

What differentiates effective followers from less effective followers: An exploratory mixed-methods field study using survey- and video-data

Author: Thom van Es

University of Twente

P.O. Box 2017, 7500AE Enschede

The Netherlands

Abstract

Over the past decades, studies within the field of leadership research increasingly emphasised the importance of effective followers within the effective leadership equation. While there is an extensive amount of research on effective leadership, effective followership has been studied to a much lesser extent. This study tries to fill this gap in the research field and examines to which extent effective followers differ from less effective followers based on behaviours, self-perceptions, attributes and biographical characteristics. A mixed-methods design is applied consisting of 1) video-based data of regular staff meetings which are minutely coded to measure the followers' behavioural repertoire (n=1503), 2) follower effectiveness ratings provided by each leader (n=112), and 3) open questions in a post-meeting survey on self-perceptions, attributes and biographical characteristics of each participant. Results pointed out that while there are significant behavioural differences between effective and less effective followers, overall these behaviours do not significantly explain follower effectiveness. However, we did find that the self-perceptions competence, self enhancement, workload sharing and job satisfaction significantly determine 33.5% of the variance of follower effectiveness. In the discussion section, the results of this research are reviewed, its limitations and practical implications are pointed out, and some suggestions for future research are given.

Supervisors:

Prof. dr. C.P.M. Wilderom

Drs. A.M.G.M. Hoogeboom

Keywords

Follower effectiveness, effective follower equation, actual follower behavioural repertoire, video-based observation, mixed-methods design, follower self-perceptions and attributes.

1. Introduction

While there is an extensive amount of research on leadership, much less attention has been paid to the role of followers (Manning & Robertson, 2016). Kelley (1988) was one of the first researchers to note that followers did have an active role in corporate success rather than it solely depending on dynamic leaders. But even prior to the research of Kelley (1988), research of Hollander and Webb (1955) already recognised that for a leader to be considered effective, followers must be at least equally effective. Therefore followership should be treated as an important component to effective leadership (Hollander & Webb, 1955). More recent studies acknowledge these statements and address that it is highly useful to gain in-depth knowledge about followership constructs such as follower behaviour and characteristics (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Baker, 2007). Moreover, the fact that followers fill such a crucial part of the effective leadership equation in creating good organizational outcomes emphasises the need to get a clearer understanding on what makes a follower effective even more (Lippiere & Carsten, 2014; Howell & Mendez, 2008; Lord, 2008; Baker, 2007). Since follower effectiveness is fundamentally intertwined with organizational outcomes, several studies have focused on the effect of personality constructs to job performance (e.g. Barrick, Mount & Judge, 2001; Judge & Ilies, 2002; Judge, Bono, Ilies & Gerhardt, 2002; Hogan & Holland, 2003).

Many studies on follower effectiveness are based on leader's implicit images of what an effective follower would be according to them. These implicit images are found to be biased since they are influenced by context, personality characteristics, experience, racism, cultural background, or affective events (Hooigeboom & Wilderom, 2015; Lord et al., 2010; Lord & Maher, 1993). Due to this bias, Shondrick, Dinh and Lord (2010) concluded that actual behaviour cannot be accurately reflected based on perception. Hence, more objective methods are needed to capture an unbiased image of actual follower behaviour in organizational settings. Some researchers suggest that using observer-ratings of personality traits could be used to predict job performance (Zimmerman, Triana & Barrick, 2010; Connelly & Ones, 2010; Oh, Wang & Mount, 2011). While personality traits have been found to affect job performance, the people themselves must be studied in order to find out to which extent personality could predict job performance (Barrick and Mount, 2005). Since behaviour could be a reflection of peoples personality (Snyder, 1983), studying the behaviour and personality of followers that are considered to be effective by their leaders might provide new insights in predicting job performance. Therefore the main purpose of this study has a rather exploratory nature and consists of finding consistent attributes present within effective followers that distinguishes them from less effective followers to gain further insights on the effective followership equation (e.g. the combination of variables that explain follower effectiveness).

This study attributes to the current followership research domain because of several reasons. First, this study applies a mixed-method design, which integrates both quantitative and qualitative data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). This method does not only combine both the strengths of quantitative and qualitative approaches (Östlund, Kidd, Wengström & Rowa-Dewar, 2011), but also optimizes the strength of both approaches and compensates the weaknesses (Clark & Creswell, 2011). Second, the research sample was drawn from a large Dutch public organization in which several regular staff-meetings (n=112) from different leaders (N=112) and their team members (n=1503) were videotaped. Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) state that a large sample size will increase reliability and reduce common source bias. Third, the way of measuring the behavioural repertoire of all participants is rather unique within this research field. Behavioural repertoire was measured by coding each taped meeting

systematically and minutely. Finally, this study tries to identify consistent behavioural and personality characteristics of effective followers which could be very useful data for similar companies when recruiting new employees.

In the next section, relevant theories are reviewed. Then the methodology used to gather and analyse the data of this study will be explained. Followed up by the result section in which the results of this study will be summarized. Lastly, the found results will be discussed and final conclusions will be drawn.

2 Theory

2.1 Followership Research

2.1.1 The emerging field of followership research

As mentioned before, followership research emerged only recently. While it is believed that “leadership is an interactive process determined by both leaders and followers” (Zhu, Avolio & Walumbwa, 2009, p2), most leadership theory has been focussing “almost exclusively on the impact of leader traits and behaviours on followers’ attitudes and behaviours” (Howel & Shamir, 2005, p. 96). Lord, Brown and Freiberg (1999, p. 167) acknowledge that followers are still a much “unexplored source of variance in understanding leadership processes”. However, the field of followership research has been emerging only recently (Carsten et al., 2010; Collinson, 2006; Hopton et al., 2012 & Sy, 2010), since the topic has become equally worthy of study as leadership (Uhl-Bien & Pillai, 2007).

The studying of followership is defined as “the characteristics, behaviours and processes of individuals acting in relation to leaders and/or in contexts in which individuals identify themselves in follower positions or as having follower identities” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 96). In order to study followership, one needs to examine the effect of followership on the process of leadership (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Carsten et al., 2010; Howell & Shamir, 2005; Dvir & Shamir, 2003; Sy, 2010). By studying followership, our understanding of leadership is enhanced in several ways. First, studies in the followership field have led to the recognition of including of follower behaviour and styles within the leadership research (Carsten et al., 2010). Secondly, follower research adds to the overall understanding of leadership, since it is believed to be interrelated (Collinson, 2006; Lord & Brown, 2003). Third, studying followership has explored the role of followers in the reciprocal relationship with leaders, hence adding to the explanation of organization effectiveness and outcomes (Baker, 2007; Shamir & Howell, 2000). Lastly, the field of followership research adds to the understanding of the followership as a predictor of leadership and leadership effectiveness (Avolio, Walumbwa & Weber, 2009; Dvir & Shamir, 2005). The latter especially emphasises the need for a throughout understanding of followers and followership.

The field of follower research has made a distinction between the constructionist view and the role-based view (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Constructionist views try to describe the gathering of people within the process of co-creator leadership and followership itself (Fairhurst & Grant, 2010; DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Shamir, 2007). What differentiates the constructionist view from the role-based view is that the constructionist views are necessarily processual views. This means that constructionist views see people as the engagers of relational interactivity and that this leads to co-producing leadership and followership (Shamir, 2007; DeRue & Ashford, 2010). Constructional followership research focusses more on a social and relational context rather than formal hierarchical role and how leadership and followership are constructed within this context (Fairhurst & Uhl-Bien, 2012). One of the concepts within constructional research is the concept of ‘co-production’ which was proposed by Shamir (2007). This concept states that leadership is an outcome of the mutual effort of both leader and followers to create effective

leadership by co-producing leadership outcomes. This clearly indicates the importance of followership within the concept of leadership.

The role-based views rather focus on how leadership and followership are defined within the context of hierarchical roles (Uhl-bien et al., 2014). Most role-based research try to obtain a full understanding of the way subordinates work with their leaders and how this contributes (or not) to leadership and organizational outcomes (Oc & Bashschur, 2013; Sy, 2010; Carsten et al., 2010). Therefore role-based research mainly focusses on subjects like follower role orientations, implicit followership theories (Carsten et al., 2010; Sy, 2010) and how follower traits, behaviour and characteristics influences leaders and leadership effectiveness (Dvir & Shamir, 2003; Howell & Shamir, 2005). Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995, p. 223) stated that role-based research tries to answer the question: “What is the proper mix of follower characteristics and follower behaviour to promote desired outcomes?”.

2.1.2 The changing role of followers within Leadership Research

Throughout the past decades, the role of followers within leadership research has transformed from followers (or subordinates) being part of the leadership process to followership having a research field on their own and being an essential part within leadership research (Haytorn et al., 1956; Clifford and Cohn, 1964; Uhl-Bien et al. 2014). Uhl-Bien et al. (2014, p. 88) describes this transformation within the leadership research as a “progression from leader-centric to follower centric, to relational views”. The leader-centric views approached followers as being the moderator of the influence of leaders on production outcome (Shamir, 2007; Crossmann & Crossman, 2011; Bass & Bass, 2009; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Follower centric views consider the followers as ‘constructor’ of leadership (Meindl, 1990; Meindl, Ehrlich & Dukerich, 1985). Lastly, the relational view considers leader and follower to be both partaking in a reciprocal influence process (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

In de past, the majority of leadership research has solely focussed on leaders themselves. This leader-centric approach has resulted in a view of leaders being almost solely responsible for organizational outcomes (Hollander, 1993, Meindl et al., 1985; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). The stereotypical view on leaders conceived as the motivational individual that leads his followers to action in order to achieve goals (Bass, 1985). The stereotypical followers on the other hand, were regarded as submissive recipients of their leaders’ influence who carried out all orders without resistance (Shamir, 2007; Kelley, 1988), or as a simple moderator of the leaders’ influence to acquire results (Kerr & Jermier, 1978; Vroom & Jago, 1978).

In the years onwards, follower-centric approaches started to arise in response to the leader-centric research field. This ‘new’ approach drew much attention due to its then controversial thoughts about the ‘real role’ of followers within leadership research (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Meindl et al. (1985) were one of the first to note that leadership is a social construction established by the followers, stating that followers wrongly over-attribute the groups’ outcomes to the leader due to them relying much to the social psychological processes that are at hand. One major theme within the follower-centric approach is the research on Implicit Leadership Theories (ILT’s) (Phillips & Lord, 1981; Thomas, Rush & Lord, 1977; Eden & Leviatan, 1975). ITL research basically proposes that the extent to which followers consider a leader to be good or bad highly depends on the followers’ personal perception of how a good leader should operate/behave (Weick, 2012). Schyns and Meindl (2005) mention that the followers’ cognitive perception of an ideal leader determines how they act towards leaders. When the leader meets the behaviour and characteristics of their own cognitive representation of an ideal leader, the follower

would treat that leader as such. Another follower-centric view, the social identity theory, bridged the gap with relational views by arguing that the effectiveness of leaders depend on the willingness of followers to work with that leader (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

The relational view addresses the importance of relational dynamics to leadership and considers leadership to be a process that is mutually influenced by followers and leaders (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). One of the first researchers to recognise leadership as a relational process was Hollander (1971, 1986, 2012). He criticized the leader-centric approaches due to those failing to distinguish between a leader that is in the centre of a process called leadership and that this process consists of a mutual effort between leader and followers to achieve a goal.

The progression from leader-centric to relational views has resulted in the “widely acceptance that leadership cannot be fully understood without considering the role of followers in the leadership process” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 89). Although followership is recognised to be a crucial part of leadership research, it is still mostly absent in many leadership literature (Bligh, 2011). However, the lack of follower research in past studies increases urge for studying followership in the future (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

2.2 Leader’s image of an effective follower

Over the past view decades, researchers have acknowledged that everybody has their own personality and that this personality will affect behaviour expressed at work (Barrick & Mount, 2005; Goldberg, 1993). Some researchers therefore argue that someone’s personality could be a predictor of work-outcomes (effectiveness) (Barrick & Mount, 2005), since the way someone behaves can influence the leaders opinion about that person. Dunn, Mount, Barrick and Ones (1995) even state that leaders equally care about personality as with general mental ability during the hiring process. Traits like persistency, goal directedness, confidence, and being organized are often preferred when hiring since leaders connect these traits to a positive work performance (Barrick & Mount, 2005). Moreover, research has pointed out that the use of observer-ratings of personality traits could be used to predict job performance (Zimmerman, Triana & Barrick, 2010; Connelly & Ones, 2010; Oh, Wang & Mount, 2011).

Several studies have focused on the effect of personality constructs to job performance (e.g. Barrick, Mount & Judge, 2001; Judge & Ilies, 2002; Judge, Bono, Ilies & Gerhardt, 2002; Hogan & Holland, 2003). One example is the Big five personality traits in which especially the traits ‘conscientiousness’ and ‘emotional stability’ have been found to have a significant effect on job performance. Conscientiousness affects the followers’ willingness to follow rules and exert effort, while emotional stability affects a followers’ capacity to accomplish tasks and allocate resources (Barrick & Mount, 2005). Both personality traits have been found to affect job performance throughout all different fields since they generally represent work motivation. Moreover, another factor that has been found to influence job performance throughout all work fields is general mental ability (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998).

The other three personality traits of the Big five model, ‘Extraversion’, ‘Agreeableness’, and ‘Openness to experience’ have also found to be valid predictors of job performance but only for specific markets (Barrick et al., 2001). Extraversion, which includes traits such as being sociable, assertive, energetic, and ambitious, has been found to be of positive influence when a job involves interacting with or influencing other individuals (Barrick et al., 2001). Agreeableness, which includes being helpful, cooperating, and

nurturing, might be the single best predictor of job performance if the job mainly involves working in a team (Mount, Barrick & Steward, 1998). Followers that score low on agreeableness, which includes being argumentative, inflexible, uncaring, disagreeable, often show behaviours that are considered to be counterproductive and therefore should be considered as less effective (Barrick & Mount, 2005). Lastly, Openness to experience, which consists of being curious, original, artistically sensitive, intellectual, and independent, is related to having the ability to adapt to change more easily and contribute more to innovation (George & Zhou, 2001; Lepine, Colquitt & Erez, 2000).

In their paper, Barrick and Mount (2005) note that while personality traits have been found to affect job performance, the people themselves must be studied in order to find out to which extent personality predicts performance. Since behaviour could be a reflection of peoples personality (Snyder, 1983), studying the behaviour of followers that are considered to be effective according to their leaders, might provide new insights in predicting job performance (Beaty, Cleveland & Murphy, 2001; Gellatly & Irving, 2001; Hochwarter, Witt & Kacmar, 2000).

2.3 Capturing the followers' behavioural repertoire

In order to capture and categorise the behaviours of followers, various typologies have been developed. One of the first researchers to acknowledge the importance of followers was Zaleznik (1965), who noted that followers differ from each other and distinctions between them are of high relevance for theoretical and practical research (Zaleznik, 1965; Kellerman, 2008). The typology of Zaleznik consisted of two dimensions: (1) dominance-submission, and (2) activity-passivity. Basically, the former represents to which extent a person wishes to be controlled and the latter measures to which extent a person wishes to be initiative. Those two dimensions combined results in a model which consists of the following four types of followers: compulsive, impulsive, masochistic, and withdrawn. Compulsive followers are dominant and passive; they try to take control in a passive way. Common traits of compulsive followers are that they are often indecisive and do not take responsibility for their actions. Impulsive followers are dominant and active, as they try to challenge authority by acting spontaneous and courageous. Masochistic followers are both active and submissive. Withdrawn followers are submissive and passive, probably due to a lack of interest and trust with the leader, which makes it very difficult to be influenced. However, the typology of Zaleznik is considered to contain a rather pessimistic view of followership (Favara, 2009).

A more optimistic approach on followership is proposed by Kelley (1992), whose work is considered to be the standard in the field. Kelley (1992) considers followers to be equally important to an organization as leaders and argues that an effective follower is a deliberate shareholder in reaching a goal instead of being a passive recipient of influence. Kelley's concept of real followership does not simply consist of people within organizations that only do what they are told. In order to distinguish between effective and less effective followers, Kelley proposes five styles based on two categories reflected on two axes namely: (1) independent thinking and (2) active participation. The five followership styles are: alienated, conformist, exemplary, passive, and pragmatist. Alienated followers score high on thinking independently, yet they score low on active participation. The alienated followers' opposite is the conformist follower which scores low on independent thinking but high on active participation. The exemplary followers would be considered to being the most effective type, since they score high on both thinking independently and on active participation. Kelley considers this type as most effective since he believes that exemplary followers challenge the leader when necessary and are competent

independent thinkers. Passive followers on the contrary score low on both categories. Lastly, pragmatist followers score in the middle of both independent thinking and active participation.

Another major researcher in the field of followership is Chaleff (2003), who defined followership to be a “distinct role within organizational settings” (Favara, 2009, p. 20). In line with Kelley (1992), Chaleff proposed a two axis model consisting of the dimensions ‘challenge’ and ‘supervisory support’ and offers four categories namely: the individualist, the resource, the partner and the implementer. The individualist scores high on challenge, but low on supervisory support. The opposite of individualists is the implementer who scores rather low on challenge, but high on support. The implementer is characterized as being trustworthy, team focused and respectful to authority. Partners score both high on challenge and support and are characterized as being risk-taking and mission oriented. Lastly, there is the resource which scores both low on supervisory support and challenge. Moreover, Chaleff probably received most empirical attention for the five dimensions he added to his followership concept (Dixon & Westbrook, 2003). These dimensions are related to different extends of courage which are: (1) the courage to assume responsibility, (2) the courage to serve, (3) the courage to challenge, (4) the courage to participate, and (5) the courage to take moral action. These different acts of courage were added since Chaleff (2008) argued that the followers have the moral responsibility to act courageously towards leaders and their organization since they all serve (or should) a common purpose.

Kellerman (2008) proposed another perspective of different follower styles by interpreting followers from a political science perspective instead of organizational psychology (Favara, 2009). Rather than working with a two-axis model like Chaleff and Kelley, Kellerman proposes a one axis model which represents the level of encouragement of the follower. This model consists of follower types depending on the level of encouragement. From low to high the types are: isolator, bystander, participant, activist, and diehard. Isolators are completely detached from the organization and do not care about their leaders (Kellerman, 2008). Followers that are considered to be the bystander type observe but do not participate, they simply follow the path their leaders provide. Participants are more engaged with the company and show this by either favouring or oppose their leader. Activists have a strong feeling and act according to that feeling. Lastly, there are the diehards who are deeply committed to a cause they share with their leader, or will do everything to overpower the leader if their visions do not match. Kellerman (2008) states that the level of follower engagement is the most important factor to differentiate followership styles. Knowing follower types help with the identification of particular follower needs in order to transform or create transformations (Kellerman, 2008; Chaleff, 2008).

What can be learned from the different typologies is that followers tend to differ on the level of proactivity when constructing their organizational role (i.e. co-constructing and actively contributing for proactive followers and being deferent and obedient for passive followers) (Hoogeboom & Wilderom, 2016; Carsten et al., 2010). Uhl-Bien et al. (2014, p. 97) supports this conclusion and offers “theoretical constructs and variables for the study of followership” which includes nine followership behaviours. However, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) conclude that earlier research on followership consists of a more classic view on followership by associating followers with deference and obedience rather than their currently perceived role within a more dynamic organization. It is also believed that particularly high skilled workers and specialists are supposed to have a more independent role (Lord, 2008; Howell & Mendez, 2008). The changes in the working environment and thus the role of followers, requires followership behaviours like proactivity, accountability, empowering, resistance, and to a certain extent, leadership (Tepper, Duffy & Shaw, 2001; Day, Gronn & Salas, 2004; Day et al., 2002; Shamir, 2007; Grant

& Ashford, 2008; Owens, Rowatt & Wilkins, 2011). Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) used these behaviours to come to the following followership behaviours: (1) proactive behaviour, (2) initiative taking, (3) obedience, (4) resistance, (5) upward influence, (6) voice, (7) dissent, (8) feedback seeking, and (9) advising. The extent to which each follower shows a particular behaviour could be influenced by underlying factors such as follower traits, follower motivation or follower perceptions (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

This research adopted the earlier mentioned categorizations of task-, relation-, change- and external oriented behaviours instead of the proactive versus passive division. Furthermore, within the category task-oriented behaviour, a distinction could be made between transactional behaviour (Avolio & Bass, 2004) and initiating structure (Fleishman, 1953). First, transactional behaviour which consists of two core attributes: constructive transactions such as contingent rewarding, and corrective transactions such as management by exception (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Typical for transactional behaviour is to clearly define expectations and to promote performance in order to achieve organizational outcomes (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Therefore, behaviour like task-monitoring is a typical reflection of transactional behaviour (Bass, 1990). Secondly, initiation structure is described as the extent to which group interactions are defined or facilitated towards goal attainment" (Fleishman, 1953, p. 2). Initiating structure includes behaviours like task delegation and structuring the conversation. Followership research acknowledges that the behaviour of followers and leaders might show similarities, resulting in followers showing behaviours that would earlier have been considered to be typical leader behaviour (Carsten et al., 2010; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Moreover, several studies found that followers show leader behaviours like directing, goal setting and regulating (Kerr & Jermier, 1978, Hollander, 1992; Larsson and Lundholm; 2013). Carsten et al. (2010) found that followers that would be considered as 'proactive' showed a particular high desire to take initiative and accountability. This view is also supported by research on shared leadership and self-management which examine the performance of leadership behaviour by team members and examine similarities between the roles of follower and leader (House & Aditya, 1997; Carson, Tesluk & Marrone, 2007; Millikin, Hom & Manz, 2010; Nicolaidis et al., 2014).

2.4 Capturing the full prototypical image of an effective follower

By studying literature on implicit followership images, one might notice that these tend to consist mainly of relation-oriented attributes. However, when aiming to capture the full prototypical image of effective followers as seen by leaders, a well-defined taxonomy is necessary. Yukl (2012) proposes a revised hierarchical taxonomy based on his own work (Yulk, 2002) that can be used to capture different behaviours that are of influence on organizational-, team- or work-unit performance. The proposed taxonomy consists of the four meta-categories 'task-oriented', 'relation-oriented', 'change-oriented' and 'external-oriented'. Each of these meta-categories provides its own determinants to capture a certain performance (Yukl, 2012). As mentioned before, these determinants can also include follower traits or behaviours that would be considered as leader behaviour in the past. Yukl's four meta-categories might be good to use, due to its potential to capture sufficient prototypical image of effective followers.

First, task-oriented has the primary use to capture achieve goals in the most efficient and reliable way (Yulk, 2012). This category does therefore consist of the following behaviours: clarifying, planning, monitoring operations, and problem solving. Clarifying is used when people explain how to achieve a certain goal, including the setting of performance standards, priorities and deadlines. Lock and Latham (1990) found that a good goal setting will generally improve group performance. A good planning will give an overview on how and when objectives should be completed and monitoring this planning should

ensure that the operations meet certain quality standards within the provided time. Lastly, problem solving is used to identify problems and how to solve them. Also, the minimizing of problems or reducing the effect of problems when they occur is included within the process of problem solving. In terms of task-oriented follower traits Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) point out goal orientation reflects the objective to accomplish work in the most efficient and qualitative way. In addition, typical task-oriented follower attributes would be hardworking, productive, and mission consciousness (Sy, 2010; Carsten et al., 2010) since these attributes will help followers to achieve goals.

Second, relation-oriented behaviour has the prime objective of developing and improving human relationships and resources (Yukl, 2012). Components included within the relation-oriented category are: supporting, developing, recognising, and empowering. Supporting will add to the process of building mutual relationships or showing positive attention. Supporting is also connected to being loyal to someone or to a cause (Carsten et al. 2010; Sy, 2010). Typical attributes for a supportive follower are being enthusiastic (excited, happy, outgoing) and having a positive attitude towards supporting, helping or providing approval (Carsten et al. 2010; Sy, 2010). The component developing is used to increase self-efficacy and improving abilities. The component recognising includes noting efficient performance or high quality of work and giving the people responsible a complement for their effort or to their team contribution. Empowering can enhance working relations since people receive more responsibility and might feel more appreciated. Adding to the components mentioned above, Carsten et al. (2010) and Sy (2010) propose the follower attribute 'being a team player' to be relation oriented since this attribute reflects a persons' willingness to help and cooperate with others, emphasising collective effort (Carsten et al. 2010).

Third, the primary objectives of the change-oriented category are increasing the rate of innovation, facilitating the process of collective learning and adapting to the external environment (Yukl, 2012). The change-oriented category includes the components: advocating change, envisioning change, encouraging innovation, and the facilitation of collective learning. Advocating change actually consists of the first step of the change process which is explaining the need for change. This is followed up by the envisioning of change in which the positive consequences of the proposed change are expressed. Encouraging innovation is about the creation of a working environment that embraces change and stimulates people to express their creative ideas. In line with encouraging innovation, Griffin et al. (2007) propose that follower behaviours like proactivity and taking initiative are change-oriented since both contribute to the initiation, creation and development of new ideas. Furthermore, the facilitation of collective learning will add to the development of new ideas and change since followers gain a better understanding of the product or service they are working with. When taking the change-oriented components in mind, follower voice behaviour might also be added since this reflects the extent to which followers feel they can express their feelings and thoughts (Carsten et al. 2010; Detert & Burris, 2007).

Lastly, the external-oriented category has the primary objective of "acquiring all the necessary information and resources, and to promote and defend the interests of the team or organization" (Yukl, 2012, p. 68). The external-oriented category includes the components: networking, environmental monitoring, positive relationships with superiors, and representing. Networking will create a relation with the external environment and enables the collecting of information, resources and allies (Ibara & Hunter, 2007; Kaplan, 1984). Networking can also be used to create and maintain positive relationships with peers and superiors. Environmental monitoring allows finding opportunities and treats by scanning

the external environment. The component representing includes promoting and defending an organization and its reputation.

2.5 Actual behaviour versus perceived behaviour

All typologies, the work of scholars and especially the work of Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) mentioned earlier, are the starting point to examine actual follower behaviour. Since actual follower behaviour can show what actual behaviours give leaders the incentive to classify a follower as being effective. Since the current literature is merely focused on the perceptions of follower behaviour rather than actually capturing exhibited behaviour (like Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). This is due to most studies within the field of organizational-behavioural research having adopted a survey (Hoogeboom & Wilderom, 2016; Hoogeboom & Wilderom, 2015). The importance of measuring and comparing actual follower behaviour and the leaders' perception of an effective follower are really emphasised by the fact that capturing the implicit images of followers will clearly display the followers 'naïve' perceptions (Rosenberg & Jones, 1972), in contrast to scientific approaches trying to display objective reality (Sternberg, 1985). Moreover, implicit images tend to form immediately after a social interaction and are become increasingly more in-depth overtime due to the influence of contextual-, individual-, task-related-, and organizational elements (Epitropaki et al., 2013; Foti, Knee & Backert, 2008; Lord & Maher, 2002; Hunt, Boal & Sorenson, 1990). The development of implicit images will result in getting frames of references that will influence the interpretation of information, and the observation and judgement of people (Lord, Foti & Vader, 1984; Shondrick & Lord, 2010) Adding to that, it is stated that individuals seem to lack the consciousness to notice how implicit schemas will impact action tendencies (Epitropaki et al., 2013). An implicit image is often formed by a prototype, which is created by combining an abstract set of features that are related to a certain person or group or by the person that is perceived as being the most representable of the group (Sy, 2010; Rosch, 1978; Ebbesen & Allen, 1979).

Study has found that implicit images and thus prototypes are biased since they are influenced by context, personality characteristics, experience, racism, cultural background, or affective events (Hoogeboom & Wilderom, 2015; Lord et al., 2010; Lord & Maher, 1993). Due to this, Shondrick, Dinh and Lord (2010) concluded that actual behaviour cannot be accurately reflected based on perception. Hence, more objective methods are needed to capture an unbiased picture of actual follower behaviour in organizational settings. When it is possible to capture actual behaviour, it is possible to study which behaviour and to which extent this behaviour is expressed by effective followers compared to less effective followers. This way, behaviour that leads to follower effectiveness can be identified.

Based on the literature, the following hypotheses are defined:

1. Effective followers distinguish themselves from less effective followers by showing more transactional- (1a), initiating structure (1b), relationship- (1c) and change-oriented behaviour (1d) and less counterproductive behaviour (1e).
2. Followers that are more satisfied with their work (2a) and leader (2b) are more effective.
3. Behaviour expressed by followers makes a significant difference when distinguishing between effective and less effective followers.

3. Methodology

This study contains a mixed-method design, which is a design in which both quantitative and qualitative data are integrated in the same study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). According to Bryman (2007), leadership research can greatly benefit from the use of mixed methods. Therefore, the method becomes increasingly more recognized as valuable since it does not only combine both the strengths of quantitative and qualitative approaches (Östlund, Kidd, Wengström & Rowa-Dewar, 2011), but also optimizes the strength of both the combined qualitative and quantitative approach and compensates its weaknesses (Clark & Creswell, 2011). Moreover, this particular research design reduces the common method/source bias since it includes both a video-observation method, a questionnaire, and an open-question format to study the prototypical and behavioural repertoire of effective leaders respectively (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003). The research sample was drawn from three divisions at a large Dutch public organization. Several meetings from different leaders were videotaped. In this study, followers are operationalized as individuals acting in a subordinate role (Bjugstad et al., 2006). Possible criticism could be towards this way of operationalization, due to the fact that the subordinates are not always followers and managers are not always leaders (Bedeian & Hunt, 2006). However, it is very interesting to find out how followers perceive effective managers (or leaders), but also the other way around.

3.1 Design of study

The mixed method design used in this study uses four different sources of data: (1) a systematic and minutely video-coded monitoring of the followers' and leaders' behavioural repertoire during regularly held staff-meetings, (2) a survey conducted directly after each videotaped team meeting measuring the leadership effectiveness rating perceived by the participating followers, (3) a survey measured experts' rating of team effectiveness, and (4) a qualitative survey measuring the leaders' perception of the effectiveness of each of his/her followers. The teams which are observed in this study were selected by a stratified random sample within different management layers of one large Dutch public organization.

3.2 Participants

The observational and survey data are collected from 112 teams randomly selected from one large Dutch public organization. These teams included a total amount of 112 participating leaders. The total amount of followers participating within this study was 1503. All participating followers were requested to fill in a questionnaire in which they had to give their opinion about their leader and their perception on effective leadership. Among all followers, 1354 actually filled in the questionnaire. According to Tanaka (1987), having a large sample size will increase the availability of information and will add to the sample's representativeness of the population.

The biographical characteristics of the leaders were: 71.1% males; average age of 51.16 (with a SD of 7.440); the average job tenure of 24.36 years (with a SD of 13.480). 41.2% of the leaders have a degree at Bachelor level, 36.8% have a master's degree, 1.8% have obtained their PHD, and the rest had an education at a lower education level. Regarding technical education level, 14.9% of the leaders have a MBO degree, 33.3% have a degree at Bachelor level, 21.9% have a master's degree and 1.8% have obtained their PHD.

The followers had the following biographical characteristics: 57.4% males; an average age of 49.09 (with a SD of 10.718); the average job tenure of 24,057 years (with a SD of 13.7813). Regarding regular

education level, 39.5% of the followers have a MBO degree, 26.0% have a degree at Bachelor level, 14.4% have a master's degree, and 1.3% have obtained their PHD. Regarding technical education level, 28.5% of the followers have a MBO degree, 30.4% have a degree at Bachelor level, 10.0% have a master's degree, and 1.3% have obtained their PHD.

3.3 Coding the behaviour of the meetings' participants

In order to code behaviour expressed during meetings by all participants of that particular meeting, a coding scheme covering all types of behaviour needed to be developed. This coding scheme should cover a full range of answers that could be connected to certain behaviour types (Carsten et al., 2010). Concept codes based on underlying theory were developed before the start of the project (Popping, 2015). These codes were modified and improved when the coding started with a method commonly known as 'inductive analysis' (Goetz and LeCompte, 1981; Lee, 1999; Patton, 2002; Popping, 2015). This method, which is in line with the grounded theory approach, let researchers discover major topics by interacting with the collected data (Patton, 2002, p. 453). Interacting with the data allows the researcher to detect the 'gaps' in the existing coding scheme. During this interaction, the existing list of categories can continually be refined and expanded to create a theory that can explain certain phenomena (Katz, 1983). By systematically collecting and analysing data from observed phenomena, a grounded theory could possibly capture the underlying meaning of the data (Bowen, 2006; Morse & Field, 1995; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). An inductive analysis will therefore not lead to an extensive explanation of certain phenomena, but will create a solid fundament for new theories and the creation of hypotheses regarding the found categories.

The inductive analysis within this study has followed the steps outlined by Goetz and LeCompte (1981). The first step consists of reviewing the collected data and identifying the first-order codes. The second step is to revise each devised category by assessing it on relevance to the new data. Thirdly, typologies must be created. Then, the last step is to assess the relationship between the categories (Goetz and LeCompte, 1981). Within this research the 'analytic induction' of Goetz and LeCompte (1981) has been implemented with a few differences. First, rather than formulating codes after the data examination, this study started with a pre-set of concept codes. Second, instead of examining relationships between categories, this study assessed the overlap between them. Last, no hypotheses were formulated based on possible relationships between the codes.

The pre-set codes and the codes that were developed during the analysis of data were formed into categories. All given answers during the meetings should be assigned to a certain category. According to Lee (1999) researchers should define as many categories as needed to organise, explain and assign all empirical data obtained to the categories in a coherent way. During the coding process, each coder assigned codes to the answers given in the dataset. Answers like "interested", "proud" and "enthusiastic" were labelled as a "positive effect". This process continued till all answers were provided with a suitable code (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Then, in order to gain support for all individual codes, frequencies were measured and assessed for mutual exclusiveness (Lee et al., 1999). Lee et al. (1999) suggested that all codes with a frequency lower than five should be get rid of by assigning them to other categories. Answers that were mentioned infrequently where only retained as a separate code if they could not be combined with an existing code or if the existing code could not be altered in a correct way. To increase reliability, codes were coded by two independent coders whom discussed and revised codes when necessary. So both coders independently tried to code all possible answers independently

and eventually discussed their differences to achieve the best judgement at those. Eventually, this method resulted in 23 mutually exclusive codes with a very high inter-rater reliability.

Based on Yukl's (2012) hierarchical taxonomy, the 23 codes were categorized in: (1) "task-oriented behaviour" which includes goal orientation, cognitive job capability, management by exception (MBEA) and job engagement. (2) "Relation-oriented behaviour" which includes to what extent followers show empathy, integrity and positive affect. (3) "Change-oriented behaviour" includes behaviours like being open towards change, being proactive and voice behaviour. (4) External behaviour, which consists of networking, environmental monitoring and being customer oriented. The main reason to use the concept of Yukl (2012) is because followers tend to categorise their own leader based on their own implicit leadership theories [ILTs] (Rosch, 1987). ILT's are described as a combination attributes and characteristics of a leader and leadership which a person (follower) uses for his own perception and evaluation of a certain leader and comparing them to a leader category and their ideal leader (Philips & Lord, 1981; Kenney, Blascovich & Shaver, 2010). Appendix 9.1 table 1 gives an overview of all categorized codes, including a definition and examples.

3.4 Video observation

Within this study the video-based observation technique was used, which is a rarely used method in social sciences (Hindmarsh & Heath, 2007). However, according to Amabile et al. (2004) this method works very well when observing leadership behaviour during ordinary work practices. This video-based observation was applied at a very large Dutch public company in the Netherlands. Participating leaders from all hierarchical levels within the organization were recorded on video in order to examine their expressed behaviour. The length of these meetings varied between 30 and 283 minutes and resulted in a total of 178 hours and 5 minutes recorded. The reason to observe regularly held staff meetings instead of occasional meetings is due to the availability of hierarchical context in which a clear identification of followers and leaders is present (Hoogeboom & Wilderom, 2016). Moreover, research pointed out that the behaviour of people inside meetings is similar to the behaviour outside meetings (Baren et al., 2012). Before the meetings started, three cameras were installed at fixed positions to record the entire meeting. During the meetings there were no human observers or technicians present other than the people who took part in the meeting. Reactivity is believed to be a threat to external validity (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). By videotaping the meetings, obtrusiveness was minimized since it is believed that individuals forget the presence of cameras shortly after the meeting starts. Videotaping the meeting would therefore result in a meeting very similar to meeting without cameras, so there are no differences in follower behaviour (Erickson, 1992; Mead, 1995; Kent & Foster, 1997). As expected, similar to the findings of Collier and Collier (1986) the followers' behavioural patterns quickly seemed to turn normal after the meeting started. However, to be certain about the lower obtrusiveness, participants of the meeting each filled in a questionnaire directly after the meeting finished in which they had to rate the meetings representativeness compared to the meetings without a camera (on a scale from 1 [not representative] to 7 [highly representative]). Overall, participants rated the taped meetings with an average of 5.53, which could be interpreted as adequately representative.

After the meetings were recorded, the videos were analysed by two independent coders. The first coder had to code all behaviour patterns shown during the meetings by the use of a pre developed codebook which included 19 mutually exclusive behaviours. The second coder verified all coding done by the first coder and highlighted the codes on which they disagreed. The coding of videos was performed with the

use of video-observation software: Noldus Information Technologies, “The Observer XT”, which is a program that is developed to analyse, manage and present observational data (Noldus et al., 2000; Spiers, 2004; Zimmerman et al., 2009). The pre-developed codebook consisted of a throughout description of each behaviour including indicators to recognise them. Prior to the coding process, coders received training on how to use the observation software in combination with the codebook and order to enhance the overall punctuality and accuracy of the coding (Van der Weide, 2007; Psathas, 1961). During the training coders also became aware of different biases they might encounter when coding. The coding scheme used in this study has been developed and validated in earlier studies (Van der Weide, 2007; Gupta et al., 2007; Nijhuis, Wilderom & Van den Berg, 2010; Van Dun & Wilderom, 2015). Behaviours shown during the meetings were coded on the basis of duration and frequencies. After a video was coded and verified by the second coder, the results were discussed by used the inter-rater reliability output and a confusion error matrix which could be generated from the observation software. Codes at which both coders disagreed upon were analysed again in order to achieve consensus on the best fitting code and to avoid getting a subjectivity bias. The inter-rater reliability after coding the videos and revising them, using a 2 seconds time interval for agreement, was between 95% and 100%.

All coded videos were standardized according to the duration of the shortest video to enable the comparison of the frequency of the coded behaviours. After the taped meetings were coded, the 19 coded behaviours were also categorized according to Yukl’s (2012) hierarchical taxonomy. However, rather than having the external-oriented behaviour category, the category ‘counterproductive behaviour’ was included since the main focus of staff meetings are on the internal issues that are discussed. The new category ‘counterproductive behaviour’ could be used to capture all counterproductive behaviours shown by the participants of the meeting. Also, a distinction was made within the task-oriented category between transactional behaviour and initiating structure.

The transactional category consists of correcting, verifying and providing negative feedback because those behavioural types aim to get corrective and constructive transactions and the defining of expectations/performance objectives (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The initiating structure category consists of behaviours that define or facilitate group interactions towards a goal (Fleishman et al., 1991), for example: delegating and structuring the conversation. Furthermore, change-oriented behaviours include visioning: long term and visioning: own opinion on organization mission, which both are behaviours that add to visioning about the team or the organization (Yukl, 2012). The relationship-oriented category consists of behaviours like intellectual stimulation, personally informing and providing positive feedback and aim to improve the relationships within a team (Yukl, 2012). Lastly, the counterproductive category includes behaviours like showing disinterest and defending one’s own position. These behaviours are mostly experienced as negative. A full overview of all categorized behaviours, including definitions and examples is shown in appendix 9.2 table 2.

3.5 Procedure and measure

3.5.1 Measurement of follower effectiveness

After the meeting was coded by the independent coders, all leaders received a tailor-made leadership effectiveness report in which their strengths and weaknesses are pointed out. All leaders also received an extra questionnaire in which the leader had to assess the effectiveness of each participating follower by filling in 4 items from Gibson, Cooper and Conger (2009). However, in order to analyse the effectiveness of each follower individually, the phrasing of items was revised (e.g. "This employee is effective"). Each leader was asked if they could rate their followers on a Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*very inaccurate*) to 10 (*very accurate*). The answers to these ratings are fully confidential and treated as such in order to receive unbiased answers. To increase confidentiality even further, each follower was tagged with a follower number to guarantee anonymity. The follower number was linked to a screenshot from the video and added to the questionnaire so the leader could link them. Only the follower numbers were included in the dataset to fully ensure that the data handling process was anonymous. Similar procedures to examine follower effectiveness were used by Moon et al. (2008), Hu and Shi (2015) and Hoogeboom and Wilderom (2016).

However, the effectiveness scores of all followers have a chance of containing bias since each leader could grade effective followers differently. For instance, leader A could grade his followers with a 10 if he thinks that the particular follower is effective and with a 6 if he thinks a particular follower is less effective, while leader B grades his effective followers with a 7 and his less effective followers a 4. While effective followers of both teams might have the same personality characteristics and show similar behaviour, their effectiveness scores differ a lot. If these scores are not corrected for bias, effective followers of group B might be compared to ineffective followers of group A. In order to avoid this bias, out all participating teams some followers were appointed as effective (with a score of 1) or ineffective (with a score of 2). This choice was based upon the highest and lowest effectiveness grade given by each leader on a team level. This created 2 groups within each team: a group representing the effective followers marked with a 1, and a group representing less effective followers marked with a 2.

3.5.2 The followers' behavioural repertoire

In order to analyse the behavioural repertoire of the followers participating in the regular held staff meetings, the meetings were taped and analysed by two independent coders. A coding scheme, which consists of 19 mutually exclusive behaviours, was pre-developed on the theoretical conceptualisations of group interactions (Feyerherm, 1994; Borgatta, 1964; Bales, 1950). The coding scheme included a throughout explanation and a detailed list of indications for each of the behaviours. This way, systematic and reliable coding was tried to be ensured (Van der Weide, 2007; Luff & Heath, 2012). The video-taped behaviours were systematically coded on the basis of frequency and duration. Because of differences in duration between all recorded videos, frequencies were altered into percentages.

3.5.3 Team effectiveness

The effectiveness of each team was rated by experts who rated on four effectiveness indicators (retrieved from: Zellmer-Bruhm & Gibson, 2006; Gibson et al., 2009) which are assessed on a Likert scale which ranges from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 10 (*strongly agree*). The four items included are: (1) "This team is effective", (2) "This team makes few mistakes", (3) "This team delivers high quality work", and (4) "This team continuously performs at high levels".

3.6 Data analysis

After a meeting was coded by the two independent coders, participating leaders received a survey in which they had to grade all their followers on a 10-point Likert-scale on the following items which were inspired by Gibson et al. (2009): (1) “this employee is effective”, (2) “this employee makes almost no mistakes”, (3) “this employee delivers high quality work”, (4) “This employee performs continuously on a high level”. The scale reached from 1 (*very inaccurate*) to 10 (*very accurate*).

These items were converted into one variable that reflected ‘employee effectiveness’. To be sure all items reflected employee effectiveness well, a factor analysis was conducted with the use of the Principal component method (a method commonly used to find the real amount of underlying factors influencing item scores). However, before a factor analysis could be used, appropriateness of using the factor analysis must be measured with the use of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test. In addition, a Bartlett’s Test must be performed to find if there is at least one significant relation between variables, indicating the relevance of a factor analysis. The KMO-test resulted in a score of 0.846 (Rule of thumb between 0.5 and 1.0), which indicates that it is appropriate to conduct a factor analysis. The Bartlett’s test showed a significant result (sig. 0.000), which indicates there is at least one significant correlation between the items. With both tests resulting in a positive result, the principal component analysis was performed and resulted in the extraction of one underlying component reflecting employee effectiveness. Finally, a Cronbach’s Alpha analysis was performed to measure the reliability of items used in a construct (or component). The total number (N) of follower-scores included in this test was N=817. The Cronbach’s Alpha resulted in a score of 0.943 which is considered to be very reliable. The items were summed up and the mean of this score became a new variable that reflected employee effectiveness.

One bias that had to be taken into account was the fact that all leaders connect a different performance grade to their most effective employee (e.g. whereas one leader grades the most effective employees with a ten, another leader grades the most effective follower with an eight) . Since all leaders grade their most effective followers differently, using mean scores within the model would create bias. Therefore two groups were created within each participating team by selecting the most effective and least effective follower from each team. The effective followers were graded with a 1. The less effective followers were graded with a 2. Then, based on the effective and less effective group, leader/follower and team number, data was aggregated to form two groups for each team based on effectiveness. To find out to which extent the effective followers differed significantly (2-tailed) from the less effective followers based on behaviours, self-perceptions, attributes, and biographical characteristics, an independent t-test was performed.

Lastly, in order to find out to which extent follower effectiveness is determined by follower behaviours, self-perceptions, attributes, and biographical characteristics, all items that scored significantly in the t-test were included in a discriminant analysis. The grouping variable of the discriminant analysis was the created item effective/less effective follower, which is, as mentioned before, based on the four items to indicate employee effectiveness provided by both Zellmer-Bruhm and Gibson (2006) and Gibson et al. (2009) and modified to exclude bias.

4. Results

4.1 The behavioural patterns of an effective follower

Appendix 9.3 table 3 shows an overview of the results of an independent sample t-test which was conducted to find out whether effective and less effective followers really differed from each other in terms of behaviour. The items that differ significantly can give an insight in to which extent effective followers distinguish themselves from less effective followers. When observing the table one can notice that, as for the behavioural meta-categories as provided by Yukl (2012) task-oriented, relation-oriented, change-oriented and counterproductive behaviour, only the means of task-oriented behaviour do significantly differ between effective and less effective followers.

When examining the statistics of the measured behaviours, one can notice that the mean for task-oriented behaviour for effective followers is 73.3897 against a mean of 66.5075 for less effective followers, indicating that when employees are more effective, they show more task-oriented behaviour. Results of the independent t-test show that this difference in means is significant (0.044). However, when examining transactional behaviour (sig. 0.209, mean effective followers 17.3721 and mean less effective followers 14.9660) and initiating structure (sig. 0.198, mean effective followers 56.2404 and mean less effective followers 51.9252), the difference between group-means is not significant. So regarding the first hypothesis (1a), while effective followers seem to generally show more transactional behaviour than less effective followers, the score found within this research is not significant. At least, not for the combination of items representing transactional behaviour. When examining specific behaviours which could be labelled as transactional behaviour, only correcting behaviour had a significant independent t-test result (sig. 0.001, $p < 0.05$) whereas effective followers had a mean score of 0.2746 while less effective followers had a mean score of 0.1036. Regarding hypothesis 1a, we do not reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternative hypothesis since there is no significant difference between the transactional behaviour of the in and out group.

As for behaviours in the category initiating structure, 'visioning: own opinion' (-0.178*) and 'delegating' (-0.201*) were the only behaviours that had significant independent t-test scores (sig. 0.026 for visioning: one's own opinion, mean effective followers 27.9715 and mean less effective followers 22.2748; sig. 0.013 for delegating, mean effective followers 0.2209 and mean less effective followers 0.0606). This indicates that, while the combination of behaviours which could be labelled as 'initiating structure' do not have a significant effect on employee effectiveness, effective employees can distinguish themselves by showing more visioning: one's own opinion and more delegating behaviour during a meeting. As for hypothesis 1b, we do not reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternative hypothesis.

The same seems to be the case with relation-oriented behaviour. While the Pearson Correlation (-.095) indicates that effective followers show more behaviour that could be labelled as 'relation oriented' within this sample, the score is not significant. This is also reflected in the independent t-test (sig. 0.063). Again, when analysing specific behaviours within the relation-oriented category, we see that both 'agreeing' and 'intellectual stimulation' do have a significant independent t-test result which shows that there is a significant difference between effective and less effective followers regarding both agreeing (sig. 0.028, mean effective followers 6.6222 and mean less effective followers 4.7199) and intellectual stimulation (sig. 0.015, mean effective followers 0.9154 and mean less effective followers 0.3385). Unfortunately, regarding hypothesis 1c, we do not reject the null hypothesis in favour of the

alternative hypothesis since the overall mean of behaviours that represent relation oriented behaviour show no significant difference between effective and less effective followers.

The independent t-test did not provide a significant result for all behaviours that could be labelled as change-oriented behaviour. This indicates that, while effective employees did show more change-oriented behaviour during the meetings (sig. 0.071, mean effective followers 0.0579 and mean less effective followers 0.0085), this difference is not significant. In case of hypothesis 1d we do not reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternative hypothesis

Lastly, when observing the category counterproductive behaviour, higher counter-productive behaviour seems to result in less follower effectiveness (sig. 0.623, mean effective followers 7.5336 and mean less effective followers 8.3138). However, this difference in mean scores is not significant. Moreover, when examining specific behaviours representing the counterproductive behaviour category, there do not seem to be any significant differences between effective and less effective followers as well. Regarding hypothesis 1e, we do not reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternative hypothesis, since effective followers do not significantly express less counterproductive behaviour than less effective followers.

In sum, results show that within the meta-categories task- and relation-oriented there are some behaviours which means do significantly differ between effective and less-effective followers. Moreover, the combination of behaviours labelled as task-oriented show different group means between effective and less effective followers. Indicating that effective employees do positively differentiate themselves by showing more task-oriented behaviour, but also by specifically showing more agreeing, correcting, delegating, vision; own opinion, and intellectual stimulation behaviour.

4.2 Characteristics and of an effective follower

To examine which follower characteristics and self-perceived attributes could be explanatory for follower effectiveness, an independent t-test was performed again in order to find out which follower characteristics and self-perceived attributes differed significantly between effective and less effective followers. When examining appendix 9.4 table 4, we notice that there are significant differences between effective and less effective followers regarding both satisfaction with leader (sig. 0.010) and job satisfaction (sig. 0.000). This is also reflected in the mean scores of both groups, showing that effective employees score higher on both satisfaction with leader (mean effective followers 5.4811 and mean less effective followers 5.1247) and job satisfaction (mean effective followers 5.8749 and mean less effective followers 5.2593). Regarding hypothesis 2a and 2b we therefore reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternative hypothesis and can conclude that there is a significant difference between effective and less effective followers in terms of leader- and job satisfaction.

When examining other attributes that showed significantly different mean scores based on the independent t-test, one can notice that the items: self-enhancement (sig. 0.000), openness towards change (sig. 0.007), being proactive (sig. 0.000), competence (sig. 0.000), and goal clarification (sig. 0.007) seem to all be significantly different between effective and less effective followers. Starting with self-enhancement, which was one of the items being part of the questionnaire, it reflects a type of motivation that people use to remain a positive self-reflection and keep a high self-esteem. Mean score of the variable self-enhancement show is 4.8670 for effective followers and 4.1925 for less effective followers members, indicating that effective followers increasingly perceive themselves as being more

self-enhancing then less effective followers. Moreover, effective followers did significantly score higher on openness towards change (mean effective followers 5.0667 and mean less effective followers 4.6206), perceiving themselves as being proactive (mean effective followers 5.4768 and mean less effective followers 4.9910), perceive themselves as being competent enough to do their job properly (mean effective followers 6.0937 and mean less effective followers 5.6915), and have a clearer understanding about their future goals (mean effective followers 5.5303 and mean less effective followers 5.2774). While these scores are all based on followers own perception, apparently there is a significant difference between effective and less effective followers regarding their self-perception on these subjects.

When examining appendix 9.5 table 5, regarding the biographical characteristics of followers, it seems that the means of both education level (sig. 0.044) and job-related education level (sig. 0.009) are significantly different for effective and less effective followers. Job related education reflects the highest level of follower education which is related to their current job. When examining the item statistics, we can note that the mean of the effective followers is 3.1416 which is between a degree from the University of Applied Sciences and a Bachelor's degree from a University. Less effective followers on the contrary have a mean score of 2.6610 which is between a degree from Intermediate Vocational Education and a degree from the University of Applied Sciences. This finding would therefore indicate that a higher job related education level does differentiate effective followers from less effective ones.

In sum, effective followers are significantly more satisfied with both their leader and their job than less effective followers. Moreover, effective followers distinguish themselves significantly by scoring high on the self-perceived items: self-enhancement, openness towards change, proactivity, competence, and goal setting. Finally, regarding biographical characteristics, effective followers score significantly higher on education than less effective followers.

4.3 The effective employee equation

One of the main purposes of this study was finding which variables determine follower effectiveness, e.g. which variables explain the effective follower equation. When looking at hypothesis 3, we expect to find that behaviour will have a significant effect on the variance equation of employee effectiveness, since behaviour is a reflexion of someone's personality (Skinner, 1978). For this, not only does the data need to provide a significant discriminant analysis, behaviour does also need to have a significant contribution to the variance equation of employee effectiveness. Appendix 9.6 table 6.1 till 6.3 show the results of a discriminant analysis performed which included all specific behaviours, self-perceptions, attributes, and biographical characteristics that scored significantly in the independent t-test. Apart from the combination of behaviours that were labelled 'relation oriented' and 'initiating structure', all groups scored significant on the test of equality of group-means. By using the stepwise method of the discriminant analysis, all items are controlled for added value they bring within the variance equation based on Wilk's Lambda. This resulted in including only 4 variables: competence, self enhancement, workload sharing and job satisfaction. The combination of these four variables results in a canonical correlation of .579, which is the equivalent of the 'r' within multiple regression. Therefore, the r^2 would be 0.335, meaning that 33.5% of follower effectiveness is significantly explained by the variables competence, self enhancement, workload sharing and job satisfaction. This result is supported by the result of the Wilks' lambda: .665 which shows the amount of variance that is not explained by the four variables.

In sum we found that the self-perceptions competence, self enhancement, workload sharing and job satisfaction determine 33.5% of the variance of follower effectiveness. Other variables that scored significantly in the independent t-test did not account for any further explanation of variance of the variable follower effectiveness. As for hypothesis 3, we must conclude while frequency of expressed behaviours does significantly differ between effective and less effective employees, this difference does not significantly add variance to the effective employee equation. Therefore we do not reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternative hypothesis.

5. Discussion

Past studies have examined personality traits, characteristics and behaviour of followers (subordinates) in order to find out what determines follower effectiveness. To obtain insights, past research was mainly based upon a leader's implicit images of effective followers. Barrick (2005) points out that the leader's implicit images represent characteristics of follower effectiveness based on logical reasoning rather upon reality, thus claiming that implicit leader images are biased. Moreover, other research also indicated that the leader's implicit image of an effective follower did not match the actual behavioural repertoire of an effective follower, which is in line with the notion that people have biased perceptions that do not reflect actual behaviour (Lord & Maher, 1993; Shondrick et al., 2010; Hoogeboom & Wilderom, 2015).

Nevertheless research has proven the positive effect of personality traits on job performance (Barrick, Mount & Judge, 2001; Judge & Ilies, 2002; Judge, Bono, Ilies & Gerhardt, 2002; Hogan & Holland, 2003). But while personality traits have been found to positively affect job performance, Barrick and Mount (2005) argue that people themselves need to be studied in order to find out to which extent personality predicts performance without the bias of implicit leader images. Therefore, this study focusses the actual behaviour and self-reflected personality traits of followers and aims to explain which behaviour and traits really result into follower effectiveness. Actual behaviour and self-reflected personality characteristics were obtained with the use of video-based coded data and survey data. Effective followers were selected based upon the effectiveness scores provided by their leaders. But instead of using implicit leader images of an effective follower, actual behaviour and self-perceived follower attributes are used to find the variables that determine follower effectiveness.

The findings of this exploratory field study are quite interesting. Implicit leadership images suggest that effective followers show more relationship oriented behaviour than task-oriented behaviour. While our results show that the mean scores of all relation oriented behaviours (mean effective followers 17.9228 and mean less effective followers 15.6486) are slightly higher than the mean scores of all transactional behaviour (mean effective followers 17.3721 and mean less effective followers 14.9660), the mean score of task oriented behaviour however is much higher than the mean score of relation oriented behaviour. Moreover, the sum of all task-oriented behaviour is the only behavioural category that scored significantly on the independent t-test, indicating that there is a significant difference between effective and less effective followers regarding task-oriented behaviour. However, this significance did not apply to all specific behaviours that are considered to be task-oriented behaviour. The task-oriented behaviour during meetings mainly consisted of initiating structure, caused by high percentages of both informing and visioning of the own opinion (the latter also being reflected by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) as a proposed followership behaviour). However, this high percentage of informing behaviour might be influenced by the setting of the meeting, since 'informing' could be one of the main aims of the entire

meeting (Romano & Nunamaker, 2001). Moreover, work teams are more task-focused, which could explain the high frequency of task-oriented behaviour expressed by followers (Sundstrom et al., 1990). Both factors could explain the high frequency of task-oriented behaviour in contrast to relation-oriented behaviour. Moreover, other empirical examinations of implicit follower theories (IFT's) have found that effective followers mostly express relation-oriented behaviours (Carsten et al., 2010; Sy, 2010). But the higher frequency of relation oriented attributes within IFT's might be biased since these attributes are often experienced far more consciously than task-oriented attributes, making them a vaster part of the implicit image (Hoogeboom & Wilderom, 2015). Hence, the higher frequency relation-oriented attributes mentioned within IFT's. This could be the reason for the found difference in frequency.

Another interesting finding was that this study did not find a significant difference in change-oriented behaviour between effective and less effective followers even though being change-oriented is regarded to be an important characteristic of an effective follower (Epitropaki et al., 2013). This might be the result of the overall frequency of exhibited change-oriented behaviour during the taped meetings being very low. Again, this might be the outcome of the main aim of the regular staff meetings, which tend to be more informative and about existing processes and work related issues rather than about discussing change related issues (Sundstrom et al., 1990). On the contrary, when examining the self-perceived attribute "openness towards change" we found a significant result within the independent t-test when comparing effective and less effective followers. Implying that effective followers are indeed, more open towards change. To a certain extent does this support the finding of Barrick et al. (2001) that openness to experience is a valid predictor of job performance within specific markets. Moreover, we found that the behaviour 'agreeing' was significantly expressed more often by followers that are considered to be effective. This is also in line with the research of Barrick et al. (2001) in which is stated that agreeableness is a valid predictor of job performance within specific markets.

The results of this study are also in line with the research of Kelley (1992) who stated that effective followers score high on both independent thinking and active participation, also referred to as exemplary followers. This study found that effective followers express significantly more behaviour during meetings which could be considered as active participation. Also effective followers significantly experience an open voice climate during meetings, which indicates they extent to which individuals speak up, communicate opinions and suggest change (VanDyne & LePine, 1998, 2001, Morrison et al., 2011). To a certain extent this could be interpreted as independent thinking.

In addition to the behavioural repertoire of followers, this study also examined the effect of self-reflected personality characteristics of followers and compared the scores of effective followers to the scores of less effective followers in order to find out which characteristics are representative for effective followers without the influence of implicit follower images. The characteristics that scored significantly were included within the discriminant analysis to discover to which extent these characteristics added variance to follower effectiveness. Since behaviour is a reflexion of someone's personality (Skinner, 1978), we expected that expressed behaviour would be of significant difference in the variance equation of employee effectiveness. Contrarily to these expectations, none of the behaviours was included within the discriminant analysis.

In sum, results show that within the meta-categories task- and relation-oriented there are some behaviours which means do significantly differ between effective and less effective followers. Moreover, the combination of behaviours labelled as task-oriented show different group means between effective

and less effective followers. Indicating that effective employees do positively differentiate themselves by showing more task-oriented behaviour, but also by specifically showing more agreeing, correcting, delegating, vision; own opinion, and intellectual stimulation behaviour. Regarding self-perceptions, effective followers are significantly more satisfied with both their leader and their job than less effective followers. Moreover, effective followers distinguish themselves by scoring significantly higher on the self-perceived items: self-enhancement, openness towards change, proactivity, competence, and goal setting. Regarding biographical characteristics, effective followers score significantly higher on education than less effective followers. As for the effective followership equation which represents the combination of variables that determine follower effectiveness, we found that the self-perceptions competence, self enhancement, workload sharing and job satisfaction determine 33.5% of the variance of follower effectiveness.

5.1 Practical implications

With the use of video based data, it was possible to examine actual follower behaviour rather than leader's implicit images of an effective follower. The main purpose of this research was to get a better understanding which variables determine follower effectiveness (effective follower equation) and to examine to which extent behaviour is a significantly contributes to this. This study shows significant differences between effective and less effective employees based on behaviour, self-perceptions, attributes, and biographical characteristics. Based on the results of this study, several practical implications can be drawn which organizations can use to detect and stimulate effective employees.

First, the differences between effective and less effective employees could be used for the identification, recruitment, and training of existing and new employees. The main difference regarding behaviour between effective and less effective employees is the frequency of all task-oriented behaviour expressed during staff-meetings. Employees showing task-oriented behaviour more often scored significantly higher on effectiveness. When examining the behaviours labelled as 'task-oriented', providing own opinion, delegating and correcting behaviour did all show a significant difference between effective and less effective followers. This indicates that employees that express these behaviours more frequently score higher on employee effectiveness. Relation-oriented behaviours like intellectual stimulation; inviting other team-members to think along and creating involvement, and agreeing; showing compliant behaviour, were significantly associated with employee effectiveness. While change-oriented behaviour did not seem to significantly differ between effective and less effective followers, effective followers did score higher on the item openness to change, which was measured by four items in the employee questionnaire. All behaviours that showed a significant difference between effective and less effective followers could all be related to the empowerment of co-workers, stimulating brain storming and creating employee engagement. Employee engagement is considered to be "the single most powerful lever that corporations have to improve productivity" (Macey, Schneider, Barbera & Young, 2011, p. 15). Therefore leaders should try to stimulate these behaviours that lead to employee engagement and are associated with employee effectiveness (Rich, Lepine & Crawford, 2010).

Secondly, when examining which variables determine employee effectiveness it is important to notice that while the frequency of several behaviours does significantly differ between effective and less effective followers, none of the behavioural effects was strong enough to be included within the discriminant analysis. The outcome of the discriminant analysis showed that the combination of

competence; the degree to which an employee considers himself qualified enough for the job, self enhancement; reflects a type of motivation that people use to remain a positive self-reflection and keep a high self-esteem, job satisfaction; the degree to which an employee is satisfied with his job; and sharing workload; the effective and equitable allocation of team tasks, explain 33.5% of the variance in employee effectiveness. Since one-third of employee effectiveness is determined by these four variables, the leader or company should aim to stimulate the enhancement of these variables within the company. For instance, competence could be achieved by facilitating training and workshop for those interested. Job satisfaction could be achieved by stimulating employee engagement or creating a nice working environment.

5.2 Strengths, limitations, and future research directions

The up and foremost strength of this research is that it has adopted a mixed-method approach by using both objective and subjective methods and data sources. This method is in line with Uhl-Bien et al.'s (2014) recommendation to gain further insights in followership studies: to apply several research methods beyond solely using a survey. Also, the use of observation is not much applied within organizational studies, but does become increasingly popular (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Finally, by using the classification of behaviour and traits according to Yukl's taxonomy (2012) we allow future followership research to further extend while using universal terms. However, while this study has certain strengths, it also has a few limitations.

Firstly, all the data used within this study was obtained from one large Dutch public organization. Some researches state that there is a difference in behaviour between employees from public and private organizations (Perry and Wise, 1990; Brugha and Zwi, 1998; Bellante and Link, 1981). Apart from the sector, culture might also be of major influence for both the observed behavioural repertoire and what is perceived as effective or important (Hofstede, 1991; Den Hartog et al., 1999). The narrow context from which the data has been conducted could also have influenced the leaders' perception of implicit follower images (Hanges, Lord & Dickson, 2000; Sy, 2010; Foti et al., 2008) and therefore influencing follower effectiveness since this is based upon effectiveness rates provided by their leaders. Leaders of a public Dutch company might experience an employee as ineffective while this same employee could be considered highly effective in a private organization in a different country. Therefore the outcome of this research is not generalizable to all types of organizations or industries. So while this company was selected due to its size and different hierarchical layers, future research should incorporate more types of organizations, cultures, sectors and other contextual factors in order to gain a further understanding on followership research.

Secondly, while the usage of the mixed method approach reduces the common source bias, the follower performance ratings were only measured by the perceptions of the leaders. Therefore the performance ratings were possibly influenced by IFT's but also by leader-member exchange [LMX] (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Theory on LMX states that "leaders and followers in these high-LMX relationships often report enhanced levels of satisfaction and effectiveness..." (Maslyn & Uhl-Bien, 2001, p. 697). This would suggest that leaders would overrate the performance of followers when higher rates of LMX are present. The selection of effective and less effective followers was only based on these performance ratings. So while using the weighted average of scores of performance rates of each team-member, there is a chance that some followers were wrongly selected as being effective or less effective. As for the discriminant analysis, this bias is excluded since the analysis classifies each score

and only includes the scores of group-members that are correctly classified as being effective or less effective. Based on the above, one recommendation for future research emerges: include several measures of employee performance to reduce the bias created by LMX.

Thirdly, the behavioural repertoire of teams was measured during regularly held staff meetings. While Baren et al. (2012) argue that the behavioural repertoire expressed during meetings reflects the behaviour expressed outside meetings, other studies claim that since meetings are task-focused, behaviour expressed during meetings is mainly task-oriented (Romano & Nunamaker, 2001). Since this study aims to explain effective followership by studying behaviour expressed by effective followers, the results regarding behaviour might be a bit biased towards task-oriented behaviour since that is often the main purpose regular staff meetings. One suggestion for future research would be to observe the behaviour of teams within different settings so see whether the organizational setting of the meeting significantly influences the behaviour expressed by the same team. With this broader and possibly longitudinal research design, the insight of behavioural repertoire that leads to follower effectiveness could be pointed out for each organizational setting.

Fourth, while the sample of followers was quite evenly distributed regarding gender (57.65% males), the sample of leaders was not (70.73% males). Both leaders and followers were mostly middle-aged. The biographical characteristics of followers and leaders in combination with the type of organization in which this research was conducted, make the results of this research applicable to a very specific group of people and companies. Age for example, might be of influence on the behavioural repertoire expressed during meetings (Rhodes, 1983). A suggestion for future research regarding this subject would be to apply the same methodology on a sample which is from a different sector, contains a more evenly distributed team of males and females and perhaps a team that has a lower average age.

Finally, the results of this study might be influenced by the fact that both the survey and observational data of each team was conducted at one point in time. The results of the survey could be influenced by situational affects that could moderate the behaviour when measuring (Beaty, Cleveland & Murphy, 2001; Gellatly & Irving, 2001; Hochwarter, Witt & Kacmar, 2000). Moreover, the fact that each team was only filmed once increases the chance that the particular behaviour of participants on that specific day was influenced by external factors. To reduce the influence of external factors on behaviour, we suggest that the behavioural repertoire of teams should be measured twice in order to differentiate between consistent behaviour and behaviour that could be possibly influenced by external factors.

Based on the limitations of this study mentioned above and the developments within followership research, the following areas of future research could be considered. Firstly, this study found significant results when looking for specific attributes and behaviour that differentiate effective employees from less effective employees. Since this study was conducted within a public organization with on average middle-aged employees, it would be quite insightful to reproduce this study within a young private organization with younger employees, to find out whether the results of this study apply to different sectors, cultures and with other contextual factors. Moreover, it is suggested to apply a longitudinal study design as it would reduce the chance of coincidental behaviour expressed during a single meeting or answers on questionnaires which are influenced by a particular external event on the day it is conducted. Also, it would be insightful to study behaviour by filming outside of regular staff meetings and in less formal work settings (e.g. McDonald, 2005; Vie, 2010) to study whether behavioural repertoire is consistent outside regular staff meetings. Further research is necessary to find out whether

the behavioural repertoire and personality characteristics that distinguishes effective employees is consistent throughout different contextual environments. Secondly, regarding the effective followership equation, the results of this study explain a third of the equation within the setting the research was conducted. While explaining a third of the equation is insightful, it would be very interesting to find out what the remaining part consists of and especially to which extent behaviour is a part of this. One insightful addition to this study would be the implementation of measuring the big five personality traits which have been found to have a significant effect on job performance (Barrick & Mount, 2005). The inclusion of the Big five model might provide further insight in the effective followership equation. Lastly, while meetings from different layers within the company were observed, this study focused on finding the general characteristics of effective followership. This could be elaborated by focussing on separate managerial levels to see whether company hierarchy influences the characteristics of effective followers.

6. Conclusion

By including the video-based observation within the mixed-method design, this study explores the effective followership equation (e.g. studying which variables determine follower effectiveness) from an uncommon perspective and elaborates on earlier findings, particularly on the equation by Barrick and Mount (2005). In order to examine which characteristics distinguishes effective followers (n=1491) from less effective followers, regularly-held staff meetings (n=112) were filmed and observed. The results show that while effective followers did seem to show higher frequencies of the meta-categories transactional, initiating structure, relation-oriented and change-oriented behaviour, the results were not significant. However, whereas the overall frequency of behaviour within each meta-category did not show significant results, some particular behaviours in each behavioural category did. Employees that expressed behaviours like 'correcting behaviour', 'visioning: own opinion', 'delegating', 'agreeing' and 'intellectual stimulation' more frequently scored significantly higher on the item employee effectiveness. Regarding the self-perceived attributes and characteristics we found that effective followers scored significantly higher on job- and leader satisfaction. Moreover, effective followers did also score significantly higher on: cognitive trust, affective trust, workload sharing, self-enhancement, openness towards change, positive affect, proactivity, competence, impact and goal clarification. Regarding biographical characteristics we found that effective followers score significantly higher on general education and job related education. When measuring which variables determine follower effectiveness by adding them to a discriminant analysis, the results show that none of the behaviours had an effect strong enough to be included within the analysis. The results of the discriminant analysis did point out that the combination of competence, self-enhancement, workload sharing and job satisfaction determines 33.5% of the variance of employee effectiveness. Future research needs to include a longitudinal study design in which behaviour would also be measured outside of the regular staff meetings and within different organizational contexts.

7. Acknowledgements

First I want to thank my supervisors, Prof. dr. C.P.M. Wilderom and Drs. A.M.G.M. Hoogeboom for all their feedback, advice and support during this research. Also I want to thank my colleague-coders, whom I spend a lot of time with during the data processing, for the great time during the many hours of coding videos. Last of all, I would like to thank my family, for all their support, motivation and patience during the process of writing this thesis.

8. References

1. Amabile, T. M., Schatzela, E., Moneta, G & Kramer, S. (2004). Leader Behaviors and the Work Environment for Creativity: Perceived Leader Support ". *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 5-32
2. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). Multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ). *Mind Garden*.
3. Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421-449.
4. Baker, S. D. (2007). Followership The theoretical foundation of a contemporary construct. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14(1), 50-60.
5. Bales, R. F. (1950). A set of categories for the analysis of small group interaction. *American Sociological Review*, 15(2), 257-263.
6. Baren, B. E., Shanock, L. R., Rogelberg, S. G., Scott, C.W. (2012). Leading Group Meetings: Supervisors' Actions, Employee Behaviors and Upward Perceptions. *Small Group Research*, 43(3), 330-355
7. Barrick, M. R., Mount M. K. (2005). Yes, personality matters: Moving on to more important matters. *Human Performance*, 18(4), 359-372.
8. Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1-2), 9-30.
9. Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.
10. Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2009). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*. Simon and Schuster.
11. Bass, B.M. (1990). From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
12. Beaty Jr, J. C., Cleveland, J. N., & Murphy, K. R. (2001). The relation between personality and contextual performance in "strong" versus "weak" situations. *Human Performance*, 14(2), 125-148.
13. Bedeian, A. G., & Hunt, J. G. (2006). Academic amnesia and vestigial assumptions of our forefathers. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(2), 190-205.
14. Bellante, D., & Link, A. N. (1981). Are public sector workers more risk averse than private sector workers? *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 34(3), 408-412.
15. Bjugstad, K., Thach, E. C., Thompson, K. J., & Morris, A. (2006). A fresh look at followership: A model for matching followership and leadership styles. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 7(3), 304.
16. Borgatta, E. F. (1964). The structure of personality characteristics. *Behavioral Science*, 9(1), 8-17.
17. Bosak, J., & Sczesny, S. (2011). Exploring the dynamics of incongruent beliefs about women and leaders. *British Journal of Management*, 22(2), 254-269.
18. Bowen, G. A. (2006). Grounded theory and sensitizing concepts. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(3), 12-23.
19. Brugha, R., & Zwi, A. (1998). Improving the quality of private sector delivery of public health services: challenges and strategies. *Health Policy and Planning*, 13(2), 107-120.
20. Bryman, A. (2007). Barriers to integrating quantitative and qualitative research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1, 8-22

21. Campbell, D. T., Stanley, J. (1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally
22. Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1217-1234.
23. Carsten, M. K., Uhl-Bien, M., West, B. J., Patera, J. L., & McGregor, R. (2010). Exploring social constructions of followership: A qualitative study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(3), 543-562.
24. Chaleff, I. (2003) *The Courageous follower: Standing up to and for our leaders* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
25. Chaleff, I. (2008). Creating new ways of following. In R. Riggio, I. Chaleff & J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.). *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations* (pp. 67 - 87). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
26. Clark, V. P., & Creswell, J. W. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Retrieved on July, 25, 2014.
27. Collinson, D. (2006). Rethinking followership: A post-structuralist analysis of follower identities. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(2), 179-189.
28. Connelly, B. S., & Ones, D. S. (2010). Another perspective on personality: meta-analytic integration of observers' accuracy and predictive validity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(6), 1092-1122.
29. Crossman, B., & Crossman, J. (2011). Conceptualising followership—a review of the literature. *Leadership*, 7(4), 481-497.
30. Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2004). Leadership capacity in teams. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 857-880.
31. Day, D. V., Shleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. J. (2002). Self-monitoring personality at work: a meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 390.
32. Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Abdalla, I. A. & Akande, B. E. (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.
33. DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), 627-647.
34. Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 869-884.
35. Dixon, G., & Westbrook, J. (2003). Followers revealed. *Engineering Management Journal*, 15(1), 19-26.
36. Dvir, T., & Shamir, B. (2003). Follower developmental characteristics as predicting transformational leadership: A longitudinal field study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(3), 327-344.
37. Ebbesen, E. B., & Allen, R. B. (1979). Cognitive processes in implicit personality trait inferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(4), 471-488
38. 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.
39. 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(6), 858-881.
40. Erickson, F. (1992). The interface between ethnography and microanalysis. In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (p. 201-225). San Diego: Academic Press.
41. Fairhurst, G. T., & Grant, D. (2010). The social construction of leadership: A sailing guide. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(2), 171-210.
42. Fairhurst, G. T., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2012). Organizational discourse analysis (ODA): Examining leadership as a relational process. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(6), 1043-1062.

43. Favara Jr, L. F. (2009). *Examining followership styles and their relationship with job satisfaction and performance*. ProQuest.
44. Feyerherm, A. E. (1994). Leadership in collaboration: A longitudinal study of two interorganizational rule-making groups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(3), 253-270.
45. Fleishman, E. A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 37(1), 1-6.
46. Fleishman, E. A., Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Levin, K. Y., Korotkin, A. L., & Hein, M. B. (1992). Taxonomic efforts in the description of leader behavior: A synthesis and functional interpretation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2(4), 245-287.
47. Foti, R. J., Knee, R. E., & Backert, R. S. (2008). Multi-level implications of framing leadership perceptions as a dynamic process. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 178-194.
48. Gellatly, I. R., & Irving, P. G. (2001). Personality, autonomy, and contextual performance of managers. *Human Performance*, 14(3), 231-245.
49. George, J. M., & Zhou, J. (2001). When openness to experience and conscientiousness are related to creative behavior: an interactional approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 513.
50. Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827-844
51. 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.
52. Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1981). Ethnographic research and the problem of data reduction. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 12(1), 51-70.
53. Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
54. Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
55. Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 3-34.
56. Gupta, K., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Van Hillegerberg, J. (2009). Exploring the behaviors of highly effective CIO's using video analysis. *AMCIS 2009 Proceedings*. Paper 463. Retrieved from <http://aisel.aisnet.org/amcis2009/463>.
57. Hanges, P., Lord, R., & Dickson, M. (2000). An Information-processing perspective on leadership and culture: A case for connectionist architecture. *Applied psychology*, 49(1), 133-161.
58. Hindmarsh, J., & Heath, C. (2007). Video-Based Studies of Work Practice. *Sociology Compass*, 1(1), 156-173.
59. Hochwarter, W. A., Witt, L. A., & Kacmar, K. M. (2000). Perceptions of organizational politics as a moderator of the relationship between conscientiousness and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 472-478
60. Hofstede, G. (1991). Cultures and organizations. Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival. Software of the mind. London: Mc Graw-Hill.
61. Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: a socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 100-112.
62. Hollander, E. P. (1971). Style, structure, and setting in organizational leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(1), 1-9.
63. Hollander, E. P. (1986). On the central role of leadership processes. *Applied Psychology*, 35(1), 39-52.

64. Hollander, E. P. (1993). Legitimacy, power, and influence: A perspective on relational features of leadership. In M. Chemers, & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions* (pp. 29-47). San Diego: Academic Press
65. Hollander, E. P. (2012). Inclusive leadership and idiosyncrasy credit in leader-follower relations. *The Oxford handbook of leadership*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 122-143.
66. Hoogeboom, A. M. G. M., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2016). Comparing Effective Leader and Follower Behaviors: A Video-Based, Multi-level Field Study. *Paper submitted to The Leadership Quarterly*.
67. Hoogeboom, M., Wilderom, C. P., Allen, J. A., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2015). Effective leader behaviors in regularly held staff meetings: Surveyed vs. Videotaped and Video-Coded Observations. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science* (pp. 381-412). Cambridge University Press.
68. Hopton, C. B., Christie, A. M. & Barling, J. (2012). Submitting to the follower label: Followership, positive affect and extra-role behaviors. *Journal of Psychology*, 220, 221-230
69. House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409-473.
70. Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 96-112.
71. Hu, X. & Shi, J. (2015). Employees' surface acting in interaction with leaders and peers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(8), 1132-1152
72. Hunt, J. G., Boal, K. B., & Sorenson, R. L. (1990). Top management leadership: Inside the black box. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(1), 41-65.
73. Ibarra, H., & Hunter, M. (2007). How leaders create and use networks. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(1), 40-47.
74. Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 797-807.
75. Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: a qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 765-780.
76. Kaplan, R. E. (1984). Trade routes: The manager's network of relationships. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12(4), 37-52.
77. Katz, J. (1983) A Theory of Qualitative Methodology. In R. M. Emerson (Eds.). *Contemporary Field Research: A Collection of Readings* (pp. 127 – 148). Waveland: Prospect Heights, Ill.
78. Kellerman, B. (2008). *Followership: How followers are creating change and changing leaders*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
79. Kelley, R. E. (1992). *The power of followership: How to create leaders people want to follow, and followers who lead themselves*. Broadway Business.
80. Kelley, R.E. (1988). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business Review*, 66, 142-148
81. Kenney, R. A., Blascovich, J., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Prototypes for new leaders. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 15(4), 409-437.
82. Kent, R. N., & Foster, S. L. (1977). Direct observational procedures: Methodological issues in naturalistic settings. In A. R. Ciminero, K. S. Calhoun, & H. E. Adams (Eds.), *Handbook of behavioral assessment* (279-328). New York: John Wiley.
83. Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 22(3), 375-403.
84. Lee, T. W. (1999). *Using Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
85. Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., & Sablinski, C. J. (1999). Qualitative research in organizational and vocational psychology, 1979–1999. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55(2), 161-187.

86. LePine, J. A., Colquitt, J. A., & Erez, A. (2000). Adaptability to changing task contexts: Effects of general cognitive ability, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. *Personnel Psychology, 53*(3), 563-593.
87. Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2003). *Leadership processes and follower self-identity*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers
88. Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (2002). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. London: Routledge.
89. Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., & Freiberg, S. J. (1999). Understanding the dynamics of leadership: The role of follower self-concepts in the leader/follower relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 78*(3), 167-203.
90. 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*(3), 343-378.
91. Luff, P., & Heath, C. (2012). Some 'technical challenges' of video analysis: social actions, objects, material realities and the problems of perspective. *Qualitative Research, 12*(3), 255-279.
92. Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K. M., & Young, S. A. (2011). *Employee Engagement: Tools for Analysis, Practice, and Competitive Advantage* (Vol. 31). John Wiley & Sons.
93. Manning, T., & Robertson, B. (2016). A three factor model of followership, part 2. Research on the three factor model and its application to Team roles. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 48*(7), 354-361
94. Maslyn, J. M., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leader-member exchange and its dimensions: Effects of self-effort and other's effort on relationship quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(4), 697-708
95. McDonald, S. (2005). Studying actions in context: a qualitative shadowing method for organizational research. *Qualitative Research, 5*(4), 455-473.
96. Mead, M. (1995). Visional anthropology in a discipline of words. In P. Hockings (Ed.), *Principles of visual anthropology*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
97. Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 78*, 78-102.
98. Meindl, J.R. (1990). On Leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 12*, 159-203
99. Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
100. Millikin, J. P., Hom, P. W., & Manz, C. C. (2010). Self-management competencies in self-managing teams: Their impact on multi-team system productivity. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(5), 687-702.
101. Moon, H., Kamdar, D., Mayer, D. M., & Takeuchi, R. (2008). Me or we? The role of personality and justice as other-centered antecedents to innovative citizenship behaviors within organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(1), 84.
102. Morse, J.M. and Field, P.A. (1995). *Qualitative Research Methods for Health Professionals*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
103. Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Stewart, G. L. (1998). Personality predictors of performance in jobs involving interaction with others. *Human Performance, 11*(3), 145-166.
104. Nicolaidis, V. C., LaPort, K. A., Chen, T. R., Tomassetti, A. J., Weis, E. J., Zaccaro, S. J., & Cortina, J. M. (2014). The shared leadership of teams: A meta-analysis of proximal, distal, and moderating relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(5), 923-942.
105. Nijhuis, J. H. E., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Van Den Berg, P. T. (2010). Filming the behaviors of effective and less effective school leaders: Transformational and transactional leadership reexamined. *Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Academy of Management, Chicago*.
106. 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.
107. Oc, B., & Bashshur, M. R. (2013). Followership, leadership and social influence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(6), 919-934.
 108. Oh, I. S., Wang, G., & Mount, M. K. (2011). Validity of observer ratings of the five-factor model of personality traits: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 762-773
 109. Östlund, U., Kidd, L., Wengström, Y., & Rowa-Dewar, N. (2011). Combining qualitative and quantitative research within mixed method research designs: a methodological review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 48(3), 369-383.
 110. Owens, B. P., Rowatt, W. C., & Wilkins, A. L. (2011). Exploring the relevance and implications of humility in organizations. *Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*, 260-272.
 111. Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
 112. Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review*, 367-373.
 113. Phillips, J. S., & Lord, R. G. (1981). Causal attributions and perceptions of leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 28(2), 143-163.
 114. Phillips, J.S. & Lord, R.G. (1981). Causal attributions and perceptions of leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 18, 143-163
 115. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879.
 116. Popping, R. (2015). Analyzing open-ended questions by means of text analysis procedures. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 128(1), 23-39.
 117. Powell, G. N., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2010). Sex, gender, and the work-to-family interface: Exploring negative and positive interdependencies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 513-534.
 118. Psathas, G. (1961). Alternative methods for scoring interaction process analysis. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 53(1), 97-103.
 119. Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635.
 120. Romano, N. C., & Nunamaker, J. F. (2001, January). Meeting analysis: Findings from research and practice. In *System Sciences, 2001. Proceedings of the 34th Annual Hawaii International Conference on* (pp. 13-pp). IEEE.
 121. Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B.B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and categorization*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. pp. 27-48
 122. Rosenberg, S., & Jones, R. (1972). A method for investigating and representing a person's implicit theory of personality: Theodore Dreiser's view of people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 22(3), 372-386
 123. Rush, M. C., Thomas, J. C., & Lord, R. G. (1977). Implicit leadership theory: A potential threat to the internal validity of leader behavior questionnaires. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 20(1), 93-110.
 124. Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 262-274.
 125. Schyns, B., & Meindl, J. R. (2005). *Implicit Leadership Theories. Essays and Explorations*, Greenwich, Conn.: Information Age Publ.
 126. Shamir, B. (2007). From passive recipients to active co-producers: Followers' roles in the leadership process. *Follower-centered perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R. Meindl*, 9-39.

127. Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (2000). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Susceptibility, social construction, and leader empowerment. In *Academy of Management annual meeting, Toronto*.
128. Shondrick, S. J., & Lord, R. G. (2010). 1 Implicit Leadership and Followership Theories: Dynamic Structures for Leadership Perceptions, Memory, and Leader-Follower Processes. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 25(1), 1-33.
129. Shondrick, S. J., Dinh, J. E., & Lord, R. G. (2010). Developments in implicit leadership theory and cognitive science: Applications to improving measurement and understanding alternatives to hierarchical leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(6), 959-978.a
130. Skinner, B. F. (1978). Reflections on behaviorism and society.
131. Snyder, M. (1983). The influence of individuals on situations: Implications for understanding the links between personality and social behavior. *Journal of Personality*, 51(3), 497-516.
132. Spiers, J. A. (2004). Tech tips: Using video management/analysis technology in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(1), 57-61.
133. Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Implicit theories of intelligence, creativity, and wisdom. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(3), 607-627
134. Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
135. 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.
136. Tanaka, J. S. (1987). "How big is big enough?": Sample size and goodness of fit in structural equation models with latent variables. *Child Development*, 134-146.
137. Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' resistance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 974-983
138. Uhl-Bien, M., & Pillai, R. (2007). The romance of leadership and the social construction of followership. *Follower-centered perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R. Meindl*, 187-209.
139. Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 83-104.
140. Van der Weide, J. G. (2007). *An explorative video-study of the behaviors of effective middle managers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tilburg, the Netherlands
141. Van Dun, D., & Wilderom, C. P. (2015). Governing Highly Performing Lean Team Behaviors: A Mixed-Method Longitudinal Study. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1, 17407.
142. Vie, O. E. (2010). Have post-bureaucratic changes occurred in managerial work? *European Management Journal*, 28(3), 182-194.
143. Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1978). On the validity of the Vroom-Yetton model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(2), 151 – 162
144. Weick, K. E. (2012). *Making sense of the organization, Volume 2: The impermanent organization* (Vol. 2). John Wiley & Sons.
145. Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(4), 66-85.
146. Yukl, G., Van Fleet, D. D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 147-197) (2nd ed.) Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
147. Zaleznik, A. (1965). The dynamics of subordinacy. *Harvard Business Review*, 43(3), 119-131.
148. Zellmer-Bruhn, M., & Gibson, C. (2006). Multinational organization context: Implications for team learning and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3), 501-518.

149. Zhu, W., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2009). Moderating role of follower characteristics with transformational leadership and follower work engagement. *Group & Organization Management*.
150. Zimmerman, P. H., Bolhuis, J. E., Willemsen, A., Meyer, E. S., & Noldus, L. P. (2009). The Observer XT: A tool for the integration and synchronization of multimodal signals. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(3), 731-735.
151. Zimmerman, R. D., Triana, M. D. C., & Barrick, M. R. (2010). Predictive criterion-related validity of observer ratings of personality and job-related competencies using multiple raters and multiple performance criteria. *Human Performance*, 23(4), 361-378.

9. Appendix

9.1 Table 1: Perception coding scheme

Category	Code	Definition	Examples
Task-oriented	Cognitive job capability	The ability to perform his/her job, residing from one's knowledge, skills and competencies.	"Knowledge" "Expertise" "Competent"
	Goal oriented	The extent to which an individual emphasizes performance goals, and helps to facilitate decision making, problem solving, and intragroup coordination that maintain the emphasis on the goals (Gong et al., 2013; Seijts et al., 2004; Van de Walle, 1997).	"Results-oriented" "Targeted" "Problem solving"
	Engaged	The positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002).	"Vigor" "Motivation" "Perseverance"
	Responsible	Capable of being depended on; worthy of trust; reliable (Carsten et al., 2010); the extent to which an individual does a fair share of the work.	"Responsible" "Dutiful" "Keeping appointments"
	Empowered	The intrinsic motivation manifested in four cognitions (meaning, competence, impact and self-determination) reflecting an individual's orientation to his/her work role (Spreitzer, 1995).	"Confident"
	Managing by exception active	Monitoring task execution for any problems that might arise and correcting those problems to maintain current performance levels (Avolio et al., 1999).	"Monitoring"
Relation-oriented	Team player	Willingness to work in cooperation with others; emphasizing collective effort and cooperation (Carsten et al., 2010).	"Collaborating" "Team focused" "Team player"
	Integrity	Adherence to moral and ethical principles; soundness of moral character; honesty (Carsten et al., 2010).	"Integrity" "Honesty" "Transparent"
	Good communicator	Able to exchange ideas and thoughts; understanding audience and framing arguments accordingly (Carsten et al., 2010).	"Good communicator" "Communication skills" "Communicative"
	Job involved	The cognitive or belief state of psychological identification with the present job (Kanungo, 1982).	"Involved"
	Positive affect (PANAS positive)	The extent to which an individual feels enthusiastic, active and alert (Watson et al.,	"Enthusiasm" "Active"

		1988).	"Alert"
	Loyal	Faithful adherence and support (Carsten et al., 2010).	"Loyal"
	Group focused transformational style	Influencing the group as a whole by creating shared values and seeking a common ground (Wu et al., 2010; Tse and Chiu, 2011).	"Stimulant" "Motivating"
	Social	Liking to interact with other people, to be in companionship.	"Social"
	Emphatic	The ability to comprehend another's feelings and to re-experience them oneself (Salovey and Mayer, 1990).	"Empathy"
	Conservative	Being averse to change or innovation and holding traditional values (e.g. obedience and respect).	"Traditional" "Respectful"
	Individual focused transformational style	Affecting individual employees by considering his/her uniqueness (Wu et al., 2010; Tse and Chiu, 2011).	"Seeing someone's individual opportunities"
Change-oriented	Open to change	Willingness to adapt to and be malleable; open to new ideas or experiences (Carsten et al., 2010).	"Openness to change" "Flexible" "Creative"
	Pro-active behaviour	Self-directed and future-focused action whereby employees aim to bring about change (Carsten et al., 2010).	"Initiative taking" "Continuous improver" "Suggesting improvements"
	Voice behaviour	The extent to which an individual speaks up (i.e. communication of ideas, suggestions, concerns or opinions) and offers constructive suggestions for change, thereby constructively challenging the status quo with the intent of improving the situation rather than merely criticizing it (VanDyne and LePine, 1998, 2001; Morrison et al., 2011).	"Expresses thoughts"
External	Customer-oriented	Having customers and their needs as primary focus of action; developing and sustaining productive customer relations.	"Customer-oriented" "Customizable"
	Environmental monitoring	Scanning and understanding of the internal and external environment to identify opportunities and threats. (Yukl, 2012; Antonakis and House, 2013).	"Aware of the environment" "Monitoring the outside world"
	Networker	Building and maintaining relationships with other people (e.g. superiors or outsiders) (Yukl, 2012).	"Networking"

9.2 Table 2: Behavioral coding scheme

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

9.3 Table 3: Independent Samples T-Test: Behaviours

Variable	Effective followers (1,00)		Nteams	Mean	SD	SE	Equality of variances	Sign.
	Less effective followers (2,00)							
Task-oriented behaviour	1,00		78	73,3897	13,98475	1,58346	,000	,043
	2,00		78	66,5075	26,32045	2,98020		,044
<i>Transactional behaviour</i>	1,00		77	17,3721	9,07082	1,03372	,000	,207
	2,00		76	14,9660	13,95639	1,60091		,209
1. Providing negative feedback	1,00		78	1,9609	3,29586	,37318	,069	,147
	2,00		74	1,2503	2,66890	,31025		,145
2. Correcting	1,00		75	,2746	,62402	,07206	,001	,044
	2,00		76	,1036	,38327	,04396		,045
3. Verifying	1,00		77	14,9818	9,52593	1,08558	,020	,071
	2,00		75	11,7202	12,43008	1,43530		,072
<i>Initiating structure</i>	1,00		78	56,2404	14,81782	1,67779	,000	,198
	2,00		78	51,9252	25,44575	2,88116		,198
4. Structuring the conversation	1,00		77	1,3739	2,58987	,29514	,046	,075
	2,00		76	,7021	2,00472	,22996		,075
5. Delegating	1,00		77	,2209	,46339	,05281	,000	,013
	2,00		74	,0606	,30251	,03517		,013
6. Informing	1,00		78	26,4120	14,22816	1,61102	,013	,902
	2,00		76	26,0660	20,11217	2,30702		,902
7. Visioning: one's own opinion	1,00		78	27,9715	14,11455	1,59816	,009	,026
	2,00		78	22,2748	17,37136	1,96692		,026
Relation-oriented behaviour	1,00		78	17,9228	10,70962	1,21263	,063	,237
	2,00		78	15,6486	13,10981	1,48439		,237
8. Agreeing	1,00		77	6,6222	5,26773	,60031	,606	,028
	2,00		78	4,7199	5,40039	,61147		,028
9. Intellectual stimulation	1,00		74	,9154	1,68729	,19614	,000	,015
	2,00		75	,3385	1,10492	,12758		,015
10. Individualized consideration	1,00		76	1,2635	2,36479	,27126	,427	,927
	2,00		75	1,3013	2,69606	,31131		,927
11. Providing positive feedback	1,00		75	,5399	1,08627	,12543	,190	,279
	2,00		78	,3535	1,03434	,11712		,279
12. Humor	1,00		78	5,0927	5,54559	,62791	,151	,748
	2,00		75	5,4102	6,60528	,76271		,748
13. Personal informing	1,00		76	1,1788	2,70113	,30984	,344	,316
	2,00		77	,7718	2,29384	,26141		,317
Change-oriented behaviour	1,00		69	,0579	,21281	,02562	,000	,061
	2,00		75	,0085	,07372	,00851		,071
14. Vision: long term	1,00		78	,2365	,85475	,09678	,001	,055
	2,00		77	,0381	,29057	,03311		,055
15. Vision: own opinion on organizational strategy	1,00		75	,0399	,20990	,02424	,000	,097
	2,00		77	0,0000	0,00000	0,00000		,104
Counterproductive behaviour	1,00		78	7,5336	8,24869	,93398	,118	,623
	2,00		76	8,3138	11,19709	1,28439		,624
16. Showing disinterest	1,00		78	,9747	2,35768	,26695	,000	,078
	2,00		77	2,0633	4,87667	,55575		,080
17. Defending one's own position	1,00		77	,7821	1,50531	,17155	,895	,523
	2,00		77	,6221	1,59272	,18151		,523
18. Disagreeing	1,00		76	2,0838	2,83750	,32548	,857	,298
	2,00		77	1,5966	2,92882	,33377		,298
19. Interrupting	1,00		78	3,1732	5,56952	,63062	,562	,723
	2,00		76	2,8615	5,30406	,60842		,723

9.4 Table 4: Independent Samples T-Test: self-perceived attributes

Variable	Effective followers (1,00)		Nteams	Mean	SD	SE	Equality of variances	Sign.
	Less effective followers (2,00)							
1. Efficiency of Leader	1,00	76	5,3925	,76208	,08742	,252	,016	
	2,00	72	5,0742	,83390	,09828			,017
2. Satisfied with Leader	1,00	76	5,4811	,72721	,08342	,018	,009	
	2,00	72	5,1247	,91091	,10735			,010
3. Goal Focused	1,00	76	5,2976	,70235	,08056	,054	,131	
	2,00	72	5,1044	,84053	,09906			,133
4. Cognitive Trust	1,00	76	5,6997	,67977	,07797	,047	,001	
	2,00	73	5,2778	,83057	,09721			,001
5. Affective Trust	1,00	76	5,9126	,62850	,07209	,022	,000	
	2,00	71	5,3341	,85109	,10101			,000
6. Team Efficiency	1,00	76	4,7975	,80047	,09182	,882	,104	
	2,00	72	5,0211	,86015	,10137			,104
7. Sharing Information	1,00	76	5,1793	,72617	,08330	,048	,352	
	2,00	71	5,0569	,86259	,10237			,355
8. Voice Climate	1,00	76	5,4757	,51881	,05951	,001	,047	
	2,00	71	5,2614	,76315	,09057			,050
9. Workload Sharing	1,00	76	4,4991	,89368	,10251	,497	,013	
	2,00	71	4,8590	,83002	,09851			,012
10. Job Satisfaction	1,00	76	5,8749	,57348	,06578	,016	,000	
	2,00	70	5,2593	,81617	,09755			,000
11. Self-enhancement	1,00	76	4,8670	,83558	,09585	,532	,000	
	2,00	69	4,1925	,86673	,10434			,000
12. Self-transcendence	1,00	76	5,3895	,68966	,07911	,031	,054	
	2,00	70	5,1369	,87546	,10464			,056
13. Self-enhancement Power	1,00	76	2,6366	,85741	,09835	,525	,893	
	2,00	70	2,6161	,97272	,11626			,893
14. Consciousness	1,00	76	4,0047	,72779	,08348	,029	,452	
	2,00	70	4,1054	,88206	,10543			,455
15. Openness towards Change	1,00	76	5,0667	,79707	,09143	,000	,006	
	2,00	70	4,6206	1,12002	,13387			,007
16. Positive Affect Scale	1,00	75	4,5353	,77753	,08978	,113	,001	
	2,00	72	4,0707	,93102	,10972			,001
17. Negative Affect Scale	1,00	74	2,0953	,56317	,06547	,119	,016	
	2,00	71	2,3431	,66397	,07880			,017
18. Proactivity	1,00	76	5,4768	,67581	,07752	,209	,000	
	2,00	72	4,9910	,77624	,09148			,000
19. Competence	1,00	76	6,0937	,44931	,05154	,008	,000	
	2,00	71	5,6915	,54413	,06458			,000
20. Impact	1,00	76	4,5546	,88520	,10154	,611	,001	
	2,00	72	4,0729	,89417	,10538			,001
21. Goal Clarification	1,00	76	5,5303	,50448	,05787	,076	,007	
	2,00	70	5,2774	,60527	,07234			,007

9.5 Table 5: Independent Samples T-Test: biographical characteristics

Variable	Effective followers (1,00) Less effective followers (2,00)		Nteams	Mean	SD	SE	Equality of variances	Sign.
1. Gender	1,00		76	1,3546	,38573	,04425	,164	,580
	2,00		74	1,3177	,42932	,04991		,581
2. Age	1,00		75	48,8163	7,83560	,90478	,201	,517
	2,00		74	49,7386	9,44901	1,09843		,518
3. Employment Years BD	1,00		76	24,6749	10,68530	1,22569	,021	,845
	2,00		73	25,0495	12,66228	1,48201		,846
4. Employment Years Department	1,00		64	10,4864	9,85025	1,23128	,437	,407
	2,00		60	12,0397	10,92677	1,41064		,408
5. Employment Years BD Team	1,00		74	3,5036	2,88433	,33530	,343	,796
	2,00		68	3,6463	3,65825	,44363		,798
6. Education	1,00		74	3,0403	1,13360	,13178	,434	,044
	2,00		72	2,6657	1,09085	,12856		,044
7. Job Related Education	1,00		63	3,1416	1,10675	,13944	,031	,009
	2,00		61	2,6610	,90203	,11549		,009

9.6 Table 6.1: Discriminant Analysis - Tests of Equality of Group Means

Variable	Wilks' Lambda	F	Sig.
1. Job related Education	,956	5,118	,026
2. Cognitive Trust	,956	5,058	,026
3. Affective Trust	,905	11,623	,001
4. Workload Sharing	,953	5,446	,021
5. Job Satisfaction	,832	22,365	,000
6. Self-enhancement	,826	23,461	,000
7. Openness towards Change	,957	4,956	,028
8. Positive Affect Scale	,956	5,081	,026
9. Proactivity	,905	11,636	,001
10. Competence	,810	26,021	,000
11. Impact	,909	11,063	,001
12. Goal Clarification	,941	6,963	,010
13. Education	,953	5,424	,022
14. RelationOrientedBehaviour_sigTTest	,981	2,141	,146
15. InniatingStructureBehaviour_sigTTest	,970	3,432	,067
16. Correcting Behaviour	,963	4,280	,041

Table 6.2: Discriminant Analysis - Stepwise-method

Step	Variable Included	Wilks' Lambda		Sig.
		Statistic	Exact F	
1	Competence	,810	26,021	,000
2	Self-enhancement	,735	19,870	,000
3	Workload Sharing	,702	15,415	,000
4	Job Satisfaction	,665	13,615	,000

Table 6.3: Discriminant Analysis - Wilks' Lambda

Test of Function	Wilks' Lambda	Chi-square	r ²	Sig.
1	,665	44,504	0,335	,000

9.7 Table 7: The perceptual variables

Variable	Description
Goal Focused Leadership	Providing a group with setting clear and specific goals (Colbert & Witt, 2009).
Goal Clarity	The ability so set clear and specific goals that all stakeholders understand and can work towards (Lee, Bobko, Early & Locke, 1991).
Positive/Negative Affect Scale (PANAS scale)	The Panas scale can show relations between positive and negative affect using personality statistics and traits (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988).
Team Information Sharing	The extent to which information is shared within a team (Bunderson & Boumgarden, 2010).
Intrateam Trust	Trust among team members (De Jong & Elfring, 2010).
Affective Job Satisfaction	Represents the emotional feeling of individuals about their occupation (Thompson & Phua, 2012).
Employee Effectiveness	The extent to which an employee is productive or capable to produce a result (Tsui et al., 1997).
Work Engagement	"...a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption" (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010; Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002, p. 74)
Cognitive and Affective Trust in leader	Cognitive trust represents the followers' confidence in the leaders' capacities (Zhu et al., 2013; McAllister, 1995).
Workload Sharing	The extent to which team members equally share tasks (Erez et al., 2002)
Self-enhancement vs. Self-transcendence	Reflects the individuals' interest in oneself and the interest in others (Brown, Trevino & Harrison, 2005).