). Additionally, Larsson and Lundholm (2013) argued that followers engage in leader behaviors and vice versa. Several studies state that followers might show "leading behaviors" like goal setting, directing and regulating (Hollander, 1992; Kerr and Jermier, 1978). Dvir and Shamir (2003) found that relational-oriented behaviors might also be expressed by followers, next to the task-oriented behaviors. Also, Shamir and Howell (2000) suggested that followers might actively affect and empower leaders.

Lastly, the categorization of task-, relation- (or "person"), change-, and external-oriented has not only been used to classify behaviors. Several studies adopted this categorization to classify traits, especially in the field of gender studies (e.g. Sczesny et al., 2004; Korabik and Ayman, 1989; Powell and Greenhaus, 2010; Bosak and Sczesny, 2011). As previously noted, followership and leadership (and thus IFTs and ILTs) could be compared more easily when a common ground is present.

2.3 Capturing perceptions of followers

The results of studies examining implicit followership images showed that the prototypical image mostly consists of relation-oriented attributes. However, a well-defined taxonomy might be needed to capture leaders' full prototypical image of an effective follower. Yukl (2012, p.68) proposed a revised hierarchical taxonomy of his 2002 work (Yukl, 2002) that describes the "behaviors used to influence the performance of a team, work unit, or organization". This taxonomy consists of the four meta-categories 'task-oriented', 'relation-oriented', 'change-oriented' and 'external'. Moreover, all four meta-categories have their own primary objective involving

determinants of performance (Yukl, 2012). On the basis of the above reasoning that not only behaviors can be captured within those four categories and that also followers might show leader behaviors, Yukl's four meta-categories might be used to capture the implicit image of an effective follower.

Starting with task-oriented, the primary objective is "to accomplish work in an efficient and reliable way" (Yukl, 2012, p. 69). The behaviors in this category include: (1) clarifying, (2) planning, (3) monitoring operations, and (4) problem solving. Clarifying includes for example setting performance standards and the communication of objectives, priorities and deadlines. The existence of high quality goals generally improves group performance (Locke and Latham, 1990). Planning includes among others decision making about priorities and objectives, whereas monitoring is used to examine progress and the quality of delivered work. Problem solving is used to identify and determine how problems can be avoided and how to minimize the effects when problems have occurred. In addition, the objective of "accomplishing work in an efficient and reliable way" might also be reflected in the follower trait 'goal orientation' (Uhl-Bien et al. 2014), or the follower attributes of hardworking, productive (Sy, 2010) and mission consciousness (Carsten et al., 2010) since all focus on striving towards goal achievement.

Secondly, the primary objective of relation-oriented is defined by Yukl (2012, p. 68) as "increasing the quality of human resources and relations". Relation-oriented included components are: (1) supporting, (2) developing, (3) recognizing, and (4) empowering. Supporting is for example used to build mutual relationships or show positive attention. Supporting also appears in Carsten et al. (2010) together with 'loyalty', whereas 'loyalty' is also reflected in Sy (2010). Besides, Carsten et al. (2010, p. 549) define a follower with a positive attitude as "being inclined to support, help or approve". Sy (2010) builds on this positive attitude by including the follower attribute Enthusiasm (e.g. excited, outgoing, happy). Continuing with developing, this behavior can be among others used to increase self-efficacy and abilities. Furthermore, examples of the use of recognizing are giving compliments for high quality (i.e. effective) performance or contributions to the team. Lastly, empowering is used to transfer work related influence and autonomy. When taking the above into account, the included follower attribute team player by Carsten et al. (2010) and Sy (2010) might also be categorized as relation-oriented since this attribute focuses on one's willingness of working in cooperation (i.e. relation) with others, thereby emphasizing collective effort (Carsten et al., 2010).

Moving to change-oriented, its primary objectives are "to increase innovation, collective learning and adaption to the external environment" (Yukl et al., 2012, p. 68). The components comprise of: (1) advocating change, (2) envisioning change, (3) encouraging innovation, and (4) facilitating collective learning. Advocating change is about explaining the urgent need of change, whereas envisioning change is about clearly expressing the positive consequences of the change. Encouraging innovation is about creating an environment in which creative ideas and innovations are given the full opportunity to develop. Along with this, also proactive follower behavior or initiative taking might be categorized as change-oriented, since Griffin et al. (2007) define a proactive individual as one who initiates change, is future directed, and self-starting. Furthermore, facilitating collective learning can be assured in many different ways, for example by exploitation or exploration. With regard to the above, also follower voice behavior or followers' expression of opinions might be

categorized as change-oriented, by constructively challenging initiatives, ideas, decisions and current ways of working and providing information to improve organizational functioning (e.g. Carsten et al., 2010; Detert and Burris, 2007).

Lastly, the primary objectives of external are "to acquire necessary information and resources, and to promote and defend the interests of the team or organization" (Yukl, 2012, p. 68). Included behaviors are: (1) networking, (2) environmental monitoring, and (3) representing. By the use of networking, positive relationships with superiors, external individuals and peers can be build and maintained. In this way, for example resources, information and allies can be provided (e.g. Ibarra and Hunter, 2007; Kaplan, 1984). Environmental monitoring includes scanning the external environment to identify threats and opportunities. Lastly, representing includes for example defending and promoting the team and/or organization and its reputation.

2.4 Actual behavior versus perceptions

The above mentioned typologies, work of several scholars, and especially the work of Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) are a solid starting point in examining actual follower behavior, thereby enabling comparisons between actual follower behaviors and perceptions about effective follower images.

However, within the current and scant followership literature, a mere focus is on perceptions of follower behavior than on empirically capturing actually exhibited behavior (e.g. Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). This is the consequence of the fact that most studies adopt survey methods, which is common in organization-behavioral research (Hoogeboom and Wilderom, 2016; Hoogeboom and Wilderom, 2015). Implicit images represent people's 'naïve' perceptions (Rosenberg and Jones, 1972), in contrast to (explicit) scientific theories approaching to display objective reality (Sternberg, 1985). Those implicit images tend to form quickly after socialization, and gain more depth in time by the influence of contextual, organization- and individual-influenced, and task-related elements (e.g. Hunt et al., 1990; Lord and Maher, 1993; Epitropaki et al., 2013; Foti et al., 2008). The frames of references that result out of the developing of implicit images influence information interpretation, and observations and judgments about other people, with individuals acting in accordance with the outcomes of this comparison (e.g. Duck, 1982; Lord et al., 1984; Shondrick and Lord, 2010). Besides, Epitropaki et al. (2013, p. 860) state that "individuals tend to lack "impact awareness", which represents the consciousness of the impact of implicit schemas on action tendencies". Prototypes, defined as an abstract set of features commonly associated with members of a certain group or the person which is seen as most representative of a certain category (e.g. Rosch, 1978; Ebbesen and Allen, 1979), are central to such implicit images (Sy, 2010). The above reasoning clearly emphasizes the importance of comparing actual follower behavior and leaders' perceptions of effective follower behavior.

According to earlier studies, implicit images and hence prototypes are biased by several factors like context, experiences, personality characteristics, racism, (cultural) background, or affective events (e.g. Moore and Lee, 1974; Lord and Maher, 1993; Lord et al., 2001; Hoogeboom and Wilderom, 2015). Shondrick et al. (2010) consequently conclude that actual behaviors are not accurately reflected by perception. Therefore, a more objective method of capturing actual follower behavior is needed in order to get a full picture of actual follower behavior in organizational settings. Afterwards, actual behaviors and perceptual images can be compared in order to gain deeper insights in the differences. In

this way, perceptual biases can be taken into account when scholars theorize about actual follower behaviors (Hoogeboom and Wilderom, 2015). Moreover, as can be concluded from the above, in-depth knowledge might be gained about the action tendencies resulting from individuals' comparison of their prototypical images with the actual shown behaviors of followers.

2.5 Propositions

Based on the aforementioned literature review, the following propositions are defined:

1. Leaders' prototypical images of an effective follower mostly consist of relation-oriented attributes (1a), and the least of external-oriented attributes (1b).

2. The actual behavioral repertoire of an effective follower mostly consists of task-oriented behaviors (2a), and the least of external-oriented behaviors (2b).

3a. Leaders' prototypical images of an effective follower do not match the actual behavioral repertoire of their own effective followers.

3b. The behavioral repertoire of an ineffective follower shows an even greater mismatch with their leaders' prototypical images of an effective follower.

3. METHODS
3.1 Design of study

In this mixed-method study design, different sources of data were used: (1) a systematic and minutely video-coded monitoring of followers' behavioral repertoire during regularly held staff-meetings, (2) a survey administered directly after each videotaped team meeting measured leaders' rating of the effectiveness of his/her own individual followers during the meeting, (3) a survey measured experts' rating of team effectiveness, and (4) a survey qualitatively measured leaders' perception of an effective follower. A stratified random sample of teams was drawn from one large Dutch public sector organization.

3.2 Participants

The observational and survey data were collected from 113 teams out of this one large Dutch public sector organization, and consisted of in total 113 team leaders and 1492 followers.

The leaders' demographics were: 74,3% males; an average age of 51,16 years (S.D. = 7,44); an average job tenure of 24,36 years (S.D. = 13,48); and an average team tenure of 2,53 years (S.D. = 3,54); 40,7% had attained a Master's degree while 43,6% had a Bachelor's degree and 15,7% was educated at a lower level.

In addition, followers' demographics were: 64,3% males; an average age of 49,11 years (S.D. = 10,70); an average job tenure of 24,07 years (S.D. = 13,77); and an average team tenure of 3,92 years (S.D. = 5,16); 18,2% had attained a Master's degree while 31,9% had a Bachelor's degree and 49,9% was educated at a lower level.

3.3 Procedures

3.3.1 Qualitative analysis of perceptions

To code the qualitative answers given by the leaders, a coding scheme able to capture the full range of answers needed to be developed (Carsten et al., 2010).

A priori to the coding process, a set of concept codes based on the theory underpinning the research project was developed (Popping, 2015). Those theoretically based categories are fine-tuned, extended and revised during the coding process by a method commonly referred to as 'inductive analysis' (e.g. Goetz and LeCompte, 1981; Lee, 1999; Popping, 2015; Patton, 2002). This type of analysis has earlier been used in followership studies (Carsten et al., 2010) With this method, major categories are identified "through an analyst's interactions with the data" (Patton, 2002, p. 453). Those interactions enable the continually creating and refining of a list of categories in order to build theory able to explain a certain phenomenon (Katz, 1983). A grounded theory is generated by the categorization of themes emerging from systematically collecting and analysing of data pertaining to a phenomenon, and therefore capturing the essence of the meaning of the data (Bowen, 2006; Morse et al., 1995; Strauss et al., 1990). Therefore, inductive analysis does not lead to a phenomena extensively being explained, however it is a solid generative starting point for building theory and formulating hypotheses regarding the found categories and possible correlations existing with those categories.

Regular meetings during the coding process took place in order to (1) review assessed data, (2) identify categories that did not fit the existing codes, (3) reassess established categories and their added value, (4) and to examine the mutually exclusiveness of the categories (adopted from Goetz and LeCompte, 1981). The "analytic induction" strategy of Goetz and LeCompte (1981) has been adopted in several ways. First, the process of Goetz and LeCompte does not start with a set of concept codes. Second, this study assessed the overlap between categories instead of examining possible relationships among categories. Third and resulting from the latter, no hypotheses were defined on the basis of possible relationships between the codes.

With the use of the preset codes and the codes that emerged from the data, categories were assigned to the answers given by the leaders. According to Lee (1999, p. 48) "the researchers create as many categories as needed to organize, explain, and assign empirical data to these categories in a coherent fashion" during the initial coding. Each coder read the answers given in the dataset and assigned (preliminary) codes. For example, answers as "enthusiastic", "interested" and "proud" were labeled as 'positive affect'. This approach was repeated until all answers were provided with a code (Miles et al., 1994). Then, coding frequencies were computed to assess the degree of support for all individual codes (Lee et al., 1999), and a thorough assessment of the mutual exclusiveness of the codes was executed. Infrequently mentioned answers were only retained as separate code when they did not fit the existing codes or existing codes could not be revised in a correct manner. Moreover, two independent coders coded the answers given, after which the codes assigned were discussed and revised when needed. The obtained inter-rater reliability was very high. In this way, 23 mutually exclusive codes emerged.

The 23 codes were afterwards categorized based on Yukl's (2012) hierarchical taxonomy consisting of task-oriented, relation-oriented, change-oriented, and external. Examples of codes within the task-oriented category are Managing by Exception Active (MBEA), engaged and goal oriented since a clear focus on the task and its correct achievement is present. This is in line with Yukl's (2012, p. 68) previously noted definition of task-oriented: "accomplishing work in an efficient and reliable way". Codes within the relation-oriented category are, among others, individual focused transformational, social and team player. Those categories are consistent with the

objective of "increasing the quality of relations and human resources" (Yukl, 2012, p. 68). Open to change, proactive behavior and voice behavior are included within the change-oriented category, with a focus on innovation (Yukl, 2012). Lastly, external consists of the codes customer-oriented, environmental monitoring and networker. This fits with the primary objective of external: "acquiring necessary information and resources, and promoting and defending the interests of the team or organization" (Yukl, 2012, p. 68). Table 1 shows an overview of the categorized codes, including definitions and some examples.

Insert table 1 around here

3.3.2 Video observation of actual behaviors

Regularly held staff meetings chaired by the team leaders were video recorded in order to examine actual follower behaviors. The length of the video-recorded meetings ranged from 49 to 212 minutes, with in total 9678 minutes of meeting time recorded. Regularly held staff meetings were selected since a hierarchical context in which a clear identification between leaders and followers is present (Hoogeboom and Wilderom, 2016). Besides, Baren et al. (2012) found that behaviors inside meetings are associated with behaviors shown outside meetings. Prior to each meeting, three video cameras were stationed at fixed positions; no human observers or video-technicians were present during the meeting. In this way, obtrusiveness was minimized. Besides, it has been argued that individuals forget the presence of video cameras shortly after the beginning of a meeting, with videotaping therefore resulting in indifferences in follower behavior (Erickson, 1992; Mead, 1995; Kent and Foster, 1997). Reactivity was checked by a survey directly administered after the meeting, which asked followers to rate the meeting's representativeness in comparison to similar non-videotaped meetings (on a scale from 1 [*not representative*] to 7 [*highly representative*]). The results showed that the recorded meetings were viewed as adequately representative.

After recording, the videos were systematically and minutely analyzed by two independent coders with use of a pre-developed codebook consisting of 19 mutually exclusive behaviors and specialized video-observation software (Noldus Information Technologies, "The Observer XT") (Noldus et al., 2000; Spiers, 2004; Zimmerman et al., 2009). Before participating in the coding process, the coders conducted an extensive training on how to use "The Observer XT" software and the coding scheme (Van der Weide, 2007). In this way, punctual and accurate coding tends to be improved (Psathas, 1961). After the coding, the two independent coders discussed their results using the inter-rater reliability outputs generated by "The Observer XT", and a confusion error matrix. In this way, subjectivity bias was avoided. When significant differences were found, the video fragment was analyzed again. The obtained inter-rater reliability after coding all videos, using a 2 seconds time interval for agreement, was 81,33%.

Furthermore, the 19 behaviors were also grouped according to Yukl's (2012) hierarchical taxonomy. Within the task-oriented category, a further distinction was made between transactional and initiating structure. Besides, a counterproductive category was included to capture the counterproductive behaviors shown by the followers. Also, no external category was included since the preset coding scheme did not include external-oriented behaviors. Behaviors within the transactional category are directing/correcting, verifying and providing negative feedback since those types of behaviors are in line with corrective and constructive transactions and defining of

expectations/performance objectives (Bass and Avolio, 2004). Furthermore, examples within the counterproductive category are showing disinterest and directing/interrupting. Besides, for example structuring the conversation and directing/delegating are included within the initiating structure category since those behaviors fit with defining or facilitating group interactions towards goal attainment (Fleishman, 1953). Furthermore, change-oriented behaviors are visioning: long term and visioning: own opinion on organization mission, which are in line with visioning about the work unit or organization (Yukl, 2012). Lastly, codes within the relation-oriented category are, among others, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. Those categories are consistent with the objective of "increasing the quality of relations and human resources" (Yukl, 2012, p. 68). Table 2 shows an overview of the categorized behaviors, including definitions and some examples.

Insert table 2 around here

3.4 Measures

Leaders' perceptions of an effective follower A direct approach requesting the 113 leaders to report a subjective assessment of effective follower attributes (i.e. prototype based trait list) was adopted via the open question "Could you please indicate what are, in your opinion, characteristics of an effective follower within this firm" (Epitropaki et al., 2013). Open-ended questions can yield useful information, especially when complex issues are explored that do not have a finite or predetermined set of responses (Todres, 2005; Carey et al., 1996; Popping, 2015). Furthermore, open-ended questions enable a view into an individuals' way of thinking (Roberts et al., 2014; Geer, 1988). From the 113 leaders asked to give answer to the question, 99 filled out the question. The obtained response rate was therefore 87,61%.

Followers' actual behavioral repertoire In order to gauge the behavioral repertoire, the videotaped behaviors shown during the regularly held staff meetings were analyzed. The preset coding scheme was developed on theoretical conceptualizations of small group interactions (Bales, 1950; Borgatta, 1964; Feyerherm, 1994). The codebook containing of 19 mutually exclusive behaviors included detailed indications for coding; thereby ensuring reliable and systematic coding (Luff & Heath, 2012; Van der Weide, 2007). The behaviors were coded on the basis of frequency of the observed behaviors. Due to differences in the length of each meeting, frequencies were converted to percentages.

Follower effectiveness The effectiveness of followers was measured with the 4 items from Gibson et al. (2009). In order to assess each follower's effectiveness individually, the items' wording was revised (e.g. "This follower produces high quality work"). The team leaders were asked to rate her or his followers on a Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*very inaccurate*) to 10 (*very accurate*). All followers wore a number on a nametag in the meetings, which were later on used for coding the behaviors and matching followers to their own job evaluation. A print screen of the follower group was included in the team leader's survey for assessing the effectiveness of the followers. By including numbers within the dataset, instead of names, an anonymous data handling process was ensured. Similar matching procedures were adopted by Hoogboom and Wilderom (2016), Hu and Shi (2015) and Moon et al. (2008).

Team effectiveness Expert raters were asked to rate the team's effectiveness. Four effectiveness indicators were used (retrieved from: Gibson et al., 2009; Zellmer-Bruhn and Gibson, 2006), and assessed on a Likert scale ranging from 1

(*strongly disagree*) to 10 (*strongly agree*). A sample item was: "This team delivers work of high quality".

4. RESULTS

4.1 Data analysis

First, on the basis of both team effectiveness and mean follower effectiveness within a team, the most effective teams (n = 10) and the least effective teams (n = 10) were selected to assess the most effective and least effective followers' behavioral repertoire.

In order to examine (possible) significant differences between the behavioral repertoire of these most effective and least effective teams, an independent sample t-test was conducted on the five categories task-oriented, initiating structure, transactional, relation-oriented, and change-oriented. Before this t-test was performed, normality was tested to access the distribution of the 5 categories. On the basis of the outcomes of this test of normality, a log 10 transformation was performed on counterproductive, change-oriented, and relation-oriented (Osborne, 2010). Besides, a Mann-Whitney U-test was conducted to test whether significant differences existed on the level of the 19 individual behaviors. The Mann-Whitney U-test was adopted since most of the behaviors appeared to be not normally distributed after a log 10 transformation (e.g. Fay and Proschan, 2010).

Furthermore, to compare leaders' implicit images with the actual behavioral repertoire, both results were transformed to 100% on the basis of the categories task-oriented, relation-oriented and change-oriented. This transformation was needed since the behavioral coding scheme did not include external behaviors, and on the other hand no counterproductive attributes were mentioned as characteristics of an effective follower. However, it should be emphasized that counterproductive behavior stays a part of the behavioral repertoire of an effective follower, and external a part of leaders' perception of an effective follower.

Lastly, a one sample t-test was performed in order to examine the differences between leaders' perceptions and the actual behavioral repertoire. Moreover, a qualitative analysis was conducted to examine whether the behavioral repertoire of the least effective followers showed larger discrepancies with leaders' perceptions than the actual behavioral repertoire of the most effective followers. A qualitative analysis was adopted since the significance (on the basis of the found p-value) for the test between leaders' perceptions and the effective follower behavioral repertoire was smaller than 0,001.

4.2 Leaders' implicit images of an effective follower

Insert table 3 around here

Table 3 shows leaders' implicit image of an effective follower as drawn by the 99 leaders who filled out the survey item. As can be concluded from the table, leaders' perception of an effective follower was predominantly relation-oriented in nature (40,27%). This finding supports proposition 1a, which stated that leaders' prototypical images of an effective follower mostly consist of relation-oriented attributes. Within this category of relation-oriented, the most frequently mentioned attribute 'team player' (14,58%) was captured. Other often mentioned characteristics of effective followers were 'cognitive job capability' (12,15%, task-oriented), 'open to change' (12,15%, change-oriented), and 'goal oriented' (10,76%, task-oriented). In contrast, table 3 also shows the characteristics which were least frequently mentioned. Four attributes accounted for less than 1% of the total answers

given: 'individual focused transformational style' (0,69%, relation-oriented), 'managing by exception active' (0,35%, task-oriented), 'voice behavior' (0,35%, change-oriented), and 'networking' (0,35%, external). Besides, the category external constituted 6,60% of the answers given, whereas task-oriented accounted for 34,37% and change-oriented for 18,75%. The above results support proposition 1b, stating that leaders' implicit images of an effective follower consist the least of external-oriented attributes.

4.3 Actual follower behaviors

Insert table 4 around here

Table 4 shows an overview of the video-filmed and video-coded behavioral repertoire shown during the regularly held staff meetings of the most effective teams (n = 10) and the least effective teams (n = 10).

As can be concluded from the table, task-oriented behaviors occurred most frequently within the effective sample (75,63%). With this, proposition 2a, stating that the actual behavioral repertoire of an effective follower mostly consists of task-oriented behaviors, is supported. Especially 'initiating structure' behavior is showed often (58,01%), with 'informing' comprising 28,50% in frequency and 'visioning: own opinion' 27,43%. Another behavior that occurred often in the effective sample was 'verifying' (14,10%). In contrast, change-oriented behaviors were shown the least often and accumulated to 0,97% of the behavioral repertoire of the 10 most effective teams. Furthermore, several behaviors accounted for less than 1% of the behavioral repertoire of the effective sample in frequency: 'directing/correcting' (0,2858%), 'directing/delegating' (0,26%), 'intellectual stimulation' (0,41%), 'providing positive feedback' (0,50%), 'visioning: long term' (0,73%), 'visioning: own opinion on mission' (0,24%), and 'showing disinterest' (0,32%). Moreover, relation-oriented behaviors constituted 17,95% of the behavioral repertoire in frequency, and counterproductive behavior 5,45%. Since the behavioral coding scheme as previously noted did not include external-oriented behaviors, proposition 2b could not be tested.

Proceeding, the shown behavioral repertoire within the least effective teams also consisted mostly of task-oriented behaviors (77,25%), and the least of change-oriented behaviors (0,18%). Seven behaviors comprised less than 1% of the behavioral repertoire in frequency: 'directing/correcting' (0,09%), 'directing/delegating' (0,33%), 'intellectual stimulation' (0,40%), 'providing positive feedback' (0,70%), 'personally informing' (0,20%), 'visioning: long term' (0,14%), and 'visioning: own opinion on mission' (0,04%). Furthermore, relation-oriented behaviors comprised 13,17% of the ten least effective teams' behavioral repertoire in frequency, and counterproductive 9,40%.

Insert table 5 around here

Table 5 shows the results of the performed independent samples t-test. As can be seen, significant differences between the categories grouped on the basis of effectiveness were found for counterproductive behavior (t (18) = -2,69, p < 0,05) and transactional behavior (t (18) = -0,74, p < 0,05). Thus, the effective followers' behavioral repertoire consists significantly more of transactional behavior and significantly less of counterproductive behavior.

Insert table 6 around here

Lastly, table 6 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U-test. Two significant differences were found: 'showing disinterest' (U = 22,00, p < 0,05), and 'individualized consideration' (U = 18,50, p < 0,05). Thus, it can be concluded that the effective

sample showed significantly less disinterest in frequency, and significantly more individualized consideration.

4.4 Leaders' perceptions vs. actual follower behaviors

Insert table 7 around here

Table 7 contrasts the behavioral repertoire of the ten most effective teams on the basis of the video-coded meetings with their leaders' implicit images of an effective follower. As previously noted, the video-based assessed behavioral repertoire was task-oriented in nature. However, the means in table 7 show that leaders' implicit image did not match the actual behavioral repertoire of an effective follower: both relation-oriented and change-oriented were overestimated and task-oriented underestimated.

Insert table 8 around here

The outcomes of the performed one sample t-test can be found in table 8. It can be concluded that leaders have a tendency to think that an effective follower is significantly more relation-oriented than they actually are (t (9) = -14,13, p < 0,001). Furthermore, also leaders' implicit images of an effective follower were significantly more change-oriented than they actually are (t (9) = -25, 45, p < 0,001). In contrast, leaders' IFTs of an effective follower with regard to task-orientation were significantly underestimated (t (9) = 21,07, p < 0,001). All in all, table 7 shows a mismatch between leaders' perceptions and the actual follower behavioral repertoire. Therefore, proposition 3a, stating that leaders' prototypical images of an effective follower do not match the actual behavioral repertoire of an effective follower, is supported.

Lastly, larger discrepancies between leaders' perceptions and the effective and ineffective behavioral repertoire were found for all three categories: task-oriented (effective 79,99% and ineffective 85,27% against 36,8% on the basis of perception), relation-oriented (effective 18,99% and ineffective 14,54% against 43,12% on the basis of perception), and change-oriented (effective 1,02% and ineffective 0,19% against 20,08% on the basis of perception). Whether these differences are significant, cannot be assessed on the basis of this data. Therefore, although proposition 3b, stating that an even greater mismatch is present for the ineffective followers, seems to be supported, no firm conclusions can be drawn.

5. DISCUSSION

This study examined leaders' perceptions of effective follower characteristics; the actual behavioral repertoire of effective and ineffective followers and the differences that exist between both groups; and the match or mismatch between leaders' perceptions and the actual follower behavioral repertoire of their followers. For this purpose, both video-based and -coded data and survey data were used. As proposed, leaders' IFTs of effective followers were predominantly relation-oriented in nature. In contrast, the actual behavioral repertoire of their effective followers consisted, as proposed, mostly of task-oriented behaviors. Thus, leaders' implicit images of effective followers did not match the actual behavioral repertoire shown by their effective followers, with even larger differences seeming to exist between those implicit images and the actual behavioral repertoire of their ineffective followers.

One of the most interesting findings of this exploratory empirical field study, and therefore a contribution of this research, pertains to the fact that leaders' implicit images of an effective follower do not match the behavioral repertoire of their effective followers. The results of this study thus support the notion that perceptions are biased and do not correctly

reflect actual behaviors (e.g. Shondrick et al., 2010; Lord and Maher, 1993; Hoogeboom and Wilderom, 2015). Whereas leaders overestimated the relation-oriented and change-oriented categories, the task-oriented category was underestimated. Furthermore, the results support the view that individuals use their prototypical images as frames of references when mentioning characteristics of effective followers (e.g. Duck, 1982), with leaders' implicit image of an effective follower hardly reflecting the behavioral repertoire of their effective followers. While the behavioral repertoire of an effective follower is to a large extent composed of task-oriented behaviors, the leaders' prototypical image shows a predominate relation-oriented focus. Within the task-oriented category of actual follower behavior, especially initiating structure behaviors were shown very frequently, with high percentages devoted to informing and visioning of the own opinion. This expression of own opinions is also reflected by Uhl-Bien et al.'s (2014) proposed behaviors for the study of followership. However, the percentage of informing might be influenced by the videotaped setting since 'informing' is regarded as one of the main aims of organizational meetings (e.g. Romano and Nunamaker, 2001). Also, work teams are tasked focused (e.g. Sundstrom et al., 1990), and therefore followers might show more task-oriented behaviors. This might have been a factor in the high task-oriented percentage found in frequency for the followers. Furthermore, the result that leaders' IFTs of effective followers are mostly relation-oriented in nature is supported by the two other empirical examinations of IFTs' content (Sy, 2010; Carsten et al., 2010). This high percentage devoted to relation-oriented attributes might result from the fact that these attributes are quite consciously experienced and therefore become a vaster part of the activated implicit image (Hoogeboom and Wilderom, 2015). Consequently, this kind of attributes may be more frequently mentioned and therefore might explain the found difference. Besides, the found difference for change-oriented might result from the changing dynamic of the public organization, perhaps leading to leaders more often mentioning change-oriented (and thus "being open to change") attributes as important characteristic of effective followers (Epitropaki et al., 2013). Though, the percentage of the actual behavioral repertoire devoted to change-oriented behaviors was very small. This might result from the fact that work teams' purpose is normally on 'business as usual' (i.e. existing processes and operational strategy) (e.g. Sundstrom et al., 1990), and therefore change-oriented behaviors might be shown infrequently. Furthermore, whereas a large mismatch was found between leaders' IFTs of effective followers and the actual behavioral repertoire, an even larger mismatch seemed to exist when comparing leaders' perceptions of effective followers with their ineffective followers' behavioral repertoire. This might suggest that higher congruence between leaders' positive IFTs and the shown follower behavioral repertoire may lead to higher follower performance outcomes (Sy, 2010).

Another striking finding of the comparison between leaders' perceptions and the actual behavioral repertoire of their effective followers is that no counterproductive characteristics were mentioned as attributes of effective followers. On the other hand, the results of the video-based observation showed that around 5,5% of the behavioral repertoire of an effective follower in frequency comprises of counterproductive behaviors. This finding is in line with studies on implicit images, stating that most often positive attributes are mentioned when one is asked to express his or hers perception (e.g. Schyns and Schilling, 2011).

Also, whereas the leaders practically did not mention characteristics of effective followers which classically belong to leaders, the video-coded behavioral repertoire showed that followers engage in this kind of 'non-following' behaviors (e.g. individualized consideration). This is an interesting difference found in this research, and shows that the follower role is more multifaceted than (long) expected (Carsten et al., 2010).

In addition, four differences have been found from the comparison of the actual behavioral repertoire of the effective sample and the ineffective sample. Firstly, a difference between the effective and ineffective sample was found for the task-oriented category 'transactional', thereby showing the importance of this behavioral style. This is in line with Hoogeboom and Wilderom's (2016) finding that transactional follower behavior is associated with follower effectiveness. Besides, it was found that effective followers actual behavioral repertoire consisted more of the behavioral category 'individualized consideration', and less of the categories 'counterproductive' and the behavior 'showing disinterest' which was grouped within the counterproductive category. This found importance of followers showing individualized consideration again highlights that the follower role, and especially the effective follower role, is way broader than long expected. The found difference on the counterproductive category, including 'showing disinterest', supports the many studies about the negative aspects and influence on (organizational) outcomes of counterproductive work behaviors (e.g. Schyns, 2013; Sacket, 2002; Penney and Spector, 2005).

Moreover, it was remarkable that a certain tendency seemed to appear in the behavioral repertoire shown by both effective and ineffective followers. Both groups' behavioral repertoire highly consisted of task-oriented behaviors, and while some behaviors occurred very often, others were hardly shown. This finding might suggest that there is something like a 'more general follower behavioral repertoire' in which also behaviors classically associated with leaders are shown. Hence, this study adds to the very scant literature on actual follower behavior, with thereby examining non-following behaviors (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Lastly, whereas this research showed that around 19% of leaders' implicit images of an effective follower were change-oriented in nature, Sy (2010) did not include change-oriented attributes in the Followership Prototype. As previously noted, the changing dynamic of the adopted organization might have influenced leaders' implicit images of an effective follower with regard to change-oriented attributes. This found difference might therefore support the notion that IFTs partly consist of dimensions that are context specific (van Gils et al., 2010; Epitropaki et al., 2013; Sy, 2010). Hence, IFTs found at other levels of analysis and even on the superordinate level might not be applicable in different contexts.

5.1 Practical implications
The results from this study show that leaders' perceptions of effective followers do not accurately reflect the actual behavioral repertoire of effective followers. Besides, this study examined based on more objective video data the actual behavioral differences between effective and ineffective followers, and showed that significant differences exist between both. Furthermore, this study shows the importance of followers showing individualized consideration, thereby highlighting that the follower role is way more multifaceted than long expected (Carsten et al., 2010). Therefore, several practical implications can be drawn from this study in order to achieve follower and organizational effectiveness.

First, the found differences between the behavioral repertoire of effective and ineffective followers can be used for the development of followership competencies, identification of more and less effective followership behaviors, as a behavioral baseline for followers, and behavioral follower training (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Due to the findings of this study highlighting that the behavioral repertoire is way broader than long expected and showing the particular importance of followers engaging in individualized consideration behavior, follower training is essential. Besides, the found difference on counterproductive behavior, and on the individual behavior level 'showing disinterest', highlights the fact that these kinds of behaviors should be avoided when striving towards maximum effectiveness. The video-observation method, which allows followers to watch their own behavior, would be particularly interesting in this case (e.g. Fukkink et al., 2011; Decker, 1983; Roter et al., 2004; Rapee and Hayman, 1996). Furthermore, the results of this study show that transactional follower behavior might lead to higher effectiveness. This conclusion is important for the development of behavioral training, especially since IFTs are predominantly relation-oriented and therefore might unconsciously bias the focus of behavioral training.

Second, it is very important that individuals become more aware of the implicit images they posses, the large mismatch of those implicit images with actual behavior, and the consequences of IFTs. This is especially of high relevance since this study found that perceptions largely differ from the actual behavioral repertoire. Furthermore, several studies found that IFTs unconsciously result in action tendencies, and that individuals tend to lack impact awareness (i.e. individuals' awareness of the influence of IFTs on those action tendencies), while IFTs are linked to several variables associated with effectiveness (e.g. Duck, 1982; Epitropaki et al., 2013; Junker and Van Dick, 2014). Workshops/ training could be used in order to built such awareness. In such a workshop, it is of high relevance that individuals' recognition is developed about the importance of understanding IFTs and its consequences since motivation is seen as precondition of adopting more explicit processing (e.g. Gawronski and Payne, 2010). For example, individuals could experience the large mismatch their selves by first listing their IFTs after which the results of this study regarding the actual behavioral repertoire is shown. When IFTs and its consequences are better understood, a more conscious (i.e. objective) method might be adopted when needed and followers might be understood in more detail. Though, it should be noted that an individuals' cognitive capacity might be a constraint in building this awareness (Fazio and Olson, 2003).

5.2 Strengths, limitations, and future research directions

The biggest strength of this research is the adopted mixed-method approach, using both subjective and more objective methods and data sources. In this way, this study responded to Uhl-Bien et al.'s recommendation (2014, p. 99) to "include a range of methodologies beyond survey measures" in order to advance the followership field. Furthermore, observational methods are still rarely employed in organizational studies, however they allow to respond to calls for examining actual follower behaviors (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). With classifying both traits and behaviors according to Yukl's taxonomy (2012), options for future research emerge, like responding to calls to simultaneously address leadership and followership (e.g. Van Gils et al., 2010). Despite the strengths of the study, there are also limitations.

First, all data was obtained from one large Dutch public sector organization. Some studies stated that there is a difference in behavior between the public and the private sector (e.g. Brugha and Zwi, 1998; Bellante and Link, 1981; Perry and Wise, 1990). Besides the sector, also cultural influences might have influenced the shown behavioral repertoire and what is seen as important or effective (e.g. Hofstede, 1991). This limited 'context' from which the data has been drawn, might thus also have influenced leaders' expressed implicit images (Sy, 2010; Foti et al., 2008; Hanges et al., 2000), especially since the survey-item explicitly asked for the characteristics of an effective follower within the examined firm. Due to the above, the findings may not be generalizable to other companies, for example in other cultures or the private sector. Even though this public sector organization was selected for its size and three different organizational units were included in the research, different results may be found within different contexts or cultures. Therefore, when a more generic (i.e. IFTs on the superordinate level) is to be derived, future research should include a wide variety of companies across different sectors, cultures, and other contextual factors.

Second, whereas common source bias was reduced by adopting a mixed-methods approach, it may have emerged due to the fact that the open-ended question about leaders' effective implicit images was asked at the end of a questionnaire consisting of related variables (Podsakoff et al., 2003). However, many IFTs outside the survey constructs were mentioned, showing that leaders have their own perceptions of an effective follower. In addition, it may be quite difficult for participants to start a survey with such an open-ended question or "out of the blue" define their implicit images of an effective follower. Besides, although not resulting in common source bias, it should be noted that followers' performance ratings were derived from their own leaders' perceptions, and that such ratings correlate with LMX (Gerstner and Day, 1997). However, this is partly offset by also taking team effectiveness into account. Out of the above, two recommendations for future research emerge: future research is recommended to (1) indicate perceptions with use of multiple methods including both direct and indirect measures, and (2) include objective performance measures and colleagues' expert ratings.

Third, whereas the behavioral repertoire was examined in regularly held staff meetings, the survey-item regarding leaders' implicit images asked for the general effective image of a follower. Whereas some studies found that behaviors shown within a meeting are associated with behaviors shown outside meetings (Baren et al., 2012), other studies state that meetings are more task-focused and therefore more task-oriented behaviors might be shown (Miller, 1994; Romano and Nunamaker, 2001). An option that emerges for future research would be explicitly asking for leaders' implicit images of a (effective) follower within a meeting, however, it would be particularly interesting to further assess the full behavioral repertoire of an effective follower outside regularly staff meetings. In this way, more information can be gained about the full behavioral repertoire, and this also allows effective followers to show their most effective behaviors in the settings they excel at.

Fourth, the survey and observational data were collected at one point in time, which might have influenced the results of the study. However, several studies stated that implicit images tend to stay (relatively) stable over time, and therefore it can be assumed that the found results correctly display the leaders' implicit image of an effective follower (e.g. Sy, 2010; Epitropaki et al., 2013; Jellinek et al., 1983). In contrast, one video-taped meeting per follower seems to be insufficient when

one is interested in the more comprehensive behavioral repertoire (Van Dun et al., 2016). On the basis of the above, it would be recommended to adopt a longitudinal study design for at least the gathering of the observational data, instead of a cross-sectional study design. Then, also differences over time can be assessed.

Fifth, the used survey-item to assess leaders' implicit images gave the opportunity to include multiple answers, without adopting a q-sort rank-order method. As a consequence, this study was not able to discriminate between the answers given. Therefore, it is recommended that future research adopts a q-sort rank-order to enable this distinction between the answers given instead of taking all answers together.

Sixth, the implicit image survey-item asked for the characteristics of an effective follower. Since IFTs consist of both behaviors and traits (e.g. Shondrick et al., 2010; Sy, 2010), often traits were mentioned. This resulted in the fact that this study could not compare leaders' implicit images with the actual behavioral repertoire on individual codes, but only on the level of task-, relation- and change-oriented. However, also traits were found to be easily categorized as task-, relation- or change-oriented. Besides, around 70% of the IFTs was based on traits, thereby emphasizing the importance of considering traits when theorizing on IFTs. Thus, this study recommends future studies to also classify traits according to Yukl's categorization (2012). A possibility for future research is to include sub-categories within those four categories of Yukl (2012), thereby enabling more in-depth comparison.

Seventh, the samples of both leaders and followers consisted of a high percentage of males, and mostly middle-aged. This might have influenced the results found in this study. For example, the shown behavioral repertoire might be influenced by followers' age (e.g. Rhodes, 1983). Thus, future studies should carefully consider the individuals adopted in the sample and prevent oversampling of certain groups of individuals.

Eight, this study was not able to assess external-oriented behaviors since no external-oriented codes were included in the behavioral coding scheme. Although this study adopted a pre-developed and validated codebook on basis of small-group theoretical interactions, it would be interesting to include external codes in future research in order to examine whether significant differences exist between perception and actuality.

Ninth, only leaders were asked to mention characteristics of an effective follower. However, those mentioned characteristics might differ from characteristics mentioned by followers themselves. Whereas this study found that leaders practically did not mention 'non-following' behaviors as characteristics of effective followers, Carsten et al.' (2010) work on FIFTs found that proactive followers adopt follower roles viewing followers as "quiet leaders". Future research is therefore recommended to adopt both views, and assess possible differences between both.

Tenth, whereas the implicit image was based on a survey-item asking for the image of an effective follower, only the ten most effective teams were assessed in the behavioral analysis. Besides, the behavioral repertoire of effective and ineffective followers was based on a sample of teams selected on mean follower effectiveness within a team and team effectiveness. However, differences in results might appear between team level or individual level of analysis. Therefore, an exploratory analysis on the basis of most effective followers (effectiveness score > 7) and least ineffective followers (effectiveness score ≤ 7), together with an elaboration on both analyses, has been added as Appendix 9.9.

Lastly, this study only contained follower behavior and IFTs. Several studies highlighted that such one-sided-perspectives might be too limited (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Van Gils et al., 2010). Thus, it is recommended that this first exploratory study will be continued within a multilevel view.

On the basis of the above limitations of the current study, and given not only the results of this research but also recent calls from the followership field, several areas of future research are stated below.

Firstly, as this study found a large mismatch between leaders' perceptions and the actual behavioral repertoire, it would be very interesting to expand this line of research. It is recommended to replicate this study across a wide variety of sectors, cultures and other (contextual) factors, thereby adopting a well-balanced sample of individuals. In this research, also traits should be incorporated in the implicit images since the results of this study show that they comprise a vast part of IFTs. As this study has shown, the adoption of Yukl's taxonomy (2012), for both implicit images and the actual behavioral repertoire, enables comparison between both. In addition to including external oriented codes to the behavioral coding scheme, also sub-categories could be added to Yukl's categorization in order to compare the implicit images and the actual behavioral repertoire in more detail. Besides, it is advised to adopt a longitudinal study design for at least the behavioral repertoire, preferably also including 'video-shadowing' data of behaviors at other (less formal) work settings (e.g. Czarniawska, 2007; Vie, 2010; McDonald, 2005). When behavioral data is gathered on both regularly held staff meetings and video-shadowing, a study could also be examined whether behaviors within those meetings are representative for behaviors shown outside these meetings. On the other hand, implicit images are advised to be captured via both direct and indirect measures (Epitropaki et al., 2013), with IFTs including both LIFTs and FIFTs. Moreover, an even larger mismatch seemed to appear between comparing perceptions of an effective follower and the ineffective follower behavioral repertoire. Therefore, further research is needed to examine in more detail whether the actual follower effective (follower) behavioral repertoire fits better with the existing positive implicit images. Also, the adopted line of research could be extended by including (work related) outcomes that result from the found differences between the implicit images and the actual behavioral repertoire. In contrast, also mediating and moderating factors and their influence in producing perceptual biases of leaders and followers should be studied. In this way, knowledge can be contributed to "a novel and emerging area of research" (Epitropaki et al., 2013, p. 868). Lastly, it is recommended to continue the line of this first exploratory research by adopting a multilevel view, and thus examining both leadership and followership at the same time (e.g. Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). A particular area for future research is elaborated on in Appendix 9.15.

Secondly, the results regarding the actual follower behavioral repertoire, and especially the actual effective follower behavioral repertoire, can be considered as a source for a novel line of research. This study has highlighted the importance of adopting a full behavioral range when examining followers' behavioral repertoire. Therefore, future research is needed to gain more in-depth knowledge about the full behavioral repertoire of followers. Such future research could examine both the behaviors shown by effective and less effective followers across a wide range of settings and participants, thereby studying the factors influencing the behavioral repertoire. Also, more and less effective follower behaviors

(Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) and their associations with follower, leader, team and organizational effectiveness should be examined. Lastly, as this study found that followers engage in leading behaviors, further research is needed to gain in-depth knowledge about these "non-following" behaviors (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). This is especially but not exclusively needed for so-called self-steering teams, and how these follower behaviors may relate to follower and team effectiveness.

Lastly, the results of this study support notions that IFTs partly consist of context specific dimensions. Therefore, future research should be examined on IFTs at different levels of analysis, and comparing the outcomes found. In this way, more knowledge can be gained about the ways in which perceptions are shaped (Duck, 1982). Besides, on the basis of the differences between the results from this study on LIFTs and Carsten et al.'s (2010) results on FIFTs, (possible) differences between LIFTs and FIFTs should be examined. This comparison is not at least important for the examination of self-other rating congruence and the possible consequences of differences in the implicit images of effective followers. Lastly, IFTs should be compared with ILT, as this may provide a better understanding of both followership and leadership (Van Gils et al., 2010; Avolio et al., 2009).

6. CONCLUSION

This study answered to recent calls for advancing the followership literature in various ways. Firstly, this study provided (to the best of our knowledge) the first empirical comparison of leaders' implicit images of effective followers and the actual behavior shown by their own followers. The results supported earlier findings that IFTs are mostly relation-oriented in nature, while the actual behavioral repertoire of both effective and ineffective followers was predominantly task-oriented in nature. Thus, the results showed a large mismatch between the actual behavioral repertoire and leaders' IFTs. Therefore, leaders' implicit images are not representative for the precise follower behavioral repertoire; neither for the most effective nor the least effective followers. Secondly, whereas prior followership research adopted typologies to assess follower role constructions, this study adopted a more objective video-method to examine the actual behavioral repertoire of variously effective followers. Knowledge about actual follower behaviors of both effective and ineffective is extremely scant, and therefore this study addressed a major gap in the emerging followership literature. Thirdly, the results showed that effective followers engaged more than their ineffective peers in transactional and individualized consideration behavior, and less in counterproductive (showing disinterest) behavior. Lastly, the results of this research contributed to the scant knowledge "on how leaders and followers perceive, decide, behave, and take action" (Sy, 2010, p. 1).

Furthermore, this study pointed to the importance of gaining more knowledge about actual follower behaviors (including both effective and less effective behaviors, and also so-called "non-following behaviors"), perceptual biases, and consequences of these perceptual biases. Large scale longitudinal multilevel field studies, preferably adopting mixed-methods designs including a broad range of participants and settings, and dividing individual followers into most effective and least ineffective, are recommended. Along these lines, in depth-knowledge can be developed about the influence of the extent of congruence between implicit images and the actual behavioral repertoire. In this way, both the followership and leadership field can be developed with strong theory and also effectiveness in organizational settings might be advanced.

As several studies have shown that both follower and leader effectiveness are crucial components when striving for (maximum) organizational effectiveness (e.g. Agho, 2009; Baker, 2007), such knowledge is of enormous relevance.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

8. REFERENCES

1. Agho, A. O. (2009). Perspectives of Senior-Level Executives on Effective Followership and Leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 16*(2), 159-166. doi:10.1177/1548051809335360.

2. Antonakis, J., & House, R. J. (2013). The Full-Range Leadership Theory: The Way Forward. *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead. 10th Anniversary Edition (Monographs in Leadership and Management)*, (pp. 3-33). doi:10.1108/s1479-357120130000005006.

3. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *MLQ: Multifactor leadership questionnaire*, 3rd edition. Mind Garden.

4. Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72*(4), 441-462. doi:10.1348/096317999166789.

5. Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current Theories, Research, and Future Directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*(1), 421-449. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621.

6. Baker, S. D. (2007). Followership: Theoretical foundation of a contemporary construct. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 14(1), 50-60. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0002831207304343.

7. Bales, R. F. (1950). A Set of Categories for the Analysis of Small Group Interaction. *American Sociological Review, 15*(2), 257-263. doi:10.2307/2086790.

8. Barrow, J. C. (1977). The variables of leadership: A review and conceptual framework, *Academy of Management Review*, 2(2), 231-255.

9. Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.

10. Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Funder, D. C. (2007). Psychology as the Science of Self-Reports and Finger Movements: Whatever Happened to Actual Behavior? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 2*(4), 396-403. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00051.x.

11. Bellante, D., & Link, A. N. (1981). Are Public Sector Workers More Risk Averse Than Private Sector Workers? *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 34*(3), 408-412. doi:10.2307/2522787.

12. Bosak, J., & Sczesny, S. (2011). Exploring the Dynamics of Incongruent Beliefs about Women and Leaders. *British Journal of Management, 22*(2), 254-269. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00731.x.

13. Bowen, G. A. (2006). Grounded theory and sensitizing concepts. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(3), 12-23.

14. Brugha, R., & Zwi, A. (1998). Improving the Quality of Private Sector Delivery of Public Health Services: Challenges and Strategies. *Health Policy and Planning, 13*(2), 107-120. doi:10.1093/heapol/13.2.107.

15. Carey, J. W., Morgan, M., & Oxtoby, M. J. (1996). Intercoder Agreement in Analysis of Responses to Open-Ended Interview Questions: Examples from Tuberculosis Research. *Field Methods, 8*(3), 1-5. doi:10.1177/1525822x960080030101.

16. Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared Leadership In Teams: An Investigation Of Antecedent Conditions And Performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(5), 1217-1234. doi:10.2307/20159921.

17. Carsten, M. K., Uhl-Bien, M., West, B. J., Patera, J. L., & McGregor, R. (2010). Exploring social constructions of followership: A qualitative study. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(3), 543-562. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.015

18. Chaleff, I. (2003). The courageous follower: Standing up to and for our leaders. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

19. Clifford, C., & Cohn, T. S. (1964). The Relationship between Leadership and Personality Attributes Perceived by Followers. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 64*(1), 57-64. doi:10.1080/00224545.1964.9919543.

20. Collinson, D. (2006). Rethinking followership: A post-structuralist analysis of follower identities. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(2): 179-189. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.12.0055.

21. Crossman, B., & Crossman, J. (2011). Conceptualizing followership - a review of the literature. *Leadership, 7*(4), 481-497. doi:10.1177/1742715011416891.

22. Czarniawska, B. (2007). Shadowing, And Other Techniques For Doing Fieldwork In Modern Societies. Malmö, Sweden: Liber AB.

23. Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2004). Leadership capacity in teams. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*(6), 857-880. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.09.001.

24. Day, D. V., Shleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. J. (2002). Self-monitoring personality at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(2), 390-401. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.390.

25. Decker, P. J. (1983). The Effects Of Rehearsal Group Size And Video Feedback In Behavior Modeling Training. *Personnel Psychology, 36*(4), 763-773. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1983.tb00511.x.

26. DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who Will Lead And Who Will Follow? A Social Process Of Leadership Identity Construction In Organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 35*(4), 627-647. doi:10.5465/amr.2010.53503267.

27. Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership Behavior And Employee Voice: Is The Door Really Open? *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(4), 869-884. doi:10.5465/amj.2007.26279183.

28. Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-Member Exchange Model of Leadership: A Critique and Further Development. *The Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 618-634. doi:10.2307/258314.

29. Dinh, J. E., & Lord, R. G. (2012). Implications of dispositional and process views of traits for individual difference research in leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*(4), 651-669. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.03.003.

30. Duck, S. W. (1982). Two individuals in search for agreement: The commonality corollary. In J. C. Mancuso & J. R. Adams-Webber (Eds.), *The Construing Person* (pp. 222-234). New York: Praeger.

31. Dvir, T., & Shamir, B. (2003). Follower developmental characteristics as predicting transformational leadership: A longitudinal field study. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(3), 327-344. doi:10.1016/s1048-9843(03)00018-3.

32. Ebbesen, E. B., & Allen, R. B. (1979). Cognitive processes in implicit personality trait inferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*(4), 471-488. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.37.4.471.

33. Eden, D., & Leviatan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(6), 736-741. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.60.6.736.

34. Engle, E. M., & Lord, R. G. (1997). Implicit Theories, Self-Schemas, And Leader-Member Exchange. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*(4), 988-1010. doi:10.2307/256956.

35. Fairhurst, G. T., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2012). Organizational discourse analysis (ODA): Examining leadership as a relational process. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*(6), 1043-1062. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.10.005.

36. Fay, M. P., & Proschan, M. A. (2010). Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney or t-test? On assumptions for hypothesis tests and multiple interpretations of decision rules. *Statistics surveys*, *4(0)*, 1-39.

37. Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2003). Implicit Measures in Social Cognition Research: Their Meaning and Use. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*(1), 297-327. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145225.

38. Feyerherm, A. E. (1994). Leadership in collaboration: A longitudinal study of two inter-organizational rule-making groups. *The Leadership Quarterly, 5*(3-4), 253-270. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(94)90016-7.

39. Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). Social Cognition (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

40. Fleishman, E. A., Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Levin, K. Y., Korotkin, A. L., & Hein, M. B. (1991). Taxonomic efforts in the description of leader behavior: A synthesis and functional interpretation. *The Leadership Quarterly, 2*(4), 245-287. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(91)90016-u.

41. Follet, M. P. (1949). The essentials of leadership. London: Management Publications Trust.

42. Foti, R. J., Knee, R. E., & Backert, R. S. (2008). Multi-level implications of framing leadership perceptions as a dynamic process. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(2), 178-194. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.007.

43. Fukkink, R. G., Trienekens, N., & Kramer, L. J. (2010). Video Feedback in Education and Training: Putting Learning in the Picture. *Educational Psychology Review, 23*(1), 45-63. doi:10.1007/s10648-010-9144-5.

44. Gawronski, B., & Payne, B. K. (2010). Handbook of implicit social cognition. Measurement, theory, and applications. NY: Guilford Press.

45. Geer, J. G. (1988). What Do Open-Ended Questions Measure? *Public Opinion Quarterly, 52*(3), 365-371. doi:10.1086/269113.

46. Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(6), 827-844. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.827.

47. Gibson, C. B., Cooper, C. D., & Conger, J. A. (2009). Do you see what we see? The complex effects of perceptual distance between leaders and teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 62-76. doi:10.1037/a0013073.

48. Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1981). Ethnographic Research and the Problem of Data Reduction. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 12*(1), 51-70. doi:10.1525/aeq.1981.12.1.05x1283i

49. Gong, Y., Kim, T., Lee, D., & Zhu, J. (2013). A Multilevel Model of Team Goal Orientation, Information Exchange, and Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(3), 827-851. doi:10.5465/amj.2011.0177

50. Goodwin, V. L., Wofford, J. C., & Boyd, N. G. (2000). A laboratory experiment testing the antecedents of leader cognitions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), 769-788. doi:10.1002/1099-1379(200011)21:73.0.co;2-j.

51. Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 9, 175-208. doi:10.1016/j.riob.1987.03.032.

52. Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly, 6*(2), 219-247. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5.

53. Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of productivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 28, 3-34. doi:10.1016/j.riob.2008.04.002.

54. Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A New Model Of Work Role Performance: Positive Behavior In Uncertain And Interdependent Contexts. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(2), 327-347. doi:10.5465/amj.2007.24634438.

55. Hanges, P., Lord, R., & Dickson, M. (2000). An Information-processing Perspective on Leadership and Culture: A Case for Connectionist Architecture. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49*(1), 133-161. doi:10.1111/1464-0597.00008.

56. Haythorn, W., Couch, A., Haefner, D., Langham, P., & Carter, L. (1956). The effects of varying combinations of authoritarian and equalitarian leaders and followers. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53*(2), 210-219. doi:10.1037/h0047418.

57. Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (Vol. 2). London: McGraw-Hill.

58. Hollander, E. P., & Julian, J. W. (1969). Contemporary trends in the analysis of leadership processes. *Psychological Bulletin, 71*(5), 387-397. doi:10.1037/h0027347.

59. Hollander, E. P., & Webb, W. B. (1955). Leadership, followership, and friendship: An analysis of peer nominations. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 50*(2), 163-167. doi:10.1037/h0044322.

60. Hoogeboom, A. M. G. M., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2015). Effective Leader Behaviors in Regularly Held Staff Meetings: Surveyed vs. Videotaped and Video-coded Observations. In J. A. Allen, N. Lehmann-Willenbrock, & S. G. Rogerberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science* (pp. 381-412). Cambrigde Univeristy

Press: UK.
http://dx.doi.org/1017/cbo9781107589735.017.

61. Hoogeboom, A. M. G. M., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2016). Comparing Effective Leader and Follower Behaviors: A Video-based, Multi-level Field Study. *Paper submitted to Leadership Quarterly*.

62. Hoption, C., Christie, A., & Barling, J. (2012). Submitting to the Follower Label. *Journal of Psychology, 220*(4), 221-230. doi:10.1027/2151-2604/a000116.

63. House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *7*(3), 323-352.

64. House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The Social Scientific Study of Leadership: Quo Vadis? *Journal of Management, 23*(3), 409-473. doi:10.1177/014920639702300306.

65. Howell, J. P., & Mendez, M. J. (2008). Three Perspectives on Followership. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff, and J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *The Art of Followership* (pp. 25-39). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

66. Hu, X., & Shi, J. (2015). Employees' surface acting in interaction with leaders and peers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(8): 1132-1152. http://dx.doi.org./10.1002/job.2015.

67. Hunt, J. G., Boal, K. B., & Sorenson, R. L., (1990). Top management leadership: inside the black box. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(1), 41-65. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(90)90014-9.

68. Ibarra, H., & Hunter, M. (2007). How leaders create and use networks. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(1), 40-47.

69. Jaussi, K., Stefanovich, A., & Devlin, P. (2008). Effective Followership for Creativity and Innovation. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff, and J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *The Art of Followership* (pp. 291-307). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

70. Jelinek, M., Smircich, L., & Hirsch, P. (1983). Introduction: A Code of Many Colors. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28*(3), 331-338. doi:10.2307/2392245.

71. Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 765-780. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765.

72. Junker, N. M., & Dick, R. V. (2014). Implicit theories in organizational settings: A systematic review and research agenda of implicit leadership and followership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(6), 1154-1173. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.09.002.

73. Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*(3), 341-349. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.67.3.341.

74. Kaplan, R. E. (1984). Trade routes: The manager's network of relationships. *Organizational Dynamics, 12*(4), 37-52. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(84)90010-x.

75. Katz, J. (1983). A Theory of Qualitative Methodology. In R. M. Emerson (Eds.). *Contemporary Field Research: A Collection of Readings* (pp. 127 – 148). Waveland: Prospect Heights, III.

76. Keller, T. (2000). Images of the familiar: Individual differences and implicit leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(4), 589-607. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00033-8.

77. Kellerman, B. (2008). Followership: How Followers Are Creating Change and Changing Leaders (1st ed.). Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press. http//dx.doi.org/10.5860/choice.46-0996.

78. Kelley, R. E. (1992). The power of followership. New York: Doubleday.

79. Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 22(3): 375-403. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(78)90023-5.

80. Korabik, K., & Ayman, R. (1989). Should women managers have to act like men? *Journal of Management Development*, *8*(6), 23-32. doi:10.1108/eum0000000001366.

81. Lappiere, L. M, & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership: What is it and why do people follow? UK: Emerald Group Publishing.

82. Larsson, M., & Lundholm, S. (2007). Leadership in interaction: A micro-discursive analysis of everyday interactions in a bank. Paper presented at the 6th International Conference on Studying Leadership, Warwick, UK, 13-14 December.

83. Larsson, M., & Lundholm, S. (2013). Talking work in a bank: A study of organizing properties of leadership in work interactions. *Journal of Human Relations*, 66(8): 1101-1129. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726712465452.

84. Lee, T. W. (1999). Using Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

85. Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., & Sablynski, C. J. (1999). Qualitative Research in Organizational and Vocational Psychology, 1979–1999. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 55*(2), 161-187. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1999.1707.

86. Lepine, J. A., & Dyne, L. V. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(6), 853-868. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.83.6.853.

87. Lepine, J. A., & Dyne, L. V. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with Big Five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(2), 326-336. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.2.326.

88. Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). The allure of toxic leaders: Why we follow destructive bosses and corrupt politicians – and how we can survive them. New York: Oxford University Press.

89. Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). Work Motivation and Satisfaction: Light at the End of the Tunnel. Psychological Science, 1(4), 240-246. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.1990.tb00207.x.

90. Lord, R. G. (2008). Followers' Cognitive and Affective Structures and Leadership Processes. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff, and J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *The Art of Followership* (pp. 255-266). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

91. Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2001). Leadership, values, and subordinate self-concepts. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12*(2), 133-152. doi:10.1016/s1048-9843(01)00072-8.

92. Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2003). *Leadership processes and follower self-identity*. Psychology Press.

93. Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., & Freiberg, S. J. (1999). Understanding the Dynamics of Leadership: The Role of Follower Self-Concepts in the Leader/Follower Relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 78*(3), 167-203. doi:10.1006/obhd.1999.2832.

94. Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & Vader, C. L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34*(3), 343-378. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(84)90043-6.

95. Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J., (1993). Leadership and Information Processing: Linking Perceptions and Performance. New York: Routledge.

96. Luff, P., & Heath, C. (2012). Some 'technical challenges' of video analysis: Social actions, objects, material realities and the problems of perspective. *Qualitative Research, 12*(3), 255-279. doi:10.1177/1468794112436655.

97. Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. (1980). Self-Management as a Substitute for Leadership: A Social Learning Theory Perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 5*(3), 361-368. doi:10.5465/amr.1980.4288845.

98. McDonald, S. (2005). Studying actions in context: A qualitative shadowing method for organizational research. *Qualitative Research, 5*(4), 455-473. doi:10.1177/1468794105056923.

99. McGregor, D. (1960). The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

100. Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 78-102. doi:10.2307/2392813.

101. Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

102. Millikin, J. P., Hom, P. W., & Manz, C. C. (2010). Self-management competencies in self-managing teams: Their impact on multi-team system productivity. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(5), 687-702. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.07.001.

103. Moon, H., Kamdar, D., Mayer, D. M., & Takeuchi, R. (2008). Me or we? The role of personality and justice as other-centered antecedents to innovative citizenship behaviors within organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1): 84-94. http/dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.84

104. Moore, L. F., & Lee, A. J. (1974). Comparability of interviewer, group, and individual interview ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*(2), 163-167. doi:10.1037/h0036518.

105. Morrison, E. W., Wheeler-Smith, S. L., & Kamdar, D. (2011). Speaking up in groups: A cross-level study of group voice climate and voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(1), 183-191. doi:10.1037/a0020744.

106. Morse, J. M., & Field, P.A. (1995). Qualitative Research Methods for Health Professionals. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

107. Nicolaides, V. C., LaPort, K. A., Chen, T. R., Tomassetti, A. J., Weis, E. J., Zaccaro, S. J., & Cortina, J. M. (2014). The shared leadership of teams: A meta-analysis of proximal, distal, and moderating relationship. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(5): 923-942. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaque.2014.06.006.

108. Noldus, L. P. J. J., Trienes, R. J. H. Hendriksen, A. H. M., Jansen, H., & Jansen, R. G. (2002). The observer video-pro: New software for the collection, management, and presentation of time-structured data from videotapes and digital media files. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 32(1): 197-206. http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/bf03200802

109. Oc, B., & Bashshur, M. R. (2013). Followership, leadership and social influence. *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*(6), 919-934. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.006.

110. 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.

111. Osborne, J. W. (2010). Improving your Data Transformations: Applying the Box-Cox transformation. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 15(12), 1-9.

112. Owens, B. P., Rowatt, W. C., & Wilkins, A. L. (2011). Exploring the Relevance and Implications of Humility in Organizations. *Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 260-272). New York: Oxford University Press.

113. Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods, 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.

114. Penney, L. M., & Spector, P. E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behavior (CWB): The moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(7), 777-796. doi:10.1002/job.336.

115. Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The Motivational Bases of Public Service. *Public Administration Review, 50*(3), 367-373. doi:10.2307/976618.

116. Pillai, R., & Meindl, J. R. (1998). Context and Charisma: A "Meso" Level Examination of the Relationship of Organic Structure, Collectivism, and Crisis to Charismatic Leadership. *Journal of Management, 24*(5), 643-671. doi:10.1177/014920639802400505.

117. Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879-903. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.

118. Popping, R. (2015). Analyzing Open-ended Questions by Means of Text Analysis Procedures. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology, 128*(1), 23-39. doi:10.1177/0759106315597389.

119. Potter, E. H., & Rosenbach, W. E. (2006). Followers as partners: the spirit of leadership. In W. Rosenbach and R. Taylor (Eds), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* (pp.143-158). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

120. Powell, G. N., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2010). Sex, Gender, and the Work-to-Family Interface: Exploring Negative and Positive Interdependencies. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(3), 513-534. doi:10.5465/amj.2010.51468647.

121. Psathas, G. (1961). Alternative Methods for Scoring Interaction Process Analysis. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 53*(1), 97-103. doi:10.1080/00224545.1961.9922105.

122. Rapee, R. M., & Hayman, K. (1996). The effects of video feedback on the self-evaluation of performance in socially anxious subjects. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 34*(4), 315-322. doi:10.1016/0005-7967(96)00003-4.

123. Rhodes, S. R. (1983). Age-related differences in work attitudes and behavior: A review and conceptual analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 93*(2), 328-367. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.93.2.328.

124. Roberts, M. E., Stewart, B. M., Tingley, D., Lucas, C., Leder-Luis, J., Gadarian, S. K., Albertson, B., Rand, & D. G. (2014). Structural Topic Models for Open-Ended Survey Responses. *American Journal of Political Science, 58*(4), 1064-1082. doi:10.1111/ajps.12103.

125. Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch and B. B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and categorization* (pp. 27-48). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

126. Rosenberg, S., & Jones, R. (1972). A method for investigating and representing a person's implicit theory of personality: Theodore Dreiser's view of people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 22*(3), 372-386. doi:10.1037/h0032891.

127. Roter, D. L., Larson, S., Shinitzky, H., Chernoff, R., Serwint, J. R., Adamo, G., & Wissow, L. (2004). Use of an innovative video feedback technique to enhance communication skills training. *Medical Education, 38*(2), 145-157. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2004.01754.x.

128. Sackett, P. R. (2002). The Structure of Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Dimensionality and Relationships with Facets of Job Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*(1&2), 5-11. doi:10.1111/1468-2389.00189.

129. Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, *9*(3), 185-211. doi:0.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG.

130. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happiness studies*, *3*(1), 71-92. doi:10.1023/A:1015630930326.

131. Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2011). Implicit Leadership Theories: Think Leader, Think Effective? *Journal of Management Inquiry, 20*(2), 141-150. doi:10.1177/1056492610375989.

132. Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership

and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*(1), 138-158. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001.

133. Sczesny, S., Bosak, J., Neff, D., & Schyns, B. (2004). Gender Stereotypes and the Attribution of Leadership Traits: A Cross-Cultural Comparison. *Sex Roles, 51*(11-12), 631-645. doi:10.1007/s11199-004-0715-0.

134. Seijts, G. H., Latham, G. P., Tasa, K., & Latham, B. W. (2004). Goal Setting And Goal Orientation: An Integration Of Two Different Yet Related Literatures. *Academy of Management Journal, 47*(2), 227-239. doi:10.2307/20159574.

135. Shamir, B. (2007). From passive recipients to active co-producers: Followers' roles in the leadership process. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. Bligh & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *Follower-centered perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R. Meindl* (pp. 9-39). Greenwhich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

136. Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (200). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Susceptibility, social construction, and leader empowerment. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Toronot.

137. Shondrick, S. J., Dinh, J. E., & Lord, R. G. (2010). Developments in implicit leadership theory and cognitive science: Applications to improving measurement and understanding alternatives to hierarchical leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(6), 959-978. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.10.004.

138. Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653. doi:10.4135/9781452231082.

139. Spiers, J. A. (2004). Tech tips: Using Video Management/ Analysis Technology in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(1): 1-8. doi:10.1177/160940690400300106.

140. Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological Empowerment In The Workplace: Dimensions, Measurement And Validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(5), 1442-1465. doi:10.2307/256865.

141. Steger, J. A., Manners Jr, & G. E., Zimmerer, T. W. (1982). Following the leader: How to link management style to subordinate personalities. *Management Review*, 71(10), 22-28. doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-054752-4.50022-1

142. Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Implicit theories of intelligence, creativity, and wisdom. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*(3), 607-627. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.49.3.607.

143. Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. *The Journal of Psychology, 25*(1), 35-71. doi:10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362.

144. Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques. Newbury Park. CA: Sage.

145. Sundstrom, E., Meuse, K. P., & Futrell, D. (1990). Work teams: Applications and effectiveness. *American Psychologist, 45*(2), 120-133. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.45.2.120.

146. Sy, T. (2010). What do you think of followers? Examining the content, structure, and consequences of implicit followership theories. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 113*(2), 73-84. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.06.001.

147. Sy, T. (2011). I think, therefore I do: Influence of leaders' and followers' implicit followership theories on relationship quality and follower performance. *Presented at the Academy of Management*, San Antonio, TX.

148. Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' resistance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(5), 974-983. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.974.

149. Tepper, B. J., Uhl-Bien, M., Kohut, G. F., Rogleberg, S. G., Lockhart, D. E., & Ensley, M. D. (2006). Subordinates' Resistance and Managers' Evaluations of Subordinates' Performance. *Journal of Management, 32*(2), 185-209. doi:10.1177/0149206305277801.

150. Todres, L., & Galvin, K. (2005). Pursuing Both Breadth and Depth in Qualitative Research: Illustrated by a Study of the Experience of Intimate Caring for a Loved One with Alzheimer's Disease. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 4(2), 20-31. doi:10.1177/160940690500400202.

151. Tse, H. H., & Chiu, W. C. (2014). Transformational leadership and job performance: A social identity perspective. *Journal of Business Research, 67*(1), 2827-2835. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.07.018.

152. Uhl-Bien, M., & Ospina, S. (2012). Paradigm Interplay in Relational Leadership: A Way Forward. In M. Uhl-Bien, S. Ospina (Eds.), *Advancing Relational Leadership Research: A Dialogue Among Perspectives* (pp. 537-580). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishers.

153. Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B, & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1): 83-104. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.007

154. Van de Walle, D. (1997). Development and Validation of a Work Domain Goal Orientation Instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57*(6), 995-1015. doi:10.1177/0013164497057006009.

155. Van der Weide, J. G. (2007). An explorative video-study of the behaviors of effective middle managers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tilburg, the Netherlands.

156. Gils, S. V., Quaquebeke, N. V., & Knippenberg, D. V. (2010). The X-factor: On the relevance of implicit leadership and followership theories for leader–member exchange agreement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 19*(3), 333-363. doi:10.1080/13594320902978458.

157. Vie, O. E. (2010). Have post-bureaucratic changes occurred in managerial work? *European Management Journal, 28*(3), 182-194. doi:10.1016/j.emj.2009.11.005.

158. Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1978). On the validity of the Vroom-Yetton model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63*(2), 151-162. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.63.2.151.

159. Walumbwa, F. O., & Schaubroeck, J. (2009). Leader personality traits and employee voice behavior: Mediating roles of ethical leadership and work group psychological safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), 1275. 10.1037/a0015848.

160. Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(6), 1063-1070. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063.

161. Whiteley, P., Sy, T., & Johnson, S. K. (2012). Leaders' conceptions of followers: Implications for naturally occurring Pygmalion effects. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23*(5), 822-834. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.03.006.

162. Wofford, J., & Goodwin, V. L. (1994). A cognitive interpretation of transactional and transformational leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly, 5*(2), 161-186. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(94)90026-4.

163. Wu, J. B., Tsui, A. S., & Kinicki, A. J. (2010). Consequences of Differentiated Leadership in Groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(1), 90-106. doi:10.5465/amj.2010.48037079.

164. Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A Hierarchical Taxonomy of Leadership Behavior: Integrating a Half Century of Behavior Research. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9*(1), 15-32. doi:10.1177/107179190200900102

165. Yukl, G. (2012). Effective Leadership Behavior: What We Know and What Questions Need More Attention. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 26*(4), 66-85. doi:10.5465/amp.2012.0088.

166. Zaleznik, A. (1965). The Dynamics of Subordinacy. *Harvard Business Review*, 43(3): 119-131. http://dx.doi.org/10.1225/65313.

167. Zhu, W., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2009). Moderating Role of Follower Characteristics With Transformational Leadership and Follower Work Engagement. *Group & Organization Management, 34*(5), 590-619. doi:10.1177/1059601108331242.

168. Zimmerman, P. H., Bolhuis, J. E., Willemsen, A., Meyer, E. S., & Noldus, L. P. (2009). The Observer XT: A tool for the integration and synchronization of multimodal signals. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*(3), 731-735. doi:10.3758/brm.41.3.731.

9. APPENDIX

9.1 Table 1: Perception coding scheme

Category	Code	Definition	Examples
Task-oriented	Cognitive job capability	The ability to perform his/her job, residing from one's knowledge, skills and competencies.	"Knowledge" "Expertise" "Competent"
	Goal oriented	The extent to which an individual emphasizes performance goals, and helps to facilitate decision making, problem solving, and intragroup coordination that maintain the emphasis on the goals (Gong et al., 2013; Seijts et al., 2004; Van de Walle, 1997).	"Results-oriented" "Targeted" "Problem solving"
	Engaged	The positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002).	"Vigor" "Motivation" "Perseverance"
	Responsible	Capable of being depended on; worthy of trust; reliable (Carsten et al., 2010); the extent to which an individual does a faire share of the work.	"Responsible" "Dutiful" "Keeping appointments"
	Empowered	The intrinsic motivation manifested in four cognitions (meaning, competence, impact and self-determination) reflecting an individual's orientation to his/her work role (Spreitzer, 1995).	"Confident"
	Managing by exception active	Monitoring task execution for any problems that might arise and correcting those problems to maintain current performance levels (Avolio et al., 1999).	"Monitoring"
Relation-oriented	Team player	Willingness to work in cooperation with others. Emphasizing collective effort and cooperation (Carsten et al., 2010).	"Collaborating" "Team focused" "Team player"
	Integrity	Adherence to moral and ethical principles; soundness of moral character; honesty (Carsten et al., 2010).	"Integrity" "Honesty" "Transparent"
	Good communicator	Able to exchange ideas and thoughts. Understanding audience and framing arguments accordingly (Carsten et al., 2010).	"Good communicator" "Communication skills" "Communicative"
	Job involved	The cognitive or belief state of psychological identification with the present job (Kanungo, 1982).	"Involved"
	Positive affect	The extent to which an individual feels enthusiastic, active and alert (Watson et al., 1988).	"Enthusiasm" "Active" "Alert"
	Loyal	Faithful adherence and support (Carsten et al., 2010).	"Loyal"
	Group focused transformational style	Influencing the group as a whole by creating shared values and seeking a common ground (Wu et al., 2010; Tse and Chiu, 2011).	"Stimulant" "Motivating"
	Social	Liking to interact with other people, to be in companionship.	"Social"
	Emphatic	The ability to comprehend another's feelings and to re-experience them oneself (Salovey	"Empathy"

			and Mayer, 1990).
	Conservative	Being averse to change or innovation and holding traditional values (e.g. obedience and respect).	"Traditional" "Respectful"
	Individual focused transformational style	Affecting individual employees by considering his/her uniqueness (Wu et al., 2010; Tse and Chiu, 2011).	"Seeing someone's individual opportunities"
Change-oriented	Open to change	Willingness to adapt to and be malleable; open to new ideas or experiences (Carsten et al., 2010).	"Openness to change" "Flexible" "Creative'
	Pro-active behavior	Self-directed and future-focused action whereby employees aim to bring about change (Carsten et al., 2010).	"Initiative taking" "Continuous improver" "Suggesting improvements"
	Voice behavior	The extent to which an individual speaks up (i.e. communication of ideas, suggestions, concerns or opinions) and offers constructive suggestions for change, thereby constructively challenging the status quo with the intent of improving the situation rather than merely criticizing it (VanDyne and LePine, 1998, 2001; Morrison et al., 2011).	"Expresses thoughts"
External	Customer-oriented	Having customers and their needs as primary focus of action; developing and sustaining productive customer relations.	"Customer-oriented" "Customizable"
	Environmental monitoring	Scanning and understanding of the internal and external environment to identify opportunities and threats. (Yukl, 2012; Antonakis and House, 2013).	"Aware of the environment" "Monitoring the outside world"
	Networker	Building and maintaining relationships with other people (e.g. superiors or outsiders) (Yukl, 2012).	"Networking"

9.2 Table 2: Behavioral coding scheme

Category	Behavior	Definition	Examples
Task-oriented			
Transactional	1. Providing negative feedback	Criticizing	"I do not like that…"
			"But we came to the agreement that…"
	2. Directing/correcting	Correcting	"That is not right'
	3. Verifying	Getting back to previously made agreements/visions/norms	"We came to the agreement that"
Initiating structure	4. Structuring the conversation	Providing structure by informing about the agenda, start/end time etc.	"The meeting will end at…"
			"We are going to have a break now"
	5. Directing/delegating	Telling others what (not) to do, dividing tasks	"Paul, I want you to"
	6. Informing	Giving factual information	"The final result is…"
	7. Visioning: own opinion	Giving own opinion	"I think that…"
Relation-oriented	8. Agreeing	Saying someone is right, liking an idea, showing compliant behavior	"You are right"
			"That is a good idea"
	9. Intellectual stimulation	Asking for ideas, inviting people to think along or come up with own ideas, brainstorming	"What do you think is the best way to…?"
			"What is your opinion about…?"
	10. Individualized consideration	Encouraging, being friendly, showing empathy	"Welcome"
			"How are you?"
	11. Providing positive feedback	Rewarding, complimenting	"Well done"
			"You did a great job"
	12. Humor	Making people laugh, saying something with a funny meaning	Laughing, making jokes
	13. Personally informing	Giving non-factual, private information	"Last weekend, my wife…"
Change-oriented	14. Visioning: long term	Giving long-term visions	"Within the next years, we want to…"
	15. Visioning: own opinion on mission	Giving own opinion on organization mission	"My opinion about this organization goal is…"
Counterproductive	16. Showing disinterest	Not showing any interest, not taking problems seriously, want to get rid of problems and conflicts	Not actively listening, talking to others while someone else is talking, looking away, looking bored
	17. Defending one's one position	Defending one's own position or opinion, emphasizing own importance	"We are going to do it my way"
			Blaming other people
	18. Disagreeing	Contradicting ideas, opposing team members	"That is not correct"
			"I do not agree with you"
	19. Directing/ interrupting	Interrupting when someone is talking	Interrupting

9.3 Table 3: Leaders' perceptions of an effective follower according to Yukl's (2012) categories

Category	Leaders' perceptions of an effective follower
1. Cognitive job capability	12,15
2. Goal oriented	10,76
3. Engaged	6,94
4. Responsible	3,13
5. Empowered	1,04
6. Managing by exception active	0,35
Subtotal task-oriented	*34,37*
7. Team player	14,58
8. Integrity	7,30
9. Good communicator	4,51
10. Job involved	3,82
11. Loyal	2,08
12. Positive affect	2,08
13. Group focused transformational style	1,74
14. Social	1,39
15. Conservative	1,04
16. Emphatic	1,04
17. Individual focused transformational style	0,69
Subtotal relation-oriented	*40,27*
18. Open to change	12,15
19. Proactive behavior	6,25
20. Voice behavior	0,35
Subtotal change-oriented	*18,75*
21. Customer-oriented	3,82
22. Environmental monitoring	2,43
23. Networker	0,35
Subtotal external	*6,60*
Total	**100%**

9.4 Table 4: Followers' actual video-coded behavioral repertoire in task- (transactional and initiating structure), relation-, change- and external-categories on the basis of the ten most and ten least effective teams

Behavior	Effective follower's behavioral repertoire in %	Ineffective follower's behavorial repertoire in %
1. Verifying	14,10	9,67
2. Providing negative feedback	3,23	1,56
3. Directing/correcting	0,29	0,09
Sub-subtotal transactional	**17,62**	**11,32**
4. Informing	28,50	27,76
5. Visioning: one's own opinion	27,43	36,67
6. Structuring the conversation	1,82	1,17
7. Directing/delegating	0,26	0,33
Sub-subtotal initiating structure	**58,01**	**65,93**
Subtotal task-oriented	*75,63*	*77,25*
8. Agreeing	7,66	5,81
9. Humor	5,82	5,62
10. Individualized consideration	2,49	0,44
11. Personally informing	1,07	0,20
12. Providing positive feedback	0,50	0,70
13. Intellectual stimulation	0,41	0,40
Subtotal relation-oriented	*17,95*	*13,17*
14. Visioning: long term	0,73	0,14
15. Visioning: own opinion on mission	0,24	0,04
Subtotal change-oriented	*0,97*	*0,18*
16. Directing/interrupting	3,04	4,63
17. Disagreeing	1,64	1,34
18. Defending one's one position	0,45	2,31
19. Showing disinterest	0,32	1,12
Subtotal counterproductive	*5,45*	*9,40*
Total	**100%**	**100%**

9.5 Table 5: Results independent sample t-test based on the ten most and ten least effective teams

	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)
Transactional	3,07	18	0,007*
Initiating structure	-0,74	18	0,470
Task-oriented	-0,70	18	0,493
Relation-oriented	1,98	18	0,063
Change-oriented	0,911	10,701	0,382
Counterproductive	-2,69	18	0,015*

*p < .05 (2-tailed), **p < .01 (2-tailed)

9.6   Table 6: Results Mann-Whitney U-test based on the ten most and ten least effective teams

	Mann-Whitney U	Significance (2-tailed)
1. Verifying	25,0	0,063
2. Providing negative feedback	44,5	0,684
3. Directing/correcting	36,5	0,315
4. Informing	47,0	0,853
5. Visioning: one's own opinion	28,0	0,105
6. Structuring the conversation	44,0	0,684
7. Directing/delegating	46,5	0,796
8. Agreeing	37,0	0,353
9. Humor	48,0	0,912
10. Individualized consideration	18,5	0,015*
11. Personally informing	27,0	0,089
12. Providing positive feedback	42,0	0,579
13. Intellectual stimulation	36,0	0,315
14. Visioning: long term	46,0	0,796
15. Visioning: own opinion on mission	49,5	0,971
16. Directing/interrupting	42,0	0,579
17. Disagreeing	45,0	0,739
18. Defending one's own position	28,5	0,105
19. Showing disinterest	22,0	0,035*

*p < .05 (2-tailed), **p < .01 (2-tailed)

9.7   Table 7: Leaders' perceptions of an effective follower and the actual behavioral repertoire of effective and ineffective followers on the basis of the ten most and least effective teams, based on task-, relation-, and change-categories

	Leaders' implicit images of an effective follower in %	Effective follower behavior in %	Ineffective follower behavior in %
Subtotal task-oriented	36,8	79,99	85,27
Subtotal relation-oriented	43,12	18,99	14,54
Subtotal change-oriented	20,08	1,02	0,19
Total	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

9.8   Table 8: Results one sample t-test leaders' perceptions vs. the actual behavioral repertoire of effective followers on the basis of the ten most effective teams, based on task-, relation-, and change-categories

	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)
Task-oriented	21,07	9	0,000**
Relation-oriented	-14,18	9	0,000**
Change-oriented	-25,45	9	0,000**

*p < .05 (2-tailed), **p < .01 (2-tailed)

9.9 Additional analysis

This section shows the exploratory analysis conducted on the basis of the above mentioned limitation regarding comparing leaders' perceptions of an effective follower with the actual follower behavioral repertoire as shown by the ten most effective teams.

9.9.1 Results

9.9.1.1 Data analysis

On the basis of individual effectiveness, most effective followers (follower effectiveness > 7, n = 414) and least effective followers (followers ≤ 7, n = 364) were selected. Followers without an assigned effectiveness score or followers that did not show four or more distinct behaviors during the video-taped meeting were excluded from the analysis. This lower bound of four distinct behaviors was chosen since followers in this case showed multiple behaviors and many followers showed four distinct behaviors. This resulted in 52,08% of the total follower sample being included in further analysis. Afterwards, a similar data analysis as in section 4 has been conducted: 1) to compare leaders' implicit images of an effective follower with the actual follower behavioral repertoire and 2) to examine differences between the actual behavioral repertoire of the most and least effective followers.

9.9.1.2 Actual follower behaviors of most effective and least effective followers

Insert table 9 around here

Table 9 shows an overview of the video-filmed and video-coded behavioral repertoire shown during the regularly held staff meetings of the most effective (n = 414) and least effective (n = 363) followers.

As can be concluded from the table, task-oriented behaviors occurred most frequently within the effective follower behavioral repertoire (73,08%). Therefore, proposition 2a, stating that the actual behavioral repertoire of an effective follower mostly consists of task-oriented behaviors, is supported. Especially 'initiating structure' behavior is showed often (55,01%), with 'informing' comprising 25,93% in frequency and 'visioning: own opinion' 27,36%. Another behavior that occurred often in the effective sample was 'verifying' (15,42%). In contrast, change-oriented behaviors were shown infrequently and only accumulated to 0,48% of the effective follower behavioral repertoire. Furthermore, several behaviors also accounted for less than 1% of the behavioral repertoire of an effective follower in frequency: 'directing/correcting' (0,32%), 'directing/delegating' (0,33%), 'intellectual stimulation' (1,31%), 'providing positive feedback' (0,53%), 'visioning: long term' (0,34%), and 'visioning: own opinion on mission' (0,14%). Moreover, relation-oriented behaviors constituted 17,91% of the behavioral repertoire. Lastly, 8,53% of the effective follower behavioral repertoire in frequency was devoted to counterproductive behavior. Since the behavioral coding scheme as previously noted did not include external-oriented behaviors, proposition 2b could not be tested.

Proceeding, the shown behavioral repertoire of the least effective followers also consisted mostly of task-oriented behaviors (70,75%), and the least of change-oriented behaviors (0,36%). Seven behaviors comprised less than 1% of the behavioral repertoire in frequency: 'directing/correcting' (0,25%), 'providing negative feedback' (0,58%), 'directing/delegating' (0,20%), 'intellectual stimulation' (0,74%), 'providing positive feedback' (0,69%), 'visioning: long term' (0,27%), and 'visioning: own opinion

on mission' (0,09%). Furthermore, relation-oriented behaviors comprised 17,19% of the ineffective followers' behavioral repertoire in frequency, and counterproductive 11,70%.

Insert table 10 around here

Table 10 shows the results of the performed independent samples t-test. As can be seen, a significant difference between the categories grouped on the basis of effectiveness was found for counterproductive behavior (t (545) = -3,491, p < 0,05). Thus, the effective follower behavioral repertoire consists significantly less of counterproductive behavior.

Insert table 11 around here

Lastly, table 11 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U-test. Four significant differences were found: 'agreeing' (U = 67701,50, p < 0,05), 'directing/correcting (U = 70986,00, p < 0,05), 'visioning: long term' (U = 71981,50, p < 0,05), and 'intellectual stimulation' (U = 68607,50, p < 0,05). Thus, it can be concluded that effective followers showed significantly more agreeing; directing/correcting; visioning: long term; and intellectual stimulation behavior than their ineffective colleagues.

9.9.1.3 Leaders' perceptions vs. actual follower behaviors

Insert table 12 around here

Table 12 contrasts the behavioral repertoire of the effective followers on the basis of the video-coded meetings with their leaders' implicit images of an effective follower.

Insert table 13 around here

As previously noted, the actual behavioral repertoire of an effective follower was task-oriented in nature. However, the means in table 13 show that leaders' implicit images did not match the actual behavioral repertoire of an effective follower: both relation-oriented and change-oriented were overestimated and task-oriented behaviors were severely underestimated. The outcomes of the performed one sample t-test can be found in table 13. It can be concluded that leaders have a tendency to think that an effective follower is significantly more relation-oriented than they actually are (t (412) = -30,52, p < 0,001). Furthermore, also leaders' implicit images of an effective follower were significantly more change-oriented than their followers actually showed in the meetings (t (412) = -180,21, p < 0,001). In contrast, leaders' IFTs of an effective follower with regard to task-orientation were significantly underestimated (t (412) = 54,08, p < 0,001). All in all, table 13 shows a mismatch between leaders' images or perceptions of their own followers and their actual behavioral repertoire. Therefore, proposition 3a, stating that leaders' prototypical images of an effective follower do not match the actual behavioral repertoire of their effective followers, is supported.

Lastly, larger discrepancies between leaders' perceptions and the effective and ineffective follower behavioral repertoire were found for all three categories: task-oriented (effective 79,90% and ineffective 80,11% against 36,8% on the basis of perception), relation-oriented (effective 19,56% and ineffective 19,49% against 43,12% on the basis of perception), and change-oriented (effective 0,54% and ineffective 0,40% against 20,08% on the basis of perception). Whether these differences are significant, cannot be assessed on the basis of this data. Therefore, although proposition 3b, stating that an even greater mismatch is between leaders' implicit images and the actual behavioral repertoire of the least effective followers, seems to be supported, no firm conclusions can be drawn.

9.9.2 Discussion on the basis of conducted analyses

As can be concluded from the above analyses, both found a (large) mismatch between leaders' perceptions of an effective follower and the actual follower behavioral repertoire. However, other differences on the basis of particular behaviors and categories of behaviors were found when adopting the above exploratory analysis. This highlights the importance of adopting a well-considered analysis. Therefore, both methods are compared below. For purpose of convenience, the adopted analysis in section four is referred to as 'analysis 1', and the above exploratory analysis as 'analysis 2'.

First, whereas the follower behavioral repertoire in analysis 1 was based on the ten most (i.e. highly) effective teams, the open question asked leaders for their image of an effective follower. Due to this difference of 'highly effective' vs. 'effective', the comparative results may not be 100% valid. In contrast, analysis 2 included all followers in the sample, thereby dividing the followers as either effective (effectiveness score > 7) or ineffective (effectiveness score ≤ 7). In analysis 2, therefore, not only highly effective followers were included in the comparison. Concluding, the assessed behavioral repertoire should be in line with the obtained IFTs in order to accurately examine differences between both. Besides, analysis 2 did not only include a (small) part of the total follower sample, as was the case in analysis 1. In this way, analysis 2 was able to utilize all gathered data to a larger extent. Lastly, while in analysis 1 the leaders' IFTs were based on 'an effective follower' (i.e. at the individual level), the actual behavioral repertoire was assessed per team as were their effectiveness ratings. Analyzing merely at the team level does not include the team's variation in individual follower effectiveness and differences in followers' behavioral repertoires between team members. When large differences or outliers exist within a team, both effective and ineffective followers and their individual behavioral repertoire might be excluded from further analysis since both mean follower effectiveness and team effectiveness might be 'moderated' or skewed. This might result in different and/or perhaps even less significant results and differences found. Concluding, future research is recommended to adopt (an analysis similar to) analysis 2.

9.10 Table 9: Followers' actual video-coded behavioral repertoire in task- (transactional and initiating structure), relation-, change- and external-categories on the basis of effective (effectiveness score > 7) and ineffective (effectiveness score ≤ 7) followers

Behavior	Effective follower's behavioral repertoire	Ineffective follower's behavorial repertoire
1. Verifying	15,42	14,74
2. Providing negative feedback	2,33	0,58
3. Directing/correcting	0,32	0,25
Sub-subtotal transactional	**18,07**	**15,57**
4. Visioning: one's own opinion	27,36	25,64
5. Informing	25,93	27,94
6. Structuring the conversation	1,39	1,40
7. Directing/delegating	0,33	0,20
Sub-subtotal initiating structure	**55,01**	**55,18**
Subtotal task-oriented	***73,08***	***70,75***
8. Agreeing	6,82	6,24
9. Humor	5,67	6,09
10. Individualized consideration	2,13	2,18
11. Personally informing	1,45	1,25
12. Intellectual stimulation	1,31	0,74
13. Providing positive feedback	0,53	0,69
Subtotal relation-oriented	***17,91***	***17,19***
14. Visioning: long term	0,34	0,27
15. Visioning: own opinion on mission	0,14	0,09
Subtotal change-oriented	***0,48***	***0,36***
16. Directing/interrupting	3,51	3,87
17. Disagreeing	2,20	2,74
18. Showing disinterest	1,68	3,52
19. Defending one's one position	1,14	1,57
Subtotal counterproductive	***8,53***	***11,70***
Total	**100%**	**100%**

9.11 Table 10: Results independent sample t-test based on effective (effectiveness score > 7) and ineffective (effectiveness score ≤ 7) followers

	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)
Transactional	1,370	775,00	0,171
Initiating structure	-0,019	722,36	0,985
Task-oriented	0,996	710,16	0,320
Relation-oriented	0,131	673,00	0,896
Change-oriented	0,811	66,00	0,420
Counterproductive	-3,491	545,00	0,001*

*p < .05 (2-tailed), **p < .01 (2-tailed)

9.12 Table 11: Results Mann-Whitney U-test based on effective (effectiveness score > 7) and ineffective (effectiveness score ≤ 7) followers

	Mann-Whitney U	Significance (2-tailed)
1. Verifying	70344,00	0,122
2. Providing negative feedback	71764,00	0,175
3. Directing/correcting	70986,00	0,011*
4. Visioning: one's own opinion	69384,50	0,064
5. Informing	72346,00	0,366
6. Structuring the conversation	71336,00	0,098
7. Directing/delegating	73043,00	0,052
8. Agreeing	67701,50	0,014*
9. Humor	73019,50	0,477
10. Individualized consideration	74999,00	0,946
11. Personally informing	72125,50	0,143
12. Intellectual stimulation	68607,50	0,003*
13. Providing positive feedback	74684,50	0,811
14. Visioning: long term	71981,50	0,012*
15. Visioning: own opinion on mission	74733,00	0,668
16. Directing/interrupting	72911,50	0,429
17. Disagreeing	71079,50	0,130
18. Showing disinterest	73955,00	0,591
19. Defending one's own position	74884,00	0,901

*p < .05 (2-tailed), **p < .01 (2-tailed)

9.13 Table 12: Leaders' perceptions of an effective follower and the actual behavioral repertoire of effective (effectiveness score > 7) and ineffective (effectiveness score ≤ 7) followers, based on task-, relation-, and change-categories

	Leaders' implicit images of an effective follower in %	Effective follower behavior in %	Ineffective follower behavior in %
Subtotal task-oriented	36,8	79,90%	80,11%
Subtotal relation-oriented	43,12	19,56%	19,49%
Subtotal change-oriented	20,08	0,54%	0,40%
Total	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

9.14 Table 13: Results one sample t-test leaders' perceptions vs. the actual behavioral repertoire of effective followers (effectiveness score > 7), based on task-, relation-, and change-categories

	t	df	Significance (2-tailed)
Task-oriented	54,07	412	0,000**
Relation-oriented	-30,52	412	0,000**
Change-oriented	-180,21	412	0,000**

*p < .05 (2-tailed), **p < .01 (2-tailed)

9.15 Elaboration on future research

This first research on comparing leaders' implicit images with followers' actual behavioral repertoire could be extended. As previously noted, Eden (e.g. 1990, 1992) stated that implicit images might be leading to Pygmalion (Golem) effects when leaders' positive (negative) prototypical images are fulfilled by followers (Sy, 2010). Thus, leaders' IFTs might eventually influence (i.e. moderate) followers' performance outcomes (Sy, 2010). Therefore, it would be particularly interesting to examine the influence of the extent of congruence between a leader's implicit image and a follower's actual behavioral repertoire on his or her performance outcomes (effectiveness). Thus, such a study would examine the moderating effect of leaders' implicit images on follower's effectiveness. However, several studies highlighted that a one-sided perspective might be too limited and addressed calls for a simultaneous examination of both leadership and followership (e.g. Van Gils et al., 2010; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Besides, several scholars argued that followers influence leaders (e.g. Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Dvir and Shamir, 2003; Howell and Shamir, 2005; Shamir, 2007). Consequently, it might be that followers' perceptions of leaders also influence (i.e. moderate) leaders' performance outcomes. Hence, this study calls to also assess the possible influence of the extent of congruence between followers' ILTs and the leader's actual behavioral repertoire on his or her effectiveness. Furthermore, this individual level congruence data could be aggregated to the team level. Continuing the above line, it might be moreover interesting to examine the influence of the extent of congruence between perception and actual behavior aggregated on the team level on team effectiveness. Such analyses are not at least interesting since both the results of the present study and the work of several scholars suggest that implicit images partly consist of dimensions that are context specific (van Gils et al., 2010; Epitropaki et al., 2013; Sy, 2010). In these analyses, also mediating and moderating factors and therefore control variables should be taken into account.

On the basis of the above, the following propositions for further study are offered:

Proposition 1. Higher follower effectiveness is found when the congruence between leaders' positive implicit images and followers' actual behavioral repertoire is higher.

Proposition 2. Higher leader effectiveness is found when the congruence between followers' positive implicit images and leaders' actual behavioral repertoire is higher.

Proposition 3. Higher team effectiveness is found when the aggregated congruence between positive implicit images and actual behaviors is higher.