A comparative study of prototypical images of (effective) leaders and followers vs. video-based behaviors

Shari Velema S1370073

Supervisors Prof. Dr. C.P.M. Wilderom Drs. A.M.G.M. Hoogeboom

MSc. Business Administration

December 19th, 2016 University of Twente P.O. Box 217, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AB	ABSTRACT					
1.	INT	DDUCTION				
2.	THE	IEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS7				
2.1 Imp		Implicit theories: Definition and earlier research	. 7			
	2.1.3	. Two dimensions of prototypes	. 7			
	2.1.2	. Implicit Leadership Theories	. 8			
	2.1.3	. Implicit Followership Theories	. 9			
	2.1.4	. Implicit theories and leader-member-exchange	10			
	2.1.5	. Implicit theories and behaviors	11			
2	.2	Earlier research into effective leadership	12			
	2.2.1	. Relations-oriented behaviors	13			
	2.2.2	. Task-oriented behaviors	14			
2.2.3.		. Change-oriented behaviors	15			
	2.2.4	. External-oriented behaviors	16			
3.	3. METHODS 1					
3	.1	Design	16			
3	.2	Perceptual data on leader and follower attributes	17			
3	.3	Perceptions and observations of leaders' and followers' behavioral repertoires	18			
	3.3.1	. Leader Effectiveness	18			
	3.3.2	. Follower Effectiveness	19			
	3.3.3	. Followers' and leaders' behavioral repertoires	19			
4.	RES	ULTS	21			
4	.1	ILTs and IFTs on the basis of attributes	21			
	4.1.1	. ILTs of followers	21			
	4.1.2	. IFTs of leaders	22			
4.1.3.		. Analysis of ILTs and IFTs	22			
4	.2	ILTs of the most and least effective followers	24			

4	.3	IFTs of the most and least effective leaders		
4	.4	Actual behavioral repertoires of leaders and followers		
	4.4.	1. Effective leader's behavioral repertoire		
	4.4.2	2. Effective follower's behavioral repertoire		
	4.4.	3. Analysis of actual effective leader and follower behaviors		
4.5 Summary of the findings				
		-		
5.	DIS	CUSSION		
5. 6.	DIS CO	CUSSION		
5. 6. RE	DIS CO FERI	CUSSION NCLUSIONS		
5. 6. RE AP	DIS CO FERI PENI	CUSSION NCLUSIONS ENCES DIX		
5. 6. RE AP	DIS CO FERI PENI	CUSSION NCLUSIONS ENCES DIX dix A: Definitions of the 30 prototypical attributes		

ABSTRACT

Implicit leadership theories (ILTs) and implicit followership theories (IFTs) are defined as a set of implicit assumptions about the behaviors or traits that characterizes an (effective) leader or follower. The goal of this present study was to identify ILTs and IFTs, and to subsequently compare them with actual effective behaviors of both leaders and followers. To reach this goal, the following comparisons were made: (1) between ILTs and IFTs in general, (2) ILTs of effective and less effective followers, (3) IFTs of effective and less effective leaders, and (4) ILTs/IFTs and actual effective leader/follower behaviors. The study included both open-ended questions in a survey and a video-based method. ILTs as well as IFTs show large differences compared to empirical (effective) leader and follower behaviors. Results provide support for the idea that people are unable to accurately recall (effective) leader and follower behaviors. The findings have important implications for future research on leader and follower performance First, ILTs and IFTs show to a large extent the same types of behaviors, in which relation-oriented attributes and behaviors is represented the most. Second, ILTs and IFTs differ substantially from actual (effective) behaviors. This finding points to the fact that people cannot rely on their implicit theories, because they are not representative of actual effective behaviors of both leaders and followers. These findings suggest that there are still a lot of improvements to be made by both leaders and followers in matching ILTs and IFTs with actual leader and follower behaviors. Leaders being aware of implicit theories and creating awareness of ILTs and IFTs among their followers can function as a first step in this process. It is recommended to study the effect of time on implicit theories by adopting a longitudinal research design, while using video-based methods. In addition, it is recommended that future research gains more knowledge about the relationship between implicit theories and effective behaviors in cross-cultural settings.

Keywords: implicit leadership theory (ILT), implicit followership theory (IFT), prototypical images, effective leader and follower behaviors, video-observation method.

1. INTRODUCTION

All organisms have the tendency to classify and categorize stimuli in their environment. This has also been supported by the social cognition literature that states that individuals have the propensity to classify others (Rosch, 1978; Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Within the organizational context, this classification, though unconscious, happens as well. Individuals are naturally inclined to classify people as leaders or followers (Engle & Lord, 1997; Lord & Maher, 1993). Every individual has a set of implicit assumptions about the behaviors or traits of an effective leader. In the academic literature, these assumptions are referred to as implicit leadership theories (ILTs) and implicit followership theories (IFTs). Whereas explicit theories are based on scientific observations and data, implicit theories are constructions built by people that reside in the minds of individuals. Implicit theories therefore represent subjective reality and perceptions, while explicit theories strive to approach objective reality (Epitropaki et al., 2013). Understanding these implicit theories is important, because regardless of the accuracy, individuals' implicit theories serve a "sensemaking" function to understand and respond to leaders or followers (Weick, 1995). ILTs and IFTs are proposed to influence how individuals judge or respond to a leader or follower, thereby influencing important outcomes such as performance appraisals (Junker, Stegmann, Braun, & Van Dick, 2016). Individuals rely even more on implicit theories than on explicit theories, even when confronted with overwhelming contradictory scientific evidence (Lewandowsky, Oberauer, & Gignac, 2013).

Early leadership research was conducted using a leader-centered approach. In the past 30 years, a rich body of research on implicit leadership theories has been established. Lord *et al.* (1984) were one of the first that came up with the *implicit leadership theories* in their research. Through personal experiences and socialization, group members develop implicit leadership theories, i.e., personal assumptions about the characteristics and abilities that a successful leader must possess. The perceived



Figure 1: Research model

match between a person's actual behavior and the attributes of a leader prototype the individual holds in memory determines whether people are categorized as leaders or not. Although these assumptions may reflect misconceptions about effective leadership, they nonetheless influence individuals in the way they perceive their leader's actions and the way they react towards their leader (Nye & Forsyth, 1991). Implicit leadership theories thus refer to the prototypes, or ideal instances of leadership (Lord *et al.*, 1984).

Only more recently, a shift in focus occurred from leader-centered leadership research to followercentered leadership research. Kouzes ad Posner (1990) stated that "leadership is a reciprocal process in that it occurs between people. It is not done by one person to another." (p. 29). The follower was recognized as an important element of leadership by other scholars as well. For example, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) stated that leadership can only occur if there is followership. During the last two decades, researchers began to see that followers are not merely passive recipients of leadership, but can also function as active contributors to leadership (Oc & Bashshur, 2013; Notgrass, 2014). In order to complement the research on ILTs, another line of research is based on the increased focus on followers. This research focused on the implicit assumptions about the behaviors or traits of followers: implicit followership theories (IFTs). Similar to ILTs, are IFTs defined as cognitive structures and schemas about the traits and behaviors that characterize followers (Sy, 2010). In contrast with implicit leadership theories, noticeably little research is available on the topic of implicit follower theories. Nevertheless, the evidence in support of implicit followership behavior has been there for many years. See for example McGregor's theory X and Y (McGregor, 1960). This theory classified followers into one of two groups, or so called prototypes. The theory was developed to determine which managerial style should be used in order to motivate workers based on implicit assumptions of followers. Only little attention has been paid to followers and followership in the leadership literature. Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) argue that this oversight is due, in large part, to confusion and misunderstanding of followership constructs and how they relate to leadership. Hence, leadership had not been understood as a process that is co-created by followers and leaders. Only more recently, followership gained attention in the leadership literature (Sy, 2010). This is of importance because research into the topic of leadership without an understanding of followership is incomplete, especially given the significance of following for leadership.

The goal of the present study is to combine the implicit theories of leaders and followers in order to provide a more integrative examination of these theories. An integrative view is important because of the shift in focus in the leadership literature, in which followers were not encountered until two decades ago. This study contributes to the existing leadership literature in two ways: (1) it provides more insights into IFTs which is a relatively understudied subject in the leadership research, and (2) because most research on implicit theories is based on ILTs and use only a survey method, this study provides additional insights when comparing survey data with observational data. Implicit images of

leaders and followers, measured using a survey method, will be compared to data retrieved from scientific observations. Hence, this paper addresses the following research question:

"What implicit theories do people have about effective followers and leaders and how do they differ from the actual behavioral repertoires of such leaders and followers?"

This research is structured as follows. First, an overview of the current literature on implicit leadership theories and implicit followership theories is given. After that, literature on effective leadership and Yukl's behavioral taxonomy on effective leadership are discussed. Subsequently, the methodologies used in this study are explained. The results are presented in the continuing sections, followed by a discussion of the results. Furthermore, practical implications, limitations and recommendations for future research will be given. Finally, a conclusion is made.

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

2.1 Implicit theories: Definition and earlier research

2.1.3. Two dimensions of prototypes

Implicit theories represent prototypical images or prototypes. Junker and van Dick (2014) distinguish two dimensions of prototypes. The first dimension "norm" is represented by typical vs. ideal prototypes. Prototypes may be based on a central tendency in which prototypes are defined as "how followers/leaders are". These typical prototypes are close to the average of the category. However, there are also ideal prototypes that are goal-derived. In this latter case individuals define ideal prototypes, i.e., "how followers/leaders should be" (Sy, 2010). Within a category only a few members will possess these attributes. Junker and Dick (2014) present a second dimension "valence" which represents positive vs. negative vs. neutral prototypes. Positive prototypes illustrate attributes that are desirable (e.g. being charismatic as a leader). These attributes are ideal to a specific goal, such as being an effective leader or follower. On the other hand, negative prototypes represent the attributes that are undesirable to reach a specific goal (e.g. being sarcastic as a leader). The neutral prototypes represent irrelevant attributes that do not add value to the categorization.

The present study focuses on goal-derived prototypes and how these theories on prototypes differ from actual effective leaders or followers. In addition, we focus on the positive dimensions of prototypes because they align with the Pygmalion theory, suggesting that positive beliefs enhance follower

Table 1. Categorization of prototypes

		Valence		
		Positive	Negative	Neutral
Norm	Goal-derived	Ideal	Counter-ideal	Atypical
	Central tendency	Prototypical	Antiprototypical	Atypical

performance (Whitely *et al.*, 2012). So, leaders that have a positive expectation of followers may improve follower performance as a self-fulfilling prophecy. Table 1 presents an overview of the prototypes and illustrates that the focus of this present study is on ideal prototypes.

2.1.2. Implicit Leadership Theories

Implicit theories represent cognitive schemas that are seen as a cognitive network of everyday concepts. These cognitive schemas are, simply defined, systems that individuals use to encode incoming information. Incoming information about stimuli (e.g., objects or people) is compared with the pre-existing cognitive schemas, in order to classify it. These cognitive schemas can also be viewed as "naïve" models, by which people seek to explain and predict their own behavior and the behavior of others. For example, when categorizing someone as a leader, you may predict how he or she will react and behave in certain situations, based on the prototypical image someone has in mind. Individuals' judgments are affected by these schemas, and influence the subsequent actions that derive from it (Schyns & Schilling, 2011). Although there is not much research yet available on the topic of implicit followership theories, there are quite some studies elaborating on the topic of implicit leadership theories. Eden and Leviatan (1975) were one of the first to introduce ILTs in their research. Lord and his associates further elaborated on the topic. Lord and Maher (1991) proposed four different information-processing models that are applicable to leadership and followership: (1) the rational model which assumes that individuals have access to all relevant information and unlimited capacity in processing this information. (2) The expert model in which experts who rely on well-organized knowledge structures on the basis of their experience in certain contexts, are differentiated from novices who need to engage in more demanding and complex cognitive processes. (3) The *cybernetic* model which is dynamic and assumes simultaneous processing of past information, current behavior and future planning. The last model (4) includes the *limited-capacity model*. This model relies on the principles of cognitive simplification, suggesting that perceivers of information use pre-existing schemas and limiting information processing resources to a satisfactory, rather than an optimal level.

This last approach also includes the categorization approach in which people are categorized as leaders through recognition-based processes, on the basis of the perceived match between their behavior and the pre-existing leader prototype the follower holds in memory (Epitropaki *et al.*, 2013). These cognitive structures or prototypes, specifying the traits and abilities that characterize leaders, are referred to as implicit leadership theories (Lord *et al.*, 1984; Lord & Maher, 1991). The prototypes are developed on the basis of socialization processes and experiences with leaders. When individuals interact, someone resembles the attributes of a pre-existing prototype and these memories of the cognitive structures are activated. These cognitive schemas do not represent objective realities, but rather perceptual abstractions that followers use to categorize individuals in leader positions (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). These perceptual abstractions can be biased by factors such as past

experiences or cultural backgrounds, and may also constrain an individual's capacity to observe leaders more objectively. Employees are hypothesized to use implicit leadership theories as uncertainty reduction mechanisms. They use it to compare actual leader behavior to their implicit leader prototype in order to form an impression of the leader in order to evaluate the quality of the exchanges they develop with the leader (Epitropaki *et al.*, 2013). Individuals may sometimes even be unaware that these schemas have been activated and that they influence their reactions and behaviors.

Earlier research already identified different categories within implicit leadership theories (Offermann et al., 1994; Schyns & Schilling, 2011). The research of Offermann et al. (1994) on implicit leadership theories included 41 items and identified eight dimensions of people's implicit theories of leadership: sensitivity, dedication, tyranny, charisma, attractiveness, masculinity, intelligence, and strength. The most characteristic dimensions of these eight are all typically positive attributes (dedication, charisma, intelligence and sensitivity), indicating that people generally view leaders or effective leaders in a positive fashion. Epitropaki and Martin (2004) have reduced the number of items by cross-validating their findings. Their ILT scale included 21 items and consists of a six-factor structure, namely, sensitivity (i.e., understanding, sincere, helpful), intelligence (i.e., intelligent, knowledgeable, educated, clever), dedication (i.e., motivated, dedicated, hard-working), dynamism (i.e., energetic, strong, dynamic), tyranny (i.e., domineering, pushy, manipulative, loud, conceited, selfish), and masculinity (i.e., masculine and male). Other studies identifying items on ILTs include Lord et al. (1984), Schein (1973) and Deal and Stevenson (1998). In addition, Schyns and Schilling (2011) included new categories in their research concerning the characteristics of leaders: being pleasant, communicative, extraverted, organized, conscientious, honest, being a team player and being open for new experiences. These studies all show similarities between the categories and items. Recurring attributes include being intelligent, honest, sensitive, dynamic and motivated.

2.1.3. Implicit Followership Theories

Consistent with the literature on implicit theories, the implicit followership theories represent individuals "naïve" theories about follower prototypes. Theorists have argued the importance of implicit followership theories in understanding leadership. For example, it is argued that a leader's management style is a function of the assumptions of followers (McGregor, 1960). Nowadays, the importance of followership has been acknowledged in the leadership literature. Leadership will not be entirely understood without examining followers or followership (Uhl-Bien *et al.*, 2014). Research into the topic of followership addresses a need to generate a deeper understanding of follower identities and how these identities affect leaders (Collinson, 2006; Lord & Brown, 2004). From a practical point of view, it can help leaders to better understand their followers as well. When a leader has an accurate IFT, he or she is better able to predict someone's behavior and to react upon it.

Leaders should be aware of the impact implicit followership theories have on followers' affect, behaviors, cognitions, and outcomes. Research has demonstrated that followers tend to fulfill the perceptions leaders have of them (Eden, 1992). The literature also refers in this case to the Pygmalion effect. According to Whitely *et al.* (2012, p. 822) the Pygmalion effect is "a special case of the self-fulfilling prophecy, whereby raising leaders' performance expectations for their followers improves follower performance". As implicit leadership theories guide followers' actions towards leaders (e.g. determining who's an effective leader and to decide whether to follow their directives), so can implicit theories on followers guide the leader's actions towards followers (e.g. determining whether to punish or reward a follower) (Sy, 2010).

Whereas in the literature it is stated that ILTs often includes aspects such as sensitivity and masculinity, can IFT include other attributes. Sy (2010) found that one of the more important aspects of IFTs include being a team player. That leaders and followers possess different attributes is not that strange, given the different roles and tasks leaders and followers have in an organization. Therefore, we expect followers to show a higher score for relation-orientated attributes such as being a team player than leaders do. The following proposition was formulated to examine the differences between ILTs and IFTs:

P1: There are differences in relation-, task-, change- and external-oriented attributes between followers' ILTs and leaders' IFTs.

2.1.4. Implicit theories and leader-member-exchange

Implicit theories are relevant for and may influence the communication between leaders and followers in an organization. Understanding ILTs and IFTs may enhance the perceived quality of the communication between followers and leaders, i.e., increase the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX). Within the LMX research, the importance of implicit leadership and implicit followership theories are acknowledged as well. Leadership effectiveness is regarded as a result of the relationship between leaders and its followers. The relationship between leader-follower can differ in terms of quality. Also, the relationship is often experienced and rated differently by leaders and followers. This results in a LMX disagreement. So, despite the fact that both parties are part of the same relationship, they interpret their relationship and its quality differently. Research suggests that this LMX quality is like to result in better performance when the relationship is experienced similarly. Within a relationship both dyadic partners are likely to have expectations of each other. In other words, in a leader-follower relationship, both parties hold a prototypical image of the other in mind (i.e., implicit leadership theories and implicit followership theories). These images will not only affect a follower's (or leader's) behavior, but they are also likely to affect the impression of the other party's contribution to the joint relationship (Van Gils, Van Quaquebeke and Knippenberg, 2010). Thus, implicit theories are a lens through which followers and leaders and their behaviors are considered as contributing to

the relationship or not. So, the more a follower's behaviors match with the leader's IFT, the more a follower is seen to contribute to the LMX relationship according to the leader. Likewise, the more a leader's behaviors match with the follower's implicit leadership theory, the more a leader is seen to contribute to the LMX relationship. A study by Epitropaki and Martin (2005) also found support that a lower discrepancy between leader's actual behavior and follower's implicit leadership theories, lead to a higher rating of the LMX quality by followers. This acknowledges the importance of a low discrepancy between an individual's actual behavior and the implicit theory the other party holds in mind. The effective leader is expected to show a low discrepancy between his prototypical images of effective follower behaviors and the actual behavioral repertoire of effective followers, because it is expected that an effective leader is effective in his communication with followers as well. Hence, the following propositions are formulated:

P2: The ILTs effective followers have, match better with the actual effective leader's behavioral repertoire than those of less effective followers.

P3: The IFTs effective leaders have, match better with the actual effective follower's behavioral repertoire than those of less effective leaders.

2.1.5. Implicit theories and behaviors

The prototypical images of leaders and followers are stored in memory and activated when a person meets an individual whose characteristics and behaviors are consistent with their implicit representations of a leader or follower (Keller et al., 1999). These cognitive representations can influence a person's reaction in a certain situation. For example, the communication between a leader and follower may be affected positively or negatively when the follower shows behaviors that is consistent or inconsistent with the follower characteristics a leader holds in memory (IFT). This may also have consequences for official work practices such as performance appraisals. When a leader rates someone's performance, he or she is relying on his memory of the follower's performance. However, what is reflected in those ratings is likely to be a combination of actual behavior that was shown and the expected behaviors based on implicit theories of the rater.

Implicit theories are also represented in someone's daily behavioral repertoire. A leader is likely to act in such a way that is consistent with his own representation of leader (ILT), indicating that implicit theories are reflected in own behaviors. This representation and the behaviors associated with it are influenced by socialization processes. This study examines whether leader behaviors match with followers' ILTs and likewise, whether follower behaviors match with leaders' IFTs. This way, we can conclude if prototypical images are a reliable reference or that it is biased. Whether implicit theories are representative of actual effective behaviors is investigated using the following proposition:

P4: ILTs and IFTs are not representative of actual effective behaviors

2.2 Earlier research into effective leadership

The current research has a focus on ideal leader prototypes, i.e., what individuals consider to be effective behaviors of a leader. A considerable amount of research is available on the topic of leader behavior and its effectiveness. This large amount of research on the topic leads to many definitions of leadership and different ways of looking at leadership. It therefore has resulted in "disparate approaches to conceptualizing, measuring, investigating and critiquing leadership" (Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio & Johnson, 2011, p. 1165). The numerous theories that came out of this research can be divided into three categories: (1) trait theories, (2) behavioral theories, and (3) situational theories (Vroom & Jago, 2007). Within the trait theories, researchers focus on aspects such as gender, intelligence and the Big Five personality traits. As for example, DeRue, Nahrgang, Wellman and Humphrey (2011) concluded that personality traits as conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness are particularly important predictors of success in leadership positions. Personality traits may function as a predictor of leadership effectiveness, but the behaviors individuals show are most visible to the outside world. Behavioral leadership theories consider the behaviors of leaders and how these behaviors can predict leadership effectiveness. It is known that leader behaviors have a bigger impact on leadership effectiveness than leader traits have (DeRue et al., 2011). Nevertheless, it is important to notice that the trait theories and behavioral theories do somehow overlap. DeRue et al. (2011) suggest behaviors are the more important predictors of leadership effectiveness, but having certain traits may predispose individuals to certain behaviors. The last category consists of situational theories in which situational variables are included. Vroom and Jago (2007) argue that a leadership style can be effective in one situation, but may be ineffective in a different situation. Although all three theories are important, the main focus of this study is on behavioral theories.

Within the behavioral paradigm, behaviors can fit into a few categories. Bass (1985) introduced early models of leadership behavior and drew his models upon transformational and transactional leader behaviors. Bass (1999) explained transformational and transactional leaders as follows: "Whereas transformational leaders uplift the morale, motivation, and morals of their followers, transactional leaders cater to their followers' immediate self-interests" (p. 9). Transformational leaders motivate followers by making them aware of a collective vision, by intellectually stimulating them, and by paying attention to their individual needs. On the other hand, transactional leaders tend to use more rewarding and corrective types of behaviors (Bass, 1985).

Prior research in this area resulted in several meta-categories of leadership styles. Different labels were used for these meta-categories including transformational and transactional leadership (Bass, 1985), production-centered and employee-centered leadership (Likert, 1961) and instrumental and supportive leadership (House, 1971). Fleishman (1953) was one of the first to introduce two concepts to identify two broadly defined behavior categories. Fleishman's (1953) model implies that leaders demonstrate

task-oriented behaviors (initiating structure) and relation-oriented behaviors (consideration) to achieve goals. The behaviors defining the two meta-categories in the theories of Fleishman (1953), Likert (1961) and House (1971) all consider task-oriented and relation-oriented behaviors, but varied somewhat from one taxonomy to another (Yukl, 2012). For decades, research on the topic of leadership behavior was dominated by a focus on these broadly-defined categories of behavior (Yukl, Gordon & Taber, 2002). Although two meta-categories to describe leader behaviors is a good start, scholars have argued that two meta-categories are over simplistic. Therefore, Yukl *et al.* (2002) added a third category to their taxonomy. In the previous mentioned meta-categories a lack of attention was given to leadership behaviors directly concerned with encouraging and facilitating change. Evidence has been found for the construct validity of the change-oriented meta-category (Yukl, 2012). The classification of change-oriented behavior as a third meta-category allows for important new insights into effective leadership in different situations. In addition, a fourth meta-category was added to the taxonomy: external behavior. This category acknowledges the importance of facilitating performance with behaviors that provide information about outside events (Yukl, 2012).

2.2.1. Relations-oriented behaviors

The relations-oriented behaviors include behaviors related to supporting, developing, recognizing and empowering (Yukl, 2012). These behaviors are used to enhance member skills, to improve the leader-member relationship, and the commitment to the mission.

Supporting. Examples of behaviors associated with supporting include showing concern for the needs and feelings of individual team members, listening carefully to members, providing support and encouragement in times of difficulties or stress. Also expressing the confidence that someone can perform a difficult task may be included in this category (Yukl, 2012). Supporting behaviors as part of the relation-oriented dimension has also been acknowledged by other scholars (Carsten *et al.*, 2010; Sy, 2010). The negative forms of supporting include hostile, abusive behavior, which reduces trust and invites retaliation (Yukl, 2012; Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Tepper, 2000).

Developing. Behaviors included are for example providing helpful career advice, informing about training opportunities and providing developmental coaching when needed (Yukl, 2012). Also behaviors such as intellectual stimulation can be assigned to this category.

Recognizing. Praising and other forms of recognition or appreciation are part of this. Effective leaders are proactive in looking for things or individuals that deserve recognition, and they provide the recognition in a sincere and specific manner (Yukl, 2012). Providing positive feedback is an example of this type of behavior.

Empowering. By giving followers more autonomy and asking for opinions, leaders can empower others. Empowering procedures include consultation and delegation. The term "participative leadership" is sometimes used to describe the extensive use of empowerment (Yukl, 2012).

An overlap exists between Yukl's previously described relation-oriented behaviors and Bass's theory on transformational leadership. Transformational leadership refers to the follower moving beyond immediate self-interests, by using idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1999). In the literature, a positive relationship between transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness is often reported (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Yukl, 2013). The full range of leadership, as measured with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), implies that leaders display transformational behaviors as well as transactional behaviors, but each leader's profile shows more of one and less of the other (Bass, 1999). Leaders who are more satisfying according to their followers and who are considered to be more effective as a leader show more transformational behaviors and less transactional behaviors (Avolio & Bass, 1991). Although transformational behaviors also include change-oriented behaviors, mainly the relation-oriented behaviors are represented.

2.2.2. Task-oriented behaviors

The task-oriented behaviors as described by Yukl (2012) match largely with the transactional behaviors as explained by Bass (1999). Transactional leaders ensure that followers reach their goals by using rewards and penalties, which is achieved by actively monitoring and controlling followers (Bass, 1985). Based on earlier measures of leadership behaviors, Yukl (2012) included the following behaviors as specific task-oriented behaviors: (1) planning, (2) clarifying (3) monitoring, and (4) problem solving.

Planning. These types of behaviors have the aim to decide what to do, how to do it, who will do it, and when it will be done. The observable behaviors of this category are most likely to be visible when a leader takes action to implement plans. This process often involves delegating tasks, or in the context of Yukl's taxonomy, involves clarifying responsibilities and objectives.

Clarifying. Clarifying involves the communication of plans, policies and role expectations (Yukl *et al.*, 2002). Clarifying behaviors have the aim to guide and coordinate work activity and to make sure followers know what to do and how to do it. Goal clarification and setting specific task objectives are important to encourage a search for efficient ways to reach objectives.

Monitoring. Behaviors associated with monitoring have the aim to assess whether people are carrying out their assigned tasks, the work is progressing as planned, and tasks are being

performed adequately. The information gathered out of monitoring can subsequently be used to determine if changes are needed in plans and procedures. Besides, it can help with relationsoriented behaviors such as praise or coaching. Important to notice are the negative examples including types of monitoring that are intrusive, excessive, superficial, or irrelevant (Yukl, 2012). Nevertheless, many studies provided evidence that monitoring can improve leadership effectiveness (e.g. Yukl *et al.*, 1990; Kim & Yukl, 1995; Amabile *et al.*, 2004).

Problem solving. According to Yukl (2012, p. 70) leaders use problem solving to: "deal with disruptions of normal operations and member behavior that is illegal, destructive, or unsafe". Management solving problems is often referred to as "crisis management". Effective leaders in this case try to quickly identify the cause of the problem and subsequently providing confident direction to the parties coping with the problem. A distinction must be made between the different types of problem solving. Operational problems can often be quickly resolved, while more complex problems are more likely to require change-oriented behaviors of leaders. The negative forms of problem solving include ignoring signs of serious problems, making a hasty response before identifying the cause of the problem, discouraging useful input from subordinates, and reacting in ways that create more serious problems (Yukl, 2012).

2.2.3. Change-oriented behaviors

Change-oriented behaviors have the aim to increase innovation and collective learning. Also, it includes behaviors that increase the adaption to changes in the external environment. According to Yukl (2012) there are four components within this category, with two focusing on leader initiation and the other two on leader facilitation of change processes.

Advocating change. To create a willingness to change, it is important as a leader to explain why change is urgently needed. Behaviors related to increasing awareness, by explaining undesirable outcomes that may occur when nothing changes, or other behaviors with the aim to decrease resistance to change can be assigned to this category (Yukl, 2012).

Envisioning change. To build commitment to new strategies and initiatives, it is important to create an appealing vision. It serves the purpose of inspiring and motivating followers, to make followers more likely to accept the changes. In (long-term) visioning it is important to share an appealing vision that is realistic and not based on false assumptions in order to increase the likelihood of success (Mumford, Scott, Gaddis, & Strange, 2002).

Encouraging innovation. Leaders can encourage and facilitate creative thinking among their followers. These types of behaviors are about encouraging individuals to look at a situation from a different perspective and to think outside-the-box. Yukl (2012) also describes the

aspects of this type of behavior as "intellectual stimulation" and "encouraging innovative thinking".

Facilitating collective learning. This category focuses on behaviors that have the aim to acquire new knowledge relevant for improving the performance of a team or organization. Leaders have the influence of helping their teams recognizing failures, analyze their causes, and to identify solutions to avoid a future recurrence (Yukl, 2012).

2.2.4. External-oriented behaviors

With the other behaviors being mostly internally focused, have the external-oriented behaviors a focus on events outside the work unit. Behaviors capturing this category are for example related to receiving information about outside events, get necessary resources and assistance, and promote the reputation of the work unit (Yukl, 2012). Besides, the extent to which management accurately perceives the relevant external environment is related to financial performance (Bourgeois, 1985).

Networking. The behaviors focused on building and maintaining favorable relationships with peers, superiors, and outsiders who can provide resources and political support are related to networking (Ibarra & Hunter, 2007; Kaplan, 1984; Kotter, 1982; Michael & Yukl, 1993).

External monitoring. Behaviors relating to external monitoring are those that analyze information about relevant events and changes in the external environment. Information about potential threats and opportunities may for example be acquired from networking or by conducting research (Yukl, 2012).

Representing. Representing includes lobbying for resources and assistance, influencing external stakeholders and including political tactics to influence decisions relevant for the work unit or organization.

In general, research into the topic of implicit theories often does not include the external-oriented behaviors. A possible explanation may be that this aspect of leadership has become more relevant throughout the years, because of a changing environment. Another reason may be that these types of behaviors are not as visible as the task-, relation-, or change-oriented behaviors, because these behaviors are more internally focused. Hence, the following proposition has been formulated:

3. METHODS

3.1 Design

As stated by Conger (1998), research on the topic of leadership is complex, because it involves multiple levels of phenomena, possesses a dynamic character, and it has a symbolic component.

Conger (1998) therefore stresses the importance of qualitative methods to investigate phenomena with such characteristics as leadership. The focus of the present study is on implicit leadership and followership theories. Therefore, the symbolic and subjective character of leadership and followership is particularly emphasized. Philips (1973) acknowledges the well-known criticism that surveys only investigate the attitudes about behavior rather than actual observed behavior. This exploratory study combines different methods of data collection in order to provide a more complete understanding on the topic of implicit leadership and followership theories (i.e., the attitudes about behavior) and its comparison with actually observed behaviors. This study comprises the following data sources: (1) data of actual leader and follower behaviors that were collected by video observations of regularly held staff meetings; (2) surveys containing an open question that measured the perceptions of effective leadership and followership of individuals attending these staff meetings, and (3) surveys that measured the general perceptions of leadership and followership behaviors using a pre set-up schema.

3.2 Perceptual data on leader and follower attributes

The perceptual data on follower or leader attributes were measured using a survey distributed after each videotaped staff meeting within a Dutch public sector organization. The perceptions were collected using an open ended type of question allowing for a maximum of three answers. The implicit leader attributes were collected with the use of a survey filled out by followers. Each survey distributed to followers attending the regular held staff meetings contained an open question that measured individuals' perceptions on what attributes an effective leader should possess. These were leader-follower dyads, measured in a team-context. This question was formulated as follows: "*Can you describe what attributes an effective leader should possess according to you*?". The measures for the implicit follower attributes are in line with the measures for the previously mentioned implicit leader attributes. A survey was distributed to leaders attending the regularly held staff meetings that contained a question measuring the attributes that an effective follower should possess according to you?"

Each respondent was given the task to fill out this question with a maximum of three answers. The follower sample consisted of 843 followers from a Dutch public sector organization. Of the 843 followers, 296 were female (35.1%), 539 were male (63.9%) and of 8 followers the gender remained unknown (0.9%). The followers were on average 47.9 years old, ranging from 20 to 65 (SD = 10.8). Their average job tenure was 22.6 years, ranging from 0 to 53 (SD = 14.0). The leader sample consisted of 99 leaders from a Dutch public sector organization. Of the 99 leaders, 28 were female (28.3%), 70 were male (70.7%) and of 1 leader the gender remained unknown (1%). The leaders were on average 50.8 years old, ranging from 27 to 64 (SD = 7.55). Their average job tenure was 24 years, ranging from 0.5 to 46 (SD = 13.49).

The answers to these open questions were coded using an "inductive analysis". This method allows continually creating and refining categories (Katz, 1983). For the present study the steps of Goetz and LeCompte (1981) were followed: (1) reviewing the data that had been collected and identifying first-order codes; (2) identifying categories that did not fit the existing codes; (3) creating typologies or themes that emerged and (4) assessing the relationships between the categories. During this process, additional constructs emerged. Two independent coders assigned the collected data to a preliminary label. In the end, 70 preliminary labels were found. By looking critically at the number of times a particular code was mentioned, these codes were revised. Codes that had a frequency lower than 5 were assigned to bigger categories. For example, based on literature, the codes "honesty", "open" and "transparency" were emerged under the category "integrity". Once agreement was reached among the research team on coding, two independent coders have replicated the entire coding process. They worked independently to improve the accuracy and to maintain inter-coder agreement. After evaluating both coders' findings, a final coding scheme of 30 prototypical attributes was obtained (Appendix A).

3.3 Perceptions and observations of leaders' and followers' behavioral repertoires

The observational data collected from videos of regular held staff meetings in a Dutch public sector organization, are compared to the perceptual behavioral repertoire filled out by individuals unrelated to the organization. These perceptions were collected with the use of a pre set-up schema including the behavioral rating scale which was also used for coding leader and follower behaviors in the recorded videos (Appendix B).

3.3.1. Leader Effectiveness

The leader effectiveness was measured based on a behavioral leader questionnaire filled out by experts. After each staff meeting expert raters were asked to fill out items on a survey. The survey contained 4 different items on leader effectiveness. Participants were asked to rate these questions on a scale, ranging from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 10 (*totally agree*). When the scores of these questions are aggregated, they must provide representative information on the effectiveness of each leader. The following items were included in the survey: "My leader leads the team effective", "My leader is effective in meeting my job-related needs", "My leader is effective in meeting organizational requirements" and "My leader is effective in representing me to higher authorities".

In total, 113 leaders were videotaped during regularly held staff meetings. In order to select the effective leaders, expert ratings were used who gave each leader a score on a scale of 1 to 10. A cutoff point was used of 8 or higher. The sample of effective leaders comprises 17 leaders with an average age of 51.4 years, ranging from 32 to 62 (SD = 8.238). The sample includes 5 female leaders (29.4%) and 12 male leaders (70.6%). Their average job tenure was 21.6 years, ranging from 0.5 to 39 (SD = 13.74).

3.3.2. Follower Effectiveness

The follower effectiveness was measured on the basis of 4 items from Gibson *et al.* (2009). These items were included in the questionnaires that were distributed directly after the meeting that was videotaped. The leaders of each team were asked to rate their followers individually on a 1 to 10 scale, ranging from 1 (*totally ineffective*) to 10 (*totally effective*). During the meetings, each follower wore a nametag with a number. These numbers were used for the coding of behaviors and for matching the individual's job evaluation to the right follower. By using numbers, instead of names, it was ensured that the data handling process remained anonymous. Hu and Shi (2015) and Moon *et al.* (2008) used similar matching procedures.

A total of 1492 followers were videotaped during the staff meetings. The effective followers were selected on the basis of average follower scores, consisting of the four items included in the survey. All followers having a score of 8 or higher were considered effective. However, only a few leaders give the maximum score of 10 to effective followers. Most leaders tend to give a maximum score of 8 to their most effective followers. To overcome this possible bias, additional followers were included in the analysis. These additional followers scored between 7.5 and 8 on effectiveness under the condition that (1) the average follower effective (team effectiveness > 4 on a Likert scale of 1 to 7). This last group is added to the analysis to overcome the differences in rating scales between leaders. The sample of effective followers comprises 243 followers. These followers have an average age of 48.6 years, ranging from 20 to 65 (SD = 10.296). The sample includes 83 female followers (33.7%), 143 male followers (58.8%) and of 18 followers the gender remained unknown (7.4%). Their average job tenure was 24.5 years, ranging from 0.3 to 46 (SD = 13.795).

3.3.3. Followers' and leaders' behavioral repertoires

In order to analyze the behavioral repertoire of followers and leaders, their behaviors in their natural work habitats were recorded and minutely coded (Van Der Weide, 2007). To exclude the potential threat of reactivity to the external validity of the study (Campbell & Stanley, 1966), each meeting was recorded with the use of three cameras positioned at fixed places during the videotaping. This way, the obtrusiveness and reactivity was minimized to ensure representative behaviors. Brand (1976) and others have argued and substantiated that videotaping, with the video camera in a fixed position, does result in reliable footage. Meetings are typically held in an office location where participants of the meeting are seated. Given this relatively constrained nature, meetings are suitable for unobtrusive video observations of behaviors (Hoogeboom & Wilderom, 2015). Besides, reactivity assumptions were investigated by asking followers questions concerning the recorded meeting and the behavior of

their leader during this meeting. These questions were formulated as follows: "To what extent do you believe the behavior of your leader during the videotaped meeting was different compared with his/her behavior during non-videotaped meetings?" and "To what extent was the videotaped meeting representative of this type of meetings?" Followers could respond to this question with a rate ranging from 1 (totally disagree) to 7 (totally agree). The average score of this study was 5.7 (SD = 1.069), suggesting that the meetings and leader behaviors were representative compared to daily practices. With the use of the behavioral software program "The Observer XT" that has been developed for the analysis, management and presentation of observational data (Noldus et al., 2000), the videos were precisely coded and analyzed. The observers were bachelor and master students of the University of Twente with a background in Business Administration. The students all received training about "The Observer XT" and how to apply the behavioral coding scheme. These instructions helped to enhance the accuracy of the coding of different behaviors. Of each video-recorded staff meeting the displayed behaviors of the leaders as well as the behaviors of the followers were precisely coded. The predefined coding scheme contained a detailed description of each of the mutually exclusive behavior to ensure systematic and reliable coding. In order the avoid subjectivity bias, each video was coded by two different observers. The results were compared through the use of a reliability test in "The Observer XT". This inter-reliability was defined as the percentage of agreement between the coded behaviors of the observers within a time range of two seconds. When significant differences or disagreements occurred, the observers re-viewed their findings. All videos in this study obtained an inter-reliability rate of 85% or higher. The recorded behaviors were coded on the basis of duration and frequencies. In order to enable direct comparisons between the videos, the duration of the coded behaviors is standardized.

Behavioral coding scheme. The behavioral coding scheme was developed in order to capture specific leadership behaviors during the daily work practices (Gupta *et al.*, 2009; Hoogeboom *et al.*, 2011; van der Weide, 2007). Appendix B includes a table which contains the different possible behaviors that have been coded in this current study by two independent coders. Each behavior has been given a short description and a couple of examples to understand the differences between the behaviors in more detail. Bales (1950) and Borgatta (1964) formed a solid base for this behavioral coding scheme. They observed in their early studies interaction processes between leaders and their followers. In their exploratory work they made a distinction between three broadly defined behaviors: (1) neutral task oriented behavior; (2) positive-social emotional behavior and (3) the remaining social-emotional behavior. The work of Bales (1950) and Borgatta (1964). She used a more experimental approach towards measuring leadership behaviors and added some behaviors to the already existing task-oriented and social-oriented behaviors. The work of Bales (1964) and Feyerherm (1994) all share two important commonalities: (1) all of three schemes assess the directly observable behavior, and (2) all three schemes are used to

observe leader behavior in a group context (e.g., Avolio, Howell, & Sosik, 1999; Yukl *et al.*, 2002). The behavioral taxonomy of the work of Yukl (2012) was also used in the development of the behavioral coding scheme, with the categorization of the different types of behaviors being based on Yukl's taxonomy. The scheme helps in more accurately describing the different observable behaviors. Due to the fact that issues that arise during staff meetings are more focused on internal matters, Yukl's category of external-oriented behavior is not included. In addition, the counter-productive category is included, because these types of behavior (e.g., "showing disinterest") are observable in staff meetings. Yukl's other categories task-oriented behaviors (e.g., "structuring the conversation"), relation-oriented behaviors (e.g., "agreeing") and change-oriented behaviors (e.g., "visioning: long term") were included in this video-based systematic set of field observations.

4. RESULTS

Given that previous research found that prototypes are perceptual abstractions biased by factors such as experiences or cultural backgrounds, we expected that the ILTs and IFTs show discrepancies with the actual effective behavioral repertoires of followers and leaders. By using the two surveys and the actual video-observations of leaders and followers, analyses must reveal differentiation between (1) ILTs and IFTs, (2) ILTs of effective and less effective followers, (3) IFTs of effective and less effective leaders, and (4) ILTs/IFTs and actual effective leader/follower behaviors. Descriptive numerical analyses were used to complement the qualitative content of the analyses. To avoid weighting single comments too heavily and generalizing findings too quickly (Schyns & Schilling, 2011), rather basic measures were used: absolute attribute frequency (i.e., total number of times a category is addressed across the surveys) and relative attribute frequency (i.e., average percentage of a category in comparison to the total number of statements mentioned in the surveys). These frequency analyses can help to critically evaluate representative attributes for the whole sample.

4.1 ILTs and IFTs on the basis of attributes

4.1.1. ILTs of followers

In total, 821 followers made 2166 statements concerning their views on the attributes of effective leaders. A total of 30 categories emerged in the analysis. Table 2 presents an overview of the different categories and their absolute frequencies as well as their percentages of all attributes. The 30 categories are divided into the four behavioral meta-categories of Yukl (2012): task-oriented, relations-oriented, change-oriented and external behaviors. The data shows that relation-oriented attributes are most desired from a leader (55,2%), followed by task-oriented attributes (33,1%), change-oriented attributes (10,3%), and finally external-oriented attributes (1,5%). In the highest scoring category relation-oriented attributes are the most frequent items "integrity" (13,4%), "group

focused transformational style" (8,5%), and "empathy" (8,2%). Behaviors and attributes considered as relation-oriented have the focus on increasing the quality of human resources and relations (Yukl, 2012). Within the category task-oriented attributes do the items "goal orientation" (12,9%) and "cognitive job capability" (10,4%) score highest. The main focus of this category is that leaders show behaviors concerning an effective and efficient completion of tasks. The third category change-oriented attributes included four items, with "voice climate" (6,1%) and "openness to change" (3,8%) having the highest scores. The final category external-oriented attributes only covered 1,5% of the total and contained three items: "environmental monitoring" (1,2%), "networking" (0,1%).

4.1.2. IFTs of leaders

In line with the analysis of follower perceptions on effective leader attributes, have the attributes of effective followers been analyzed on the basis of absolute frequency and relative frequency as well. Table 2 also presents an overview of the attributes an effective follower should strive for or should posses according to leaders. A total of 288 statements derived out of the responds given by 99 leaders. Out of the responses were 23 items derived, that are sorted into four categories. The four overlapping categories are comparable to the categories used for the leader attributes. The highest scoring category is the one with relation-oriented attributes (41,1%), indicating that leaders think an effective follower should behave in such a manner that it improves the quality of relations. The highest scoring items within this category are: "team player" (14,6%) and "integrity" (7,4%). The second highest scoring category is the one with the task-oriented attributes. The items "cognitive job capability" (12,2%) and "goal orientation" (10,8%) have the highest rating. Thirdly, the change-oriented attributes covered 18,8% of the total items, containing items as "openness to change" (12,2%) and "pro-active behavior" (6,25%). The least scoring category is the one with the external-oriented attributes (6,6%). Three items were included, with "customer oriented" (3,8%) and "environmental monitoring" (2,4%) scoring best.

4.1.3. Analysis of ILTs and IFTs

Table 2 shows that, to a large extent, similar subcategories are mentioned for the effective leader attributes and effective follower attributes. However, there are some attributes considered to be typical for leaders. Within the task-oriented category, the attributes "directive leadership", "instrumental leadership" and "resilience" were not mentioned as effective follower attributes. Out of these three attributes, "directive leadership" was mentioned the most. This is an interesting result, because providing direction is likely to not only be used in a top-down situation, but may also happen in peer-to-peer situations. Whereas in top-down situations this may be viewed as providing direction or "directive leadership", the same types of behaviors may be interpreted in a different manner in peer-to-peer situations and therefore may be considered as helping each other or being a "team player". Also, Table 2 shows that individuals do not expect effective followers to be resilient, but they do require this

Table 2.				

T 11 A

from an effective leader. A possible explanation is the effect that the resilient leaders have on their followers. Bass (1990) noted the ability of leaders to convert crises into developmental challenges to followers. Resilient leaders may therefore maintain resilience among followers by providing "intellectual stimulation to promote subordinates' thoughtful, creative, adaptive solutions to stressful conditions, rather than hasty, defensive, maladaptive ones" (Bass, 1990, p. 652). Consequently, "resilience" is seen as more typical for effective leaders compared to effective followers. Table 2 shows that within the relation-oriented category there are typical leader attributes as well. The attributes that were not mentioned for effective followers are: "affective trust", "intra-team trust", "supportive leadership" and "calm". Of these attributes, "affective trust" obtained the highest percentage for leaders (1,9%). A possible explanation may be that leaders think that cognitive trust is more important, because affective trust is likely to follow after cognitive trust is established. Literature also showed the positive influence of cognitive trust on affective trust (McAllister, 1995).

Continuing, the attribute "team player" is considered to be more typical for followers in comparison with the effective leadership attributes. It has the highest score within the relation-oriented attributes for followers (14,6%), while "team player" only covers 3,2% of the effective leadership attributes. As explained earlier, it may be that helping each other and providing direction in peer-to-peer situations may cause "team player" to score higher for effective follower attributes compared to the effective leader attributes. Another difference exists within the change-oriented attributes, especially in "openness to change". Being willing to change and accept changes are considered to be more typical for effective followers as for effective leaders. On the other hand, "voice climate" covers a larger part of the effective leader attributes. This is in line with Yukl's taxonomy which includes "advocating change" and "envisioning change" as change-oriented leader behaviors. Leaders should have the voice climate to communicate changes and ideas, and followers should be open to these changes.

Looking at Table 2, ILTs and IFTs show similarities. Nevertheless, there are differences in the prototypical images as well. We can therefore partly support proposition 1: *"There are differences in relation-, task-, change- and external-oriented attributes between followers' ILTs and leaders' IFTs"*.

4.2 ILTs of the most and least effective followers

Table 3 presents an overview of the prototypical leader attributes according to the 160 most effective followers and the 148 least effective followers. Besides, the observed effective behavioral repertoire of leaders on the categories "relation-oriented", "task-oriented" and "change-oriented" is also presented in Table 3.

Both groups show little discrepancies in the four categories. However, the most effective followers think an effective leader has more task-oriented attributes than the least effective followers think. There's a difference of 3,3% between both groups, suggesting that effective followers acknowledge

Table 3.



that effective leaders tend to show more task-oriented behaviors. Nevertheless, task-orientation is heavily underestimated compared to the actual task-oriented behaviors of effective leaders. The largest difference between both groups is shown in the change-oriented attributes. A difference of 3,9%, with the most effective followers allocating 9,8% to this category and the least effective followers allocating 13,7%. This category is overestimated by both groups. However, the group of the most effective followers allocates a more accurate score to this category compared to the least effective followers. Given this information, it seems that the effective follower is better in estimating effective leadership attributes than the less effective followers. So, support has been found for proposition 2: *"The ILTs effective followers have, match better with the actual effective leader's behavioral*

repertoire than those of less effective followers." Nevertheless, it remains important to notice the large differences in task- and relation-oriented attributes of both groups in comparison with the actual effective leader behaviors.

4.3 IFTs of the most and least effective leaders

Table 4 presents the attributes of effective followers as been mentioned by 16 most effective leaders and 16 least effective leaders. Task-oriented attributes were underestimated by both most effective and least effective leaders. Also, it is remarkable to see the difference between the subcategory "engagement" which covers 17,4% of the follower attributes according to the least effective leaders against 8,5% according to the most effective leaders. Although the difference between least effective leaders and effective leaders in this category is 3%, it is interesting to see that the least effective leaders allocate a higher score to task-orientation. Compared to actual effective follower behaviors in which task-orientation covers 81,3%, this may indicate that the least effective leaders have a more realistic

Table 4.



view of task-orientation than the most effective leaders have. Likewise, a difference in relationoriented attributes has been noticed between most effective and least effective leaders. While both leader groups overestimate this type of attribute in comparison with the actual effective follower behaviors (13,0%), the less effective leader is even overestimating this 8,5% more than the effective leader. Also, it is worth mentioning that the effective leaders only came up with five different subcategories, with "integrity" (12,8%) and "team player" (12,8%) being the largest subcategories. However, the least effective leaders mentioned nine different subcategories, of which "team player" (8,7%) and "good communicator" (8,7%) are being mentioned most. So, less effective leaders not only overestimate relation-orientation as an aspect of an effective follower, but it also seems that the least effective leaders are less unanimous in allocating attributes to effective followers.

Looking at Table 4, proposition 3: "*The IFTs effective leaders have, match better with the actual effective follower's behavioral repertoire than those of less effective leaders*", can only partly be supported. Both, most effective and least effective leaders underestimate task-oriented attributes in comparison with the actual effective follower behaviors (81,3%). The score of the least effective leaders matches even better with the actual effective behavioral repertoire of followers than the score of effective leaders. On the other hand, the percentage relation-oriented follower attributes of effective leaders matches better with the actual behavioral follower repertoire (13,0%) than the percentage of the less effective leaders. Overall, the survey on effective followers and effective followers' actual behavioral repertoires, especially for the two largest categories. Although external-oriented behaviors are not observed in our video observations, it is interesting to see the differences between the external-oriented attributes in 10,6% of the answers, while the less effective leaders overlook the aspect of external orientation and expect effective followers to only have an internal orientation.

4.4 Actual behavioral repertoires of leaders and followers

The actual effective behavioral repertoires of leaders and followers are presented in Table 5. These percentages are derived from the video-observations of the regularly held staff meetings. Also presented in this table are the results of the survey in which individuals were asked to allocate percentages to a pre set-up schema of leader and follower behaviors, in the table referred to as "implicit effective leader behaviors" and "implicit effective follower behaviors". The statistically significant differences in scores between the actual observed behaviors and the perceptions of behaviors are based on a Mann-Whitney test.

4.4.1. Effective leader's behavioral repertoire

Table 5 presents an overview of the actual behaviors displayed by leaders during regularly held staff meetings. These behaviors are categorized using Yukl's taxonomy on relation-, task-, change-oriented behaviors. External-oriented behaviors are excluded from the analysis, since the nature of staff meetings indicate largely internally focused behaviors. In addition, counter-productive behaviors are included in the analysis, because these types of behaviors are indeed present in the videotaped meetings. Referring to Table 5 it is worth mentioning the large percentage of task-oriented behaviors. Task-oriented behaviors accounted for 86,5% of the behavioral repertoire of leaders during staff meetings. The two highest scoring items within this category are: "informing" (46,8%) and "visioning: one's own opinion" (23,2%). This seems remarkable, since the "implicit effective leader behaviors" shows a percentage of 47,7% on task-oriented behaviors. Actual effective leader behavior only accounted for 10,6% on relation-oriented behaviors. Change-oriented behaviors showed a score of 3,6%. Finally, the least scoring category is the one with the counter-productive behaviors that covered 2,3% of the total behaviors. This is in line with the expectations, since effective leaders have been analyzed and counter-productive behaviors are assumed to decrease leader effectiveness.

4.4.2. Effective follower's behavioral repertoire

The overview of actual follower behaviors during the videotaped staff meetings is presented in Table 5 as well. The behavioral repertoire of followers is categorized in the same manner as the behavioral repertoire of leaders. The table shows that the following two behaviors were displayed the most by effective followers during the meetings: "informing" (34,6%) and "visioning: one's own position" (31,7%). These two behaviors are most displayed by the leader as well, indicating that effective leaders and effective followers to a large extent display the same types of behavior. The task-oriented behaviors are underestimated by the respondents, which accounts for 81,29% of the observed follower behaviors. On the other hand, the relational types of behaviors are significantly overestimated by individuals, even more than the overestimation of leaders showing relation-oriented behaviors. Although no statistical support has been found for the behavior "showing disinterest", it is interesting to see that this is the largest scoring behavior within the category of actually displayed counter-productive behaviors and it only covers a small part of the "implicit effective follower behaviors".

4.4.3. Analysis of actual effective leader and follower behaviors

It seems that actual effective behaviors of leaders differ significantly from what is estimated. As the descriptive statistics already suggested, the task-oriented behaviors occurred significantly more. Indeed, four out of six behaviors showed a discrepancy between actual and estimated behaviors: "informing" (U = 17, z = -6.267, p = .000), "visioning: one's own opinion" (U = 100, z = -5,405, p = .000), "directing" (U = 93, z = -5.456 p = .000), and "providing negative feedback" (U = 436.5, z = -2.061, p = .039). Statistics indicated that people's perceptions of effective leader behaviors show

significantly more positive relational type of behaviors than effective leaders actually did. In fact, every relation-oriented behavior is overestimated in comparison with actual effective leader behaviors: "agreeing" (U = 430, p = .047), "intellectual stimulation" (U = 137, z = -5.045, p = .000), "individualized consideration" (U = 358, z = -2.719, p = .000), "humor" (U = 179, z = -4.582, p = .000), "personally informing" (U = 362, z = -2.733, p = .006), and "providing positive feedback" (U = 63.5, z = -5.847, p = .000). The type of behavior categorized under change-oriented behaviors was significantly overestimated (U = 100, z = -5.419, p = .000). In terms of counter-productive behaviors of leaders, individuals tend to overestimate these types of behaviors. However, no significant support has been found for this difference, indicating that the perceptions regarding counter-productive leader behaviors are estimated most accurately.

Continuing with the effective followers, Table 5 shows that followers' task-orientated behaviors are underestimated, with five out of six behaviors showing a statistical discrepancy between actual and estimated behaviors: "informing" (U = 5012, z = -5.239, p = .000), "visioning: one's own opinion" (U

= 2614, z = -8.848, p = .000), "structuring the conversation" (U = 4538.5, z = -7.117, p = .000), "directing" (U = 4238, z = -6.756, p = .000) and "providing negative feedback" (U = 6423, z = -3.724, p = .000). However, whereas the counter-productive behaviors of leaders did not show a significant difference with the perceptions of individuals, individuals' perceptions of effective follower behaviors show a significant overestimation of two counter-productive behaviors: "defending one's own position" (U = 4958, z = -6.846, p = .000) and "disagreeing" (U = 3934, z = -7.600, p = .000). With significant support that three out of four categories of effective leader behaviors are not accurately estimated, proposition 4: "*ILTs and IFTs are not representative of actual effective behaviors*", can be supported.

4.5 Summary of the findings

Table 6 presents a main overview of the most important results that came out of the analyses. The table presents the three categories of Yukl's taxonomy which were included in both our survey and video-based observations: relation-, task-, and change-oriented behavioral categories.

Table 6.



5. DISCUSSION

In an effort to compare implicit leadership and followership theories to explicit, video-based behaviors, this study analyzed the differences between perceptual prototypical images (ILTs and IFTs) and actual behaviors of leaders and followers in regularly held staff meetings. By using two sources of data, this descriptive empirical study provides a more complete understanding of effective leadership and followership. The aim of this study was to answer the following research question:

"What implicit theories do people have about effective followers and leaders and how do they differ from the actual behavioral repertoires of such leaders and followers?"

Based on our findings, we found that the prototypical images of effective leaders and followers that reside in the minds of individuals differ substantially from the real effective behaviors. Also, people were not able to accurately estimate how often specific behaviors are shown by effective leaders and followers. The current study showed that the ILTs and IFTs of followers and leaders both emphasized the importance of relation-orientation. However, this is considered a misconception because the effective video-observed behaviors showed task-oriented behaviors as the largest part of the effective

behavioral repertoire of both leaders and followers. These findings reveal that people's prototypical images of followers and leaders are biased when they recall effective behaviors. This may not only influence the LMX, but may also influence the acceptance of a leader or follower in his or her role or function. The leadership or followership role can be viewed as a claiming and granting process (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). The role of leadership for example will be granted when the match between someone's ILT and the target person's qualities and behaviors is best. This may indicate that a follower is not likely to accept a leader (as effective) when this leader shows qualities and behaviors that are not consistent with his or her ILT. This highlights the importance of matching ILTs and IFTs with actual behaviors, which is likely to result in more acceptances of leaders and followers within the organization.

An additional outcome was that the actual behavioral repertoire of effective leaders does not show large differences, compared to the actual behavioral repertoires of effective followers. Effective leaders as well as effective followers display task-oriented behaviors the most, with 86,5% and 81,3% respectively. This may suggest that people in the daily work practices show the same type of behavior in general and that it does not matter whether the person is a leader or a follower.

Practical implications

Decision making, performance evaluation and LMX in the eyes of both leaders and followers are often biased, because of individuals' expectations about effective leaders and followers. It is important for leaders and followers to develop awareness of their ILT and IFT profiles, and how these perceptions may influence their behaviors toward each other. Second, the information on implicit theories shows possibilities for improvements in terms of matching implicit theories with actual behaviors and characteristics. For example, leaders may see more potential in someone who matches with his IFT. Because his or her IFT is not representative of actual effective behaviors, he or she may overlook potential in equally capable followers. Hence, creating awareness of the mismatch between implicit theories and actual behaviors may influence organizations in such a way that it improves performance in terms of recognizing potential, LMX by better understanding each other and acceptance of leaders (and followers) in his or her role or function.

Strengths and Limitations

An important strength of this study is the use of a video-observation method with which we examine much less subjectively leader and follower behavior. In addition, different surveys were used for followers and leaders. By using and comparing the results of these different sources and methods for collecting data, common source bias was reduced in this study (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). However, this study has several limitations. Firstly, the video-observations have been conducted within a Dutch public-sector organization. It is argued that implicit theories can vary depending on the sector of

business. Although effective leader and follower characteristics will be the same, it is expected that their behaviors in a public sector organization are likely to differ from a coach of a sports team (Schyns & Riggio, 2016). It is possible that the outcome of the study is subject to cultural differences, which may influence the generalizability of the findings to other organizations and countries. Secondly, the observed behaviors in this study have taken place in a staff-meeting setting. This may not provide a representative image of a leaders' and followers' actual behavior shown outside staff meetings. Thirdly, within this study attributes are directly compared with actual behaviors on three main categories. Even though a person's attribute is not always directly translated in a certain behavior. Comparing observed behavior and respondent-formulated attributes, even though categorized into a generic framework (of Yukl), may therefore not provide the best possible comparison.

Future research

We found that the shown effective behaviors do not differ that much between the role of a leader or a follower. For future research it may be interesting to investigate the lack of their differences might be dependent on the immediate organizational culture in which the research subjects act. Also, it would be interesting for future research to explore differences in ILTs and IFTs across other companies, sectors and countries to check for cross-cultural differences. Based on the findings in this study, and the striking similarities that occurred between the effective behaviors of both leaders and followers, conducting research into the differences in behaviors of leaders and followers could provide interesting insights. More research needs to be conducted to investigate whether behavioral repertoires are, to a large extent, not specifically linked to a person's role or function within the organization. In terms of other recommended research, it would also be valuable to carry out comparative studies between leaders' own ILTs and their own video-based behaviors. Likewise, it would be interesting to compare followers' actual behavior to their own IFTs. Through those comparisons we could examine to what extent people at work perceive their own behaviors accurately. Lastly, future studies might explore the effect of time. Implicit theories are based on experiences and socialization processes, assessing whether prototypical images are sensitive to people's experiences and processes through a longitudinal study would contribute as well to the existing literature on implicit theories.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In order to complement the existing literature on ILTs, this study is showing a gap in leadership and followership research in which followers only more recently gained attention. This study answers a part of the call for research that views both leaders and followers as co-producers of leadership and its outcomes (Uhl-Bien *et al.*, 2014). Also, it contributes to the existing literature in that it used objective measures in video-based observations instead of single survey-data based measures.

Based on our findings, we can come to the several conclusions. First, ILTs and IFTs show to a large extent the same types of behaviors, in which relation-oriented attributes and behaviors is represented the most. Second, ILTs and IFTs differ substantially from actual effective behaviors. Task-behaviors, which are represented the most in the observed behaviors, seem to be overlooked for both leaders and followers. This finding points to the fact that people cannot rely on their implicit theories, because they are not representative of actual effective behaviors of both leaders and followers. These findings suggest that there are still a lot of improvements to be made by both leaders and followers in matching ILTs and IFTs with actual leader and follower behaviors. Leaders who are aware of implicit theories and are able to create awareness of ILTs and IFTs among their followers can be a first step in this process. It is recommended to study the effect of time on implicit theories by adopting a longitudinal research design, while using video-based methods. In addition, it is recommended that future research gains more knowledge about the relationship between implicit theories and effective behaviors in cross-cultural settings. This will contribute to the awareness of implicit theories for both leaders and followers in order to better understand each other and better observe their actual behaviors.

REFERENCES

- 1. Amabile, T.M., Schatzel, E.A., Moneta, G.B., & Kramer, S.J. (2004). Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(1), 5-32.
- 2. Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1991). *The full range of leadership development: Basic and advanced manuals*. Binghamton, NY: Bass, Avolio & Associates.
- Avolio, B.J., Howell, J.M., & Sosik, J.J. (1999). A funny thing happened on the way to the bottom line: Humor as a moderator of leadership style effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 219-227.
- 4. Bales, R.F. (1950). A set of categories for the analysis of small group interaction. *American Sociological Review*, *15*(2), 257-263.
- 5. Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations. New York: Free Press.
- 6. Bass, B.M. (1990). *Handbook of Leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- 7. Bass, B.M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *8*, 9-32.
- 8. Borgatta, E.F. (1964). A note on the consistency of subject behavior in interaction process analysis. *Sociometry*, 27(2), 222-229.
- 9. Bourgeois, L.J. (1985). Strategic goals, perceived uncertainty, and economic performance in volatile environments. *Academy of Management Journal*, *3*, 548-573.
- 10. Brand, M. (1976). Watch what you're doing: Learning to cope with behavior problems through video simulation. *Music Educators Journal, 63*, 50-53.
- 11. Campbell, D.T, & Stanley, J. (1966). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. *Chicago: Rand McNally.*

- 12. 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*, 543-562.
- 13. Collinson, D.L. (2006). Rethinking followership: A post-structuralist analysis of follower identities. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(2), 172-189.
- 14. Conger, J.A. (1998). Qualitative research as the cornerstone methodology for understanding leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(1), 107-121.
- 15. Deal, J.J., & Stevenson, M.A. (1998). Perceptions of female and male managers in the 1990s. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 38*, 287-300.
- Den Hartog, D.N., House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., Dorfman, P.W., *et al.* (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 219-256.
- DeRue, D.S., & Ashford, S.J. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), 627-647.
- DeRue, D.S., Nahrgang, J.D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S.E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 7-52.
- 19. 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.
- 20. Eden, D. (1992). Leadership and expectations: Pygmalion effects and other self-fulfilling prophecies in organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 163-178.
- 21. Engle, E.M., & Lord, R.G. (1997). Implicit theories, self-schemas, and leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*(4), 988-1010.
- 22. Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2004). Implicit leadership theories in applied settings: Factor structure, generalizability and stability over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(2), 293-310.
- 23. Epitropaki, O., Sy, T., Martin, R., Tram-Quon, S., & Topakas, A. (2013). Implicit Leadership and Followership Theories "in the wild": Taking stock of information-processing approaches to leadership and followership in organizational settings. *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*, 858-881.
- 24. Feyerherm, A.E. (1994). Leadership in collaboration: A longitudinal study of two interorganizational rulemaking groups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(3/4), 253-270.
- 25. Fiske, S.T., & Taylor, S.E. (1991). Social cognition (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- 26. Fleishman, E.A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. Personnel Psychology, 37, 1-6.
- 27. 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.

- 28. Gils, S. van, Quaquebeke, N. van, & Knippenberg, D. van. (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.
- 29. Gupta, K., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Van Hillegersberg, J. (2009). *Exploring the behavior of highly effective CIOs using video analysis*. AMCIS 2009 Proceedings. Paper 463. Retrieved from http://aisel.aisnet.org/amcis2009/463
- Hernandez, M., Eberly, M.B., Avolio, B.J., Johnson, M.D. (2011). The loci and mechanisms of leadership: Exploring a more comprehensive view of leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1165-1185.
- 31. Ho, C.L. (2012). Implicit leadership theories: Explicit and implicit measures and their respective relationship to leadership perceptions and followers' characteristics. (Doctoral Dissertation). North Carolina State University.
- 32. 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 *et al.* (eds.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science* (pp. 381-412). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 33. Hoogeboom, A.M.G.M., Wilderom, C.P.M., Nijhuis, J.H.E., & Van Den Berg, P.T. (2011). Leader values, style and behavior during meetings: Triangulated evidence of effective leadership. Paper Submitted and presented at the OB division of the AoM Meetings, Texas: San Antonio.
- 34. House, R.J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *16*, 321-339.
- 35. Hu, X., & Shi, J. (2015). Employees' surface acting in interaction with leaders and peers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*(8), 1132-1152.
- 36. Ibarra, H., & Hunter, M. (2007). How leaders create and use networks. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(1), 40-47.
- 37. Judge, T.A., & Piccolo, R.F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A metaanalytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(5), 755-768.
- 38. Junker, N.M., van Dick, R. (2014). Implicit theories in organizational settings: A systematic review and research agenda on implicit leadership and followership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 1154-1173.
- 39. Kaplan, R.E. (1984). Trade routes: The manager's network of relationships. *Organizational Dynamics, Spring*, 37-52.
- 40. Keller, T. (1999). Images of the familiar: Individual differences and implicit leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10,* 589-607.
- 41. Kim, H., & Yukl, G. (1995). Relationships of self-reported and subordinate-reported leadership behaviors to managerial effectiveness and advancement. *The Leadership Quarterly, 6*, 361-377.
- 42. Kotter, J.P. (1982). The general managers. New York: Free Press.

- 43. Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1990). The credibility factor: what followers expect from their leaders. *Management Review*, 97(1), 29-33.
- 44. Lewandowsky, S., Oberauer, K., & Gignac, G.E. (2013). NASA faked the moon landingtherefore, (climate) science is a hoax: An anatomy of the motivated rejection of science. *Psychological Science*, 24, 622-633.
- 45. Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 46. Lord, R.G., & Brown, D.J. (2004). *Leadership processes and follower identity*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 47. Lord, R.G., Foti, R.J., & De Vader, C.L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *34*, 343-378.
- 48. Lord, R.G., & Maher, K.J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- 49. Lord, R.G., & Maher, K.J. (1993). Leadership and information processing. London: Routledge
- 50. McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *The academy of management journal, 38*, 24-59.
- 51. McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 52. Michael, J., & Yukl, G. (1993). Managerial level and subunit function as determinants of networking behavior in organizations. *Group and Organization Management*, 18, 328-351.
- Mitchell, M.S., & Ambrose, M.L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1159-1168.
- 54. Moon, H., Kamdar, D., Mayer, D.M., & Tukeuchi, 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), 84-91.
- 55. Mumford, T.V., Campion, M.A., & Morgeson, F.P. (2007). The leadership skills strataplex: Leadership skill requirements across organizational levels. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*, 154-166.
- 56. Noldus, L.P.J.J., Trienes, R.J.H., Hendriksen, A.H.M., Jansen, H., & Jansen R.G. (2000). 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, 197-206.
- 57. Notgrass, D. (2014). The relationship between followers' perceived quality of relationship and preferred leadership style. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 35*(7), p. 605-621.
- 58. Nye, J.L., & Forsyth, D.R. (1991). Effects of prototype-based biases on leadership appraisals: A test of leadership categorization theory. *Small Group Research*, *22*(3), 360-379.

- 59. Oc, B. & Bashshur, M.R. (2013). Followership, leadership and social influence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(6), p. 919-934.
- 60. Offermann, L.R., Kennedy, J.K., & Wirtz, P.W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Content, structure, and generalizability. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *5*(1), 43-58.
- 61. Philips, D.L. (1973). Abandoning method. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review on the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903.
- 63. Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and categorization* (pp. 27-48). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 64. Schein, V.E. (1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *57*, 95-100.
- 65. Schyns, B., & Riggio, R.E. (2016). Implicit leadership theories. In Global Encyclopedia of Public Admnistration, Public Policy, and Governance (p. 1-7). Farazmand, A. Cham: Springer.
- 66. Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2011). Implicit leadership theories: Think leader, think effective? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(2), 141-150.
- 67. 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.
- 68. Tepper, B.J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. Academy of Management Journal, 43(2), 178-190.
- 69. Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R.E., Lowe, K.B., & Carsten, M.K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 83-104.
- 70. Vroom, V.H., & Jago, A.G. (2007). The role of situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 17-24.
- 71. Van der Weide, J. G. (2007). An explorative video-study of the behaviors of effective middle managers (Doctoral-dissertation). University of Tilburg, the Netherlands.
- 72. Weick, K.E. (1995). Sensemaking in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 73. Whitely, P., Sy, T., & Johnson, S.K. (2012). Leaders' conceptions of followers: Implications for naturally occurring Pygmalion effects. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 822-834.
- 74. Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *26*(4), 66-85.
- 75. Yukl, G. (2013). Leadership in organizations (8th ed.). Englewood Gliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- 76. Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(1), 15-32.

77. Yukl, G., Wall, S., & Lepsinger, R. (1990). Preliminary report on validation of the managerial practices survey. In K.E. Clark & M.B. Clark (eds.) *Measures of leadership* (pp. 223-238). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Definitions of the 30 prototypical attributes