

The differences and similarities in verbal behaviors of leaders and followers on a team level, seen in regularly held staff-meetings in the public sector.

Author: Xavier Willibrord Guillaume Roosendaal
University of Twente
P.O. Box 217, 7500AE Enschede
The Netherlands

ABSTRACT:

In this cross-sectional study, the similarities and differences in verbal behaviors of leaders and followers are investigated. During regularly held staff-meetings, 108 teams in 3 large instances of the public sector were video-taped. Their verbal behaviors were coded afterwards with a detailed codebook. Both the frequency and the duration of 19 unique behaviors are analyzed for the 108 leaders and the corresponding 1410 followers. The study focuses on four of these behaviors that are commonly associated with a leader or follower role. Two behaviors that are expected to be seen in both groups during a meeting are investigated as well. The study does not find support for both behaviors commonly associated with leaders and one meeting associated behavior. Findings revealed that 12 out of 19 behaviors differ significantly between leaders and followers for both frequency and duration. This represents a total duration of behaviors shown of 40.71% by leaders and 44.54% by followers. The strengths and limitations of the research are discussed. Moreover, future research possibilities including environments where there is no clear leader-follower division are given as well.

Graduation Committee members:

1st supervisor: R. Kortekaas

2nd supervisor: Prof. Dr. C.P.M Wilderom

Keywords

Verbal behavior, duration, frequency, leaders, followers, video-observation, team meetings.

1. INTRODUCTION

Many authors have focused on the relationship between leaders and their subordinates, otherwise known as followers. Traditionally speaking, leaders have been regarded as having a big impact on teams, organizations and even nations (Hackman & Wageman, 2004). The study of leaders is therefore quite logical. The behavior associated with a leader is leadership. Waldman (1993) stated that leadership is there to embed cultural assumptions, values and norms. A more specific definition according to Yukl (2012) would be: "The essence of leadership in organizations is influencing and facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives" (p. 66). Studies go further than simply explaining leadership. Leadership researchers often also assume that leadership has a big influence on for example team effectiveness (Andersen, 2010). Andersen also argues that such relations were often assumed but rarely demonstrated. J. Larsson and S. Vinberg (2010) concluded that similarities found between successful organizations were a visionary leader role, communication, information and authority. Studying leaders is therefore quite extensively seen.

Another interesting theory on leaders is that they can profoundly influence followers and therefore their behavior as well (Lord, Brown, & Freiberg, 1999). The role of a follower is focused on task accomplishment (Vine, Holmes, Marra, Pfeifer, & Jackson, 2008). However, they have not received the same amount of attention as leaders do. As early as 1995, Meindl called for a "more follower-centric approach" (p. 329) towards leadership. Meindl stated that followers are constructors of leaders and leadership. Similarly, B. M. Bass and Bass (2008) considered followers as a moderator of leadership. Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, and Carsten (2014) provide arguments that the oversight on followership follows from confusion and misunderstanding about what followership is and how it relates to leadership. Shamir (2007) goes as far as saying that our understanding of leadership is incomplete without an understanding of followership. When looking at leaders and leadership, there is no possibility of ruling out followers and followership.

Most of the insights on leaders and followers however show little interest in how these groups show behavior on a regular basis. Leaders and followers meet and interact with each other at the workplace. In this business environment, people show verbal and non-verbal behavior. These interactions all have a unique purpose. This form of communication between leaders and followers is vital. For example, it helps motivating people and in turn enhance team performance (Luthra & Dahiya, 2015).

A great example where these interactions happen is a team meeting. They are a common tool in organizations; they are used in order to for example share information (Cohen, G. Rogelberg, Allen, & Luong, 2007). These meetings are also important processes where leader-follower relationships are shown directly. Meetings have been suggested as an useful context to examine leader and follower verbal behavior (Baran, Shanock, Rogelberg, & Scott, 2011). As early as 1957, Skinner (1957) extensively described the importance of the verbal aspect of communication between people.

There is a large body of literature on leaders and their characteristics, yet followers and followership are less discussed. Moreover, their connection and how they fundamentally behave between each other sees little discussion. Therefore, in order to get a more robust understanding of behavior, an effective step would be to see how verbal behavior is displayed in meetings between different roles and therefore different groups.

1.1 Research objective

The purpose of this paper is to describe verbal behavior of leaders and followers in meetings. After setting out what these behaviors are, analysis is performed on how often and how long these behaviors are seen. For both leaders and followers, separate analysis will be done and afterwards compared to each other to see significant differences in behavior displayed.

1.2 Research question

What are the similarities and differences in duration and frequency of verbal behavior seen in leaders and followers during regularly held team meetings in the public sector?

1.3 Academic and practical relevance

The connection between leaders and followers and its effectivity has been frequently described in writings, articles and publications. Leadership has been proven a key element for success in a team. However, it is important that leadership is not assumed as such an important pillar of teamwork and afterwards pay no further attention to it. Despite the general attention given, precise and practical observation of leadership often is not the object of debate. Moreover, paying no attention to a well-known subject leaves room for basing theories and research on incorrect assumptions. The purpose of this paper is therefore to provide a review of leadership in verbal behavior in teams during meetings. Through this, future ideas and research can be explored with correct underlying assumptions.

This research may further be used in order to stimulate a better understanding of leadership and its role in a team. In general, focusing on the process can lead to improvements. Leadership consists out of various actions and behaviors. Certain skills, such as communication, are key for leadership (Engleberg & Wynn, 2007). When the study can see a pattern in leadership or follower behavior of people working in teams, their skills can be addressed. Through training, instruction and workshops skills can be improved. In order to do this efficiently, the corresponding behaviors that are shown the longest and most often need to be known as they are the most efficient to improve on.

1.4 Outline of this report

In the next section of the paper a comprehensive literature review and description of leaders, followers and their interaction will be given. The focus is on behaviors that are commonly associated with either group or as a characteristic of a meeting. Secondly, the way how these behaviors are analyzed is explained. In the section following that, the results of this analysis are shown. The paper ends with a discussion of the findings and a set of recommendations for future research possibilities.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Especially on the leadership side, verbal behavior is assumed to play an important role. Leader oral communication, or verbal behavior, has been studied and tied to enhancing human capital and work life quality (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2012). As a result of these kind of findings, more and more attention is being paid to communication in leaders. Entire leader communication models, such as persuasive communication, have been created by for example Fairhurst and Sarr (1998). As a result, time is being spend on these behaviors in a concrete work environment. What is more is that this has been going on for a long period of time already. Language and communication has been the focus for quite a while: Pondy (1978) stated that leadership is a language game. Pfeffer (1981) already concluded that leaders spend at least 70% of their time communicating. Therefore, verbal behavior is an important part of leaders and leadership.

This logically leads to the question what leadership behavior is. Before looking at leadership behaviors, a definition is given through literature. To start out, Smith and Bond (1999) specify behavior as 'specific actions which occur in a particular setting at a particular time'. Following this definition, leadership behavior can be seen as leadership actions which occur at work during some time. On one hand, (House, 1971) already concluded that a leader and this behavior shown by him also enables support for the followers and increase the probability of achieving goals. The effects of leadership behavior therefore go further than just the leader itself. On the other hand, Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad (2007) describe that leadership behaviors can be destructive as well. Behaviors that go against the organization, such as stressing too much authority, can have negative effects. Therefore, Leadership behavior has an important role in the creation of an organization which is successful (Larsson & Vinberg, 2010).

In order to get a better picture of leadership behavior, a select few behaviors are studied in more detail. These behaviors are commonly defined by literature as closely related to leadership.

The first behavior that is associated with leadership is informing. This behavior is as simple as telling other members facts, figures and other information. Feyerherm (1994) defines informing behavior as providing facts and to communicate knowledge to others. According to Mintzberg (1975), a leader is the 'nerve center' of a team as they typically know more information than followers do. They have an informing role due to their formal and easy access to resources, making this behavior logical to be seen in leaders. Therefore, informing behavior is expected to be seen significantly more and longer in leaders compared to their followers.

H1: Leaders show significantly more and longer informing behavior compared to their followers.

As a second example of leadership behavior there is verifying behavior. Verifying is a behavior that is often associated with classical leader behavior (Fleishman et al., 1991). In fact, verifying can be seen as a natural task of a leader. Verifying behavior can be understood as all behavior that surrounds gathering information and checking on its process. The behavior is there to make sure that people focus on the set goals and the correct vision (Nwabueze, 2011). Verifying behavior can therefore be expected to be a behavior predominantly shown by leaders. Consequently, a significant difference between leaders and followers for both duration and frequency of verifying behavior is expected.

H2: Leaders show significantly more and longer verifying behavior compared to their followers.

Besides leadership and leadership behavior there is also followership and follower behavior. Naturally there is a clear task-related relation between leaders and followers. For example, leaders provide a follower with support, mentoring and coaching (Boerner, Eisenbeiss, & Griesser, 2007). Next to the task-related relation the followers interact with the leaders. However, as briefly stated before, little attention is being paid to follower behavior (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Despite this, followers do play an important role. Fairhurst and Uhl-Bien (2012) defined that leadership is co-created in social interactions between people. To summarize, the importance of followers cannot be overlooked.

There are behaviors that are closely related to followership. One of those behaviors that is commonly discussed as follower behavior by literature is sharing opinion. This behavior entails the personal feelings and thoughts towards subjects discussed. More specifically, contributing suggestions and speaking up in for instance a meeting is sometimes also called voice (A. LePine & Van Dyne, 2001). Others have defined it as employees engaging in the conversation and contributing in that way: it is how the employees have a say regarding work activities (Wilkinson & Fay, 2011). By speaking up and sharing opinions, followers take the lead in situations, suggest improvements and see problems. In short, sharing opinion behavior for followers is expected to be seen significantly more and longer compared to their leaders.

H3: Followers show significantly more and longer sharing opinion behavior compared to their leaders.

Another behavior that ties closely to followers is agreeing behavior. This behavior is quite simplistic in practice, taking into consideration verbal expressions of saying that something is a good idea or that someone else is right. Yukl (1999) described how followers like to 'follow' leaders in attempt to gain acceptance and/or approval. This include accepting their task objectives and complying with their conclusions. Riggio, Chaleff, and Lipman-Blumen (2008) categorize such followers as 'yes-people', who are on the leader's side and expect them to do the thinking and directing for them. Uhl-Bien and Carsten (2007) however warns for this kind of behavior, as it promotes not only silence but more importantly passivity. To conclude, agreeing behavior is expected to be shown significantly more and longer by followers than leaders.

H4: Followers show significantly more and longer agreeing behaviors compared to their leaders.

Next to leaders and followers and their behaviors it is interesting to look at the context in which these behaviors are shown. This context are team meetings. While meetings are quite commonly known and certainly not regarded by most as rocket science, it is useful to state what a meeting is. As stated briefly before, meetings are common tools in organizations. They can be used for multiple purposes, such as information sharing, training, brainstorming, problem solving, decision making and socializing (Cohen et al., 2007). Due to the many purposes of a meeting, they are likely to stay. For example, while digitalization in the workspace developed quite rapidly, the expected diminish in need for meetings in organizations did not live up to its name (Scott, Shanock, & Rogelberg, 2012). However, this is not unexpected. Researcher van Vree (1999) described the term of 'meetingization of society'. This term was given to the long-term process of an increasing number of meetings over time. A major reason given for this is that more and more people become dependent on each other on more and larger areas. Therefore, meetings are likely to stay the place where leaders and followers alike regularly meet.

Next to the practical purposes, meetings play another large role in organizations. Employee socialization, relationship building, building of the culture and sharing organizational values are all purposes of meetings that are not task related (Rogelberg, Scott, & Kello, 2007). These informal behaviors therefore are also part of the fundamental purpose of meetings. Therefore, this will likely be reflected in the behaviors shown by leaders and followers alike. In view of this idea, it is expected to see no significant difference for follower and leaders in individual consideration and personally informing behavior.

H5: Leaders and followers show no significant difference for the duration and frequency of individual consideration behavior.

H6: Leaders and followers show no significant difference for the duration and frequency of personally informing behavior.

3. METHODOLOGY

In the next section, the methodology of the research is described. To start off, the research design is discussed. Following this the sample used is explained in more detail and finally the method of observation and coding is discussed.

3.1 Research design

In order to look at the hypothesis, this quantitative study makes use of one main data source. This cross-sectional study makes use of a data source where video has been used in order to systematically analyze the verbal behaviors seen in leaders and followers. This is done with the use of a pre-defined codebook for verbal behaviors. Next to this, use is made of a second data source being a survey that was given to the people after the meeting took place. Leaders, followers and experts answered this survey. This survey is used in order to state whether the videotaped meetings are a good reflection of an everyday meeting.

3.2 Sample

In order to take a look at leadership behavior, a sample consisting of 108 teams is used. These teams were all part of three different yet large Dutch public sector instances.

Out of the 110 teams that were analyzed, 108 had one corresponding leader. The two teams were however excluded from analysis because they were extraordinary meetings. These meetings were large one's between teams and had more than 1 leader present in them. These inter-team meetings are significantly different from leader-follower meetings. Since the context and setup of those meetings are different from the other meetings that were taken into consideration, the two cases were not used for analysis. For these 108 teams, the duration and frequency of verbal behaviors is studied.

Since these teams and their leaders cover different organizations and branches, they differ quite a lot regarding demographics as well. The maturity level reaches from a M1 level, meaning a mostly directing role of leadership. The highest level is M3, showing little directing and a lot of support as a leader. Out of these 108 leaders, 77 (71.30%) are male and 27 (25.00%) are female; four of them did not define a gender. This suggests a small imbalance towards males, meaning conclusions can differ for other gender distributions. Most of the leaders (84.50%) enjoyed some form of higher education with 42.70% having attained at least a bachelor's degree.

The differences in leaders are shown in more aspects: the youngest leader was 27 years old and the oldest 64 years old. The mean (M) age was 51.1 years old with a standard deviation (SD) of 7.55. All these leaders worked a minimal amount of 0.2 years in their current team as either a leader or follower. All leaders taken into consideration however also held their leadership position for at least 0.2 years. The mean amount of

years worked in the corresponding organization was 24.2 with a SD of 13.40. This is especially beneficial when asked to rate how the recorded meetings were compared to non-videotaped ones. These people have a good overview and the experience to tell the differences. Taking into account previous careers, all leaders had at least a year of leadership experience.

To make a comparison of leadership behaviors in leaders and followers, we take a look at the followers of the team leaders described before. In this sample, there are 1410 followers distributed over 108 teams. These teams ranged from a leader with 4 followers to a team with 33 followers and a leader. The youngest follower is 18 years old and the oldest one 69. The mean age was 49.1 with a SD of 10.72. Out of all the followers, 57.60% was male and 32.60% was female. The remaining people did not define a gender. Out of the followers, the majority (51.30%) had a senior-vocational level of education or lower. A smaller part, 19.30%, had attained at least a bachelor level of education.

Some followers were hired the same month as data collection took place and the maximum amount of job tenure is 53 years. On average, followers worked here for 23.90 years with a SD of 13.77 years. Similar to the leaders, this makes a good argument for the capability of followers to rate the reflectiveness of the video-recorded meetings. The maximum amount of years worked in the same team is 38 and the minimum 0. On average, people work 3.63 years in their current team with a SD of 5.17.

3.3 Video observation and coding of behaviors

This sample used for this study originates from observing leaders and followers in a meeting context. Their behavior will in this research be analyzed by video observation. Through this method, we can easily analyze verbal behavior during meetings. As stated before, more than 100 teams were included in the sample. All these teams were individually videotaped during their meetings. These meetings are common practice in the organizations yet differ in length, style and frequency. Using cameras and microphones, as little as possible obtrusive elements were introduced to their meeting in order to ensure it represents a normal meeting. In all cases, the small cameras and microphones were placed before people entered the meeting room. Watching the recordings showed that little to no attention was paid to the fact that the cameras were there once the initial minutes passed. This illustrates that people are not bothered by these cameras.

The survey given to participants included questions such as: 'How different was the videotaped meeting from other non-video-taped meetings?'. Participants answered this question on a Likert scale ranging from 1 'Completely different' to 7 'Completely the same'. Out of 1351 follower answers, the mean score was 5.56 with a SD of 1.39 as seen in Table 1 in the Appendix. Rounded to the nearest decimal, this score means that followers rate it as 'not different'.

Together with 2 more items related to this subject, a scale is made in order to more precisely check the representativeness of the videotaped meetings. Cronbach's alpha for the followers (N=1410) is 0.83. When considering leaders, Cronbach's alpha is 0.82 (N=108). Based on this 3-item scale and the measures taken in order to make this observation method as unobtrusive as possible, we can conclude that these video-taped meetings give a good representation of regular non-recorded meetings.

To further continue the case of representativeness we consider the details that were observed during the team meetings. Several cases that were analyzed stood out from the assumption of a normal meeting. Some people came in later, which often

resulted in the fact that they showed verbal behavior in a shorter timespan compared to others. They also showed corresponding verbal behavior as in apologizing they were late or asking where the discussion was at this very moment. Other people had to leave early, resulting in the fact that they wanted to share everything they wanted to say early and promising to catch up later (outside of the meeting). Some people that were analyzed in the research also showed little to no verbal communication. Some people were guest for very specific parts of discussion in the meeting. Sometimes a secretary was present which only was there to document what was being said.

We still consider all these people to be part of the team and reflect what happens in a normal day-to-day setting. Therefore, they are all analyzed and used in the sample. Similarly to these examples are extreme outliers that showed disproportional amounts of certain behaviors. Some people showed more disinterest than others because they were about to leave their position anyways. Other cases had people that barely talked because they recently joined the team. As they reflect everyday behavior, they are also taking into consideration.

After the recording and survey was done, the video and audio were studied in behavior coding software. Here, the behavioral coding scheme that has been developed for this specific type of analysis was used in order to accurately analyze and code behavior. The coding scheme was first tested and afterwards refined and fully used for the rest of the research. Very small verbal expressions are still considered and coded as behavior. These behaviors were exclusive from each other, resulting in the fact that only one behavior is coded for one time period. All the behaviors included can be seen in Table 2 in the Appendix.

The people involved in this analysis were students of the University of Twente and received training in doing so. To make sure there is no bias involved, each recording was at least analyzed by two different persons. Afterwards analyzed behavior was compared and where needed corrected paying extra attention to the codebook. Using examples, such as for directing behavior: 'I want you to have your task finished by next week', 'From now on, you will take care of this' and 'Do you want to take responsibility for this task', helps making the final decisions.

After these behaviors are coded, analysis of this coded data can be done. Both the frequency as well as the duration of the behaviors shown can be compared between leaders and followers. Followers are grouped on a team-level as the interaction between them and the leaders is not individual but in a team meeting context. We test whether or not there are significant differences between followers and leaders in behaviors shown.

3.4 Methods

The verbal behaviors of leaders and followers in meetings and their differences and similarities will be analyzed using descriptive information and independent samples t-tests. Before going in more detail, it is important to note that this study takes into account both the frequency as well as the duration of behaviors shown. Verbal behavior would be an endless discussion if we only consider one of them. Showing a behavior more frequent or longer can both be seen as displaying a behavior more than another group, especially when we want to compare it between them. Therefore, to have a more balanced understanding of verbal behavior, we consider both duration and frequency.

Using the coded data for both leaders and followers, we can do analysis on each behavior. The mean, minimum and maximum value of all behaviors for each of the groups will be studied through descriptive statistics. Our categorical independent variable is the group a person belongs to, being either followers or leaders. The behaviors are coded as percentages of the total frequency or duration of all behaviors shown.

In order to compare the mean behaviors of the two groups, we therefore use an independent samples t-test with a confidence level of 95%. This compares the means of the behaviors between two groups, in order to determine whether we can be 95% sure they differ significantly. For each behavior, we also check whether there is homogeneity of variance, simply said whether the two groups have the same variance. This is an assumption for the independent samples t-test and is done using the corresponding Levene's test for equality of variances. This will display certain behaviors not having the same variance among groups, leading to using the unequal variance t-test instead. These analysis and tests will, as stated before, be done for both the duration and the frequency of behaviors shown.

Using this analysis, we can see whether there are significant differences between leaders and followers for H1 to H2. These are the hypothesis regarding informing and verifying behavior. Similarly, the difference between followers and leaders in H3 for sharing opinion and agreeing behavior in H4. Looking at the *t*-test the other way, we can say whether there are no differences between the group. This is what is used for the hypothesis on no significant difference in individual consideration and personally informing behavior in H5 and H6.

4. RESULTS OF THE STUDY

4.1 Leader behavior

When looking at the behaviors shown by leaders, four behaviors stand out as they are always displayed by leaders. While all other behaviors were not necessarily always shown, verifying, structuring the conversation, informing and sharing own opinion could be seen in all leaders. As seen in Table 3 in the Appendix, informing behavior had the highest minimum value of these behaviors with 4.61%.

In total, the behaviors with the highest duration shown during these meetings are informing (47.01%), sharing own opinion (21.45%), structuring the conversation (8.73%) and verifying behavior (5.90%). These four behaviors therefore form 83.09% of the total duration of all behaviors shown. When we look at the frequency of behaviors shown, informing (27.85%) is still the most frequent behavior seen. Following that are sharing own opinion (19.84%), verifying (13.17%) and structuring the conversation (11.77%). These behaviors form 72.63% of the total frequency of all behaviors shown.

Our first hypothesis predicted that leaders would have a significant difference between the mean informing behavior shown. Table 4 shows that leaders ($M=47.01\%$, $SD=13.41\%$) show more informing behavior than followers ($M=41.15\%$, $SD=15.08\%$). As also seen in this Table, we can indeed see there is a significant difference for the duration of informing behavior between leaders and followers, $t(214.00)=3.02$, $p=0.00$. Despite there being a significant difference in the mean duration for this behavior, we see something different for the frequency. Here, in Table 6, leaders ($M=27.85\%$, $SD=8.70\%$) have a lower mean frequency percentage than followers ($M=28.18\%$, $SD=10.18\%$). The independent samples t-test in Table 6 show no significant difference for the frequency of informing behavior shown, $t(214.00) = -0.25$, $p=0.80$. We therefore reject our first hypothesis even though there is a significant difference for mean duration of informing behavior shown.

Our second hypothesis on leaders stated there would be a significant more verifying behavior by leaders than by followers. However, Table 3 already suggests that leaders ($M=5.90\%$, $SD=4.32\%$) show less mean duration of verifying behavior than followers ($M=7.74\%$, $SD=4.69\%$) do. In fact, Table 4 suggests that this is actually a significant difference $t(214.00) = -3.00$, $p=0.00$. Our hypothesis is therefore already completely rejected by showing a significant difference in favor of the followers. Moreover, we see interesting results for the mean frequency as well. Leaders ($M=13.17\%$, $SD=6.01\%$) show slightly less mean frequency of verifying behavior than followers ($M=13.86\%$, $SD=5.51\%$). This results in the fact that Table 6 states there is no significant difference for this value, where $t(214.00) = -0.87$, $p=0.38$. This same no significant difference for frequency we found in informing behavior. This argument also rejects our second hypothesis.

4.2 Follower behavior

The followers, just like the leaders, had some behaviors that were always displayed. At a team level, agreeing (0.06%), verifying (0.62%), sharing own opinion (1.40%) and informing (8.66%) behaviors were always shown by at least someone. Here, informing behavior also had the highest amount of minimal time spend of all these behaviors as seen in Table 3.

In total, the behaviors that were shown by followers on a team level during meetings the longest are informing (41.15%), sharing own opinion (31.66%), verifying (7.74%) and humor (2.97%). These four behaviors therefore form 83.52% of the total duration of all behaviors shown.

When looking at the descriptive of frequency of the behaviors shown in Table 5 in the Appendix, sharing own opinion (28.60%) is seen slightly more often than informing (28.18%). Verifying behavior (13.86%) is followed up by agreeing behavior (6.49%) and humor (5.28%).

Our third hypothesis stated that followers would show significantly more sharing opinion behavior than leaders do. When we look at Table 3, we see that followers ($M=31.66\%$, $SD=14.11\%$) show a higher mean duration than leaders do ($M=21.45\%$, $SD=9.98\%$). This results in a significant difference

Table 4. Independent Samples Test for mean duration of behaviors

Behavior	Group				95% CI		t	df
	Leaders		Followers		For Mean Difference			
	M	SD	M	SD				
1. Showing disinterest	.04%	.19%	1.98%	4.29%	-2.75, -1.11	-4.68*	107.40**	
2. Defending own position	1.02%	1.96%	1.25%	3.01%	-0.91, 0.45	-.67	214.00	
3. Providing negative feedback	.35%	.77%	2.36%	4.43%	-2.87, -1.16	-4.66*	113.42**	
4. Disagreeing	.28%	.38%	.81%	1.44%	-0.82, -0.25	-3.71*	122.00**	
5. Agreeing	1.63%	1.61%	2.36%	4.79%	-1.69, 0.23	-1.50	214.00	
6. Directing: correcting	.38%	.73%	.20%	.43%	0.02, 0.34	2.22*	173.42**	
7. Directing: delegating	1.51%	1.58%	.24%	.44%	0.96, 1.58	8.04*	123.32**	
8. Directing: interrupting	.38%	.64%	1.09%	1.48%	-1.01, -0.40	-4.53*	145.46**	
9. Verifying	5.90%	4.32%	7.74%	4.69%	6.13, 8.53	-3.00*	214.00	
10. Structuring the conversation	8.73%	5.88%	1.40%	2.25%	2.04, 9.69	12.10*	137.56**	
11. Informing	47.01%	13.41%	41.15%	15.08%	-13.49, -6.94	3.02*	214.00	
12. Visioning: sharing opinion	21.45%	9.98%	31.66%	14.11%	-13.49, -6.93	-6.14*	192.61**	
13. Visioning: sharing long-term vision	2.16%	4.20%	.58%	1.86%	0.70, 2.45	3.57*	147.57**	
14. Visioning: sharing opinion on organization	.50%	1.77%	.20%	.85%	-0.08, 0.67	1.58	154.22**	
15. Providing positive feedback	.98%	1.11%	.31%	.50%	0.44, 0.90	5.76*	148.67**	
16. Professionally challenging	2.96%	2.85%	.93%	1.53%	1.42, 2.65	6.55*	163.92**	
17. Individual consideration	2.32%	2.64%	1.84%	6.53%	-0.86, 1.82	.70	214.00	
18. Humor	1.48%	1.40%	2.97%	2.64%	-2.06, -0.92	-5.19*	162.46**	
19. Personally informing	.91%	2.09%	.94%	2.28%	-0.61, 0.56	-.09	214.00	

* $p < .05$ (two-tailed).

** equal variance not assumed

shown in Table 4, for $t(192.61) = -6.14, p=0.00$. When looking at the frequency of sharing opinion behavior, we also see a difference for followers ($M=28.60\%$, $SD=10.98\%$) compared to leaders ($M=19.84\%$, $SD=7.82\%$). This also results in a significant difference shown in Table 6, for $t(193.36) = -6.75, p=0.00$. Both these results show support for our hypothesis, accepting that follower show significantly more sharing opinion than leaders do.

The fourth hypothesis stated that follower would significantly more agreeing behavior than leaders do, similar to sharing opinion behavior. The results however are mixed. For duration, as seen in Table 4, we see no significant difference between followers ($M=2.36\%$, $SD=4.79\%$) and leaders ($M=1.63\%$, $SD=1.61\%$), $t(214.00) = -1.50, p=0.14$. For the frequency however, we do see a significant difference. The mean frequency for followers was ($M=6.49\%$, $SD=3.46\%$) and for leaders ($M=5.55\%$, $SD=3.12\%$), resulting in $t(214.00) = -2.11, p=0.04$, as displayed in Table 6.

4.3 Comparing leader and follower behavior

In Table 4 the means for both leaders and followers for duration of behaviors are compared to each other. For 14 out of 19 behaviors studied, we see a significant difference between the duration of behaviors shown by leaders and followers. As an example, providing negative feedback by leaders ($M=.35\%$, $SD=.77\%$) was seen significantly shorter amounts of mean time than followers ($M=2.36\%$, $SD=4.43\%$), $t(113.42) = -4.66, p=0.00$. Professionally challenging on the other hand was seen significantly longer in leaders ($M=2.96\%$, $SD=2.85\%$) than in followers ($M=.93\%$, $SD=1.53\%$), $t(163.92) = 6.55, p=0.00$.

In Table 6, the mean frequency of behaviors shown by leaders and followers are compared to each other. Here, of 14 out of 19 behaviors studied, a significant difference is seen between leaders and followers. To give an example, delegating behavior by leaders was seen more frequently ($M=1.92\%$, $SD=1.58\%$)

than in followers ($M=0.33\%$, $SD=0.42\%$), $t(122.26) = 10.11, p=0.00$. Showing humor behavior was seen more frequently in followers ($M=5.28\%$, $SD=3.57\%$) than leaders ($M=2.81\%$, $SD=2.31\%$), $t(183.47) = -6.05$.

Our fifth hypothesis stated that there would not be a significant difference between leaders and followers regarding individual consideration. Table 4 shows that leaders ($M=2.32\%$, $SD=2.64\%$) show slightly more mean duration than followers ($M=1.84\%$, $SD=6.53\%$). This leads to the independent samples t-test not showing a significant difference, for $t(214.00) = 0.70, p=0.48$. So far, the mean duration supports our hypothesis. When looking at the mean frequency, we see larger differences between leaders ($M=4.34\%$, $SD=3.88\%$) and followers ($M=1.86\%$, $SD=2.61\%$). This results in, as displayed in Table 6, a significant difference for the mean frequency of individual consideration, $t(187.55) = 5.52, p=0.00$. This results in rejecting our hypothesis.

Our sixth and final hypothesis was in similar light to the previous one, that there is no significant difference between leaders and followers regarding personally informing behavior. The mean duration percentage of leaders ($M=0.91\%$, $SD=2.09\%$) differs only slightly from the followers ($M=0.94\%$, $SD=2.28\%$). This is why in Table 4 we see strong evidence that there is no significant difference between the means of the groups, for $t(214.00) = -0.09, p=0.93$. In similar fashion, Table 6 shows a small difference between leaders ($M=0.88\%$, $SD=1.87\%$) and followers ($M=1.10\%$, $SD=2.09\%$). This also results in strong evidence that there is no significant difference between the means of the groups, for $t(214.00) = -0.82, p=0.41$. The findings support our hypothesis that there is no significant difference between leaders and followers regarding personally informing behavior. Therefore, we accept the hypothesis.

Table 6. Independent Samples Test for mean frequency of behaviors

Behavior	Group				95% CI For Mean Difference	t	df
	Leaders		Followers				
	M	SD	M	SD			
1. Showing disinterest	.06%	.21%	1.21%	2.04%	-1.54, -0.76	-5.80*	109.29**
2. Defending own position	1.22%	1.99%	1.29%	1.98%	-0.61, 0.46	-.27	214.00
3. Providing negative feedback	.47%	.82%	2.02%	2.75%	-2.10, -1.00	-5.61*	126.09**
4. Disagreeing	.89%	.99%	1.83%	2.09%	-1.38, -0.51	-4.25*	153.05**
5. Agreeing	5.55%	3.12%	6.49%	3.46%	-1.83, -0.06	-2.11*	214.00
6. Directing: correcting	.71%	1.10%	.32%	.51%	0.16, 0.62	3.32*	151.02**
7. Directing: delegating	1.92%	1.58%	.33%	.42%	1.28, 1.91	10.11*	122.26**
8. Directing: interrupting	1.79%	2.03%	3.81%	3.79%	-2.84, -1.20	-4.88*	163.78**
9. Verifying	13.17%	6.01%	13.86%	5.51%	-2.23, 0.86	-.87	214.00
10. Structuring the conversation	11.77%	4.99%	1.95%	2.61%	8.75, 10.89	18.13*	161.49**
11. Informing	27.85%	8.70%	28.18%	10.18%	-2.87, 2.21	-.25	214.00
12. Visioning: sharing opinion	19.84%	7.82%	28.60%	10.98%	-11.32, -6.20	-6.75*	193.36**
13. Visioning: sharing long-term vision	1.08%	1.87%	.27%	.81%	0.42, 1.20	4.14*	145.78**
14. Visioning: sharing opinion on organization	.27%	.86%	.13%	.64%	-0.06, 0.35	1.41	197.52**
15. Providing positive feedback	1.90%	1.68%	.59%	.74%	0.96, 1.66	7.40*	147.21**
16. Professionally challenging	3.48%	3.29%	.88%	1.29%	1.93, 3.27	7.65*	139.05**
17. Individual consideration	4.34%	3.88%	1.86%	2.61%	1.60, 3.37	5.52*	187.55**
18. Humor	2.81%	2.31%	5.28%	3.57%	-3.28, -1.67	-6.05*	183.47**
19. Personally informing	.88%	1.87%	1.10%	2.09%	-0.75, 0.31	-.82	214.00

* $p < .05$ (two-tailed).

** equal variance not assumed

5. DISCUSSION

This research set out in order to analyze the similarities and differences of verbal behaviors in leaders and followers. From the results, we can draw the general conclusion that in the meetings of the instances in the public sector, we see quite some differences in verbal behavior.

While literature supports the fact that leaders have a natural position of more information and therefore could show more informing behavior, we do not see a significant difference. Followers, just like leaders, show a relatively large amount of time on sharing information. As displayed in Table 3, a mean of between 40 and 50 % of the total duration is seen. It seems that the function of a meeting outweighs the natural position of having more as a leader. As Cohen et al. (2007) described, meetings are there to share information, solve problems and make decisions. These behaviors closely align with the objectives of a meeting. Followers and leaders both want to achieve these objectives (Allen et al., 2012) and therefore likely show closely related behaviors doing so.

The very first interesting aspect of analyzing behaviors is that 3 behaviors were seen in both leader and followers no matter what. Informing, sharing own opinion and verifying behavior were seen at least some time during every meeting. When one logically thinks about meetings and the reason why they exist, an easy explanation can be found. In the same way of thinking as we did for informing behavior, we can take a look at structuring the conversation as a behavior. This is seen in every meeting as well, yet only by leaders. According to Feyerherm (1994), a leader who coordinates and facilitates calls on participants, monitors the agenda and structures the conversation through this way. This is seen as leadership tasks with corresponding leadership behavior. It is therefore not strange to see that all leaders in this study show at least some amount of behavior regarding structuring the conversation. The same therefore also go for informing, sharing own opinion and verifying behavior. These behaviors reflect fundamental meeting purposes.

Our second hypothesis, on verifying behavior, was that leaders would show significantly more of this behavior than followers. However, the test results show the contrary. Followers show more verifying behavior than leaders do. One possible explanation for this could be the influence of peer monitoring. Not only does the leader check on a process, followers check each other too. This way, they can correct coworkers and prevent mistakes (Loughry & Tosi, 2008). In this way, one could almost regard it as a way of sharing positive peer pressure, understanding why followers show it more than leaders do.

Our third hypothesis about followers showing significantly more sharing opinion behavior was supported by the data. As literature defined, followers likely use this to engage in and contribute to a conversation. Admittedly, one could find obstacles regarding sharing his own opinion such as being doubtful about speaking up to their leaders (Detert & Burris, 2007). Nevertheless, sharing opinion behavior is in this study one of the behaviors seen the most in followers (duration $M = 31.66\%$, frequency $M = 28.60\%$).

Similarly to the sharing opinion behavior, the fourth hypothesis examines agreeing behavior of followers. The results found no significant difference between them and leaders for duration. However, for frequency, there is a significant difference. This result might possibly be even better in line with the theory than what is hypothesized. As followers try to agree more with for example leaders, they do this more often than them. Meanwhile, they show little difference into how long they do so. This implies that they want to share their agreeing more

often. This is also reflected in the fact that every single team had at least one follower showing agreeing behavior some time, as seen in Table 3.

We expected to see that there is no significant difference between leaders and followers for individual consideration behavior. While this was true for duration, it did not hold for the frequency. We therefore rejected the fifth hypothesis. When we take a look at leadership theory, we can find a possible explanation. Individual consideration has also been categorized by literature as a 'transformational leadership behavior' (Bass & Avolio, 1994). This form of leadership revolves around the leader motivating and transforming its followers by intellectual stimulation, charisma and consideration (Bass, 1985). This means that what we found in this study supports this categorization partly: leaders show individual consideration more often, but not significantly longer.

Unlike individual consideration behavior shown more in leaders, personally informing behavior had no significant difference for either duration or frequency. These results support our sixth and final hypothesis. The socializing, individual consideration reason of meetings is considered equally important by both groups, if we reflect on their behavior shown.

Out of the 19 behaviors studied, only 3 of them had no significant difference for both the duration and frequency showed by leaders and followers. These behaviors are defending own position, sharing opinion on the organization and personally informing. This study leaves us with a total of 12 behaviors that differ significantly for both duration and frequency between leaders and followers. In other words, 12 out of 19 behaviors considered are significantly different between these groups. However, these behaviors make up 40.71% of the total duration of behaviors shown for leaders. For followers this is 44.54% of the total duration. It is way too extensive, and not in the scope of this study, to discuss all these behaviors and the possible underlying reasons why they do or do not differ between the two groups. However, it is interesting to state that there still is a noteworthy amount of behavior shown that is different if we consider a categorization of leaders and followers.

5.1 Strengths, limitations and further research possibility

5.1.1 Strengths of this study

The current study provides an insight on the leader follower relationship. It uses videotaped meetings from three different large Dutch instances. This method is as unobtrusive as it gets since next to a camera and microphone, there are no differences from a day to day meeting. This method is quite unique and gives us the possibility to analyze this behavior. This is further supported by literature that state that video-recorded (verbal) behavior leads to results that are valid and reliable (Fele, 2012). This study would not be an exception to this theory. The survey, reflected in a Cronbach's alpha the study found of at least 0.82 (N=108), showed that this cross-sectional study indeed reflects reality well.

Additional to the observation method, another strength of this research is the sample size used. Data was collected of 108 leaders and more than 1400 followers over 108 teams. There is little bias created by sample size we can say that findings are unlikely to be subject to chance. The power of this study and therefore the validity leads towards real conclusions.

5.1.2 Limitations of this study

There are however some limitations towards the generalizability of the study. All the companies included in the research were Dutch. Both the followers and leaders have mastered at least the Dutch language and are familiar with its culture and working atmosphere. When organizations outside of the Netherlands would be analyzed, chances are that behavior is different. Language and communication are intertwined with culture and therefore verbal behavior would differ per country or region. For this reason, it would be interesting to have future research focus on more diverse leaders and followers from organizations in different countries. What is even better if such research could be done at an international oriented organization with employees from different parts and cultures of the world.

There is room for more in-depth discussion regarding behavior between leaders and followers. This study did not touch on any non-verbal behavior. (Werner & Kaplan, 1963) already stated that verbal communication is often accompanied by non-verbal forms of communication. Examples of such behavior are for example facial expressions, hand gestures and body movements. Birdwhistell (1970) already stated that between 65% and 95% of all interaction encompasses non-verbal behavior. With the link between non-verbal and verbal behavior and the large frequency it is seen, it helps considering both sorts of behavior to fully understand how leaders and followers behave.

5.1.3 Further research possibilities

What more is interesting for the future is the fact that this study only encompasses verbal behavior seen during meetings. While this is convenient for analysis and a structured environment for seeing leader and follower behavior, it does not manage to capture the full picture. Alvarez and Svejnova (2005) note that especially leadership research has focused on personal characteristics of leaders instead of their behavior and activities in the tasks that come along with their role. Fairhurst (2007) is one of a select few to call for more attention towards leadership created through everyday talk. Svennevig (2008) mentions that such communication and behavior only is analyzed in an expert-lay communication between for example doctors and their patients. On a level of leaders and followers however, Svennevig praises the call for attention of Fairhurst. Larsson and Lundholm (2013) state that despite these calls from Fairhurst and Svennevig, there are still quite few studies available that focuses

on behavior on the level of talk-in-interaction. They argue that especially leadership can only be understood as something that is found in day to day communication and other mundane actions. As a solution, they describe ways of interpreting behavior in this form. This micro-level of behavior can for example be examined through 'shadowing'. This process entails recording audio and or video of these field behaviors the entire workday and afterwards reliably coding them. This would also serve as interesting following step of this research.

Another fundamental pillar of this research is the clear distinction between a leader and its followers. Both these groups show corresponding behavior and influence each other. The logical question to ask is what if there is no clear distinct division between leaders and followers. Such working environments are growing in popularity; an example of this is agile. Authors have elaborated on how inter-person connections and teamwork factors work in agile (Moe, Dingsøyr, & Dybå, 2010) and how group development is key here (Gren, Torkar, & Feldt, 2017). All together, these authors have generated important insights into how the agile way of working is done best. However, similarly to why this study is done, there is little interest in the fundamentals of the people in a team working together and their actual behaviors shown. Recently, there has been a small growing amount of interest towards behaviors that are key for agile (Lenses, 2018). This would be a suitable time to join that conversation. Without a top-down leader, and corresponding leader behavior, the question what happens to behavior in a team must be raised. Leadership appears to be a major part of any form of working together. Therefore, the assumption is easily made that the leadership behavior is seen somewhere in an agile team. For example, one can imagine that team members show structuring the conversation more here since there is no leader. Adding to this idea is the fact that there is a role for some people, even without hierarchical structure. Each squad has a product owner, sometimes also referred to as coordinator, that has the task of coordinating the squad. This comes down to 3 major tasks being customer collaboration, communicating change requests of the customer and sketching a realistic picture to the customer. The person who fulfills this role might be a good candidate for replacing a traditional leader if we look at it from a task point of view. Whether this reflects in behavior is however another question. The coming of dramatic changes of working together such as agile teams but also other concepts such as digitalization and modernization undoubtedly have further impacted leader-and followership. Cross, Cross, and Parker (2004) already stated that the difference between leaders and followers is shrinking as information is more readily available to all. Therefore, it is only logical to further research how the concept of roles and behavior is seen in these new ways of working together. The implications and results can be further used to learn about team dynamics and drastically improve team effectiveness.

As a final but not least suggestion for further research is the idea of taking into consideration the effectivity of leaders and followers. This study took a sample of all the people that were videotaped and who were part of a team. This results in the fact that there is no subdivision made between whether a leader (or a follower) is efficient in what they do. The reason why this was not in the scope of the study is to reflect a real-life situation as well as possible. Not all people will be as efficient but will still work in a team. It is however still interesting to see what an effective leader or follower does different from an ineffective one. The questionnaire that was given to the participating team members, which was used in this study to look at whether the meetings recorded were similar to normal ones, included expert ratings as well. These questions were asked to the supervisors of the leaders. Example of these questions were 'Leads a group that

is effective' and 'is effective in meeting organization requirements'. These questions and their results on a Likert scale could form a scale that rates leader effectiveness. When the effectiveness of leaders is known, one can analyze if there are differences between efficient and inefficient leaders. In the same way, effective followers can be categorized. Their efficiency was rated directly by their leaders in a similar fashion to the examples stated for the leaders. Efficient followers might show different verbal behavior than inefficient ones. The relation between efficiency and verbal behavior might even provide a framework which can be used to see discrepancies between someone's rating and the verbal behavior they show. For whatever reason, a leader might rate a follower as inefficient while they show efficient behavior. This can then be used to highlight possible misjudgments of efficiency of both leaders and followers.

6. CONCLUSION

This study set out to analyze the similarities and the differences in duration and frequency of verbal behaviors, seen in both leaders and followers in regularly held team meetings. After analyzing the verbal behaviors shown by leaders and followers, we found that there are a lot of differences. In team meetings, leaders and followers show quite different behaviors. 12 out of 19 behaviors studied differ significantly in both frequency and duration shown. Only 3 behaviors, defending own position, sharing opinion on the organization and personally informing, were seen without a significant difference between the two groups studied. The old-fashioned image of leaders and followers being and behaving different therefore is reflected in their behavior in this study as well.

Using a video observation method proved to be effective to identify behaviors of both the leaders and the followers. Attempts made to be as unobtrusive as possible were successful according to the people who were videotaped as reflected in the survey that was filled in afterwards. Combining this with the fact that 108 teams were considered in this study, we can say that the results of this study reflect a common, real life situation. The behaviors shown therefore would likely be shown more or less the same in a non-videotaped meeting. Whether this holds true for all meetings over the world is difficult to say. Admittedly, only observing Dutch governmental instances may lead to problems regarding generalizability. To look on the bright side, it makes a good precedent for further research. More and different instances and companies can be used in order to see whether behavior of leaders and follower different in other environments. Additionally, future research into leader and follower verbal behavior has more possibilities than just a different sample. Research into day-to-day communication and the verbal behavior associated with it can give insightful clarifications. Other work environments such as agile, where no distinct difference between leaders and followers is made, are also interesting area's for studying verbal behavior.

If anything, this study contributes insights on how leaders and followers communicate with each other. The often assumed but overlooked difference between leaders and followers and their behavior is clearly demonstrated. Results from this study, such as the large amount of informing behavior, gives practical suggestions. Skills in such behaviors can be trained in order to be done more efficient and effective.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my first supervisor, Rianne Kortekaas, for all the helpful guidance throughout the process. Walk-ins and questions were always met with kindness, patience and good insights, which was much appreciated. Thanks to everyone else who also helped me in any way along the process.

8. REFERENCES

9. A. LePine, J., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and Cooperative Behavior as Contrasting Forms of Contextual Performance: Evidence of Differential Relationships with Big Five Personality Characteristics and Cognitive Ability (Vol. 86).
10. Allen, J., J. Sands, S., L. Mueller, S., Frear, K., Mudd, M., & G. Rogelberg, S. (2012). Employees' feelings about more meetings: An overt analysis and recommendations for improving meetings (Vol. 35).
11. Alvarez, J. L., & Svejenova, S. (2005). Sharing executive power: Roles and relationships at the top: Cambridge University Press.
12. Andersen, J. A. (2010). Public versus private managers: How public and private managers differ in leadership behavior. *Public Administration Review*, 70(1), 131-141.
13. Baran, B. E., Shanock, L. R., Rogelberg, S. G., & Scott, C. W. (2011). Leading Group Meetings: Supervisors' Actions, Employee Behaviors, and Upward Perceptions. *Small Group Research*, 43(3), 330-355. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496411418252>. doi:10.1177/1046496411418252
14. Bass, & Avolio. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership: Sage.
15. Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). The Bass handbook of leadership : theory, research, and managerial applications (4th ed., Free Press hardcover ed. ed.). New York: Free Press.
16. Birdwhistell, R. L. (1970). Kinesics and context: Essays on body motion communication: University of Pennsylvania press.
17. Boerner, S., Eisenbeiss, S. A., & Griesser, D. (2007). Follower Behavior and Organizational Performance: The Impact of Transformational Leaders. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 13(3), 15-26. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1071791907013030201>. doi:10.1177/1071791907013030201
18. Cohen, M., G. Rogelberg, S., Allen, J., & Luong, A. (2007). Meeting Design Characteristics and Attendee Perceptions of Staff/Team Meeting Quality (Vol. 15).
19. Cross, R. L., Cross, R. L., & Parker, A. (2004). The hidden power of social networks: Understanding how work really gets done in organizations: Harvard Business Press.
20. Detert, J., & Burris, E. (2007). Leadership Behavior and Employee Voice: Is The Door Really Open? (Vol. 50).
21. Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207-216.
22. Fairhurst, G. T. (2007). Discursive Leadership: A Communication Alternative to Leadership Psychology. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 21(4), 510-521. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318907313714>. doi:10.1177/0893318907313714
23. Fairhurst, G. T., & Sarr, R. A. (1998). The art of framing: Managing the language of leadership: . *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(1), 123-126. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1048984398900455>. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(98\)90045-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(98)90045-5)
24. Fairhurst, G. T., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2012). Organizational discourse analysis (ODA): Examining leadership as a relational process. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(6), 1043-1062. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S104898431200094X>. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.10.005>
25. Fele, G. (2012). The use of video to document tacit participation in an emergency operations centre. *Qualitative Research*, 12(3), 280-303. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1468794111436140>. doi:10.1177/1468794111436140
26. Feyerherm, A. E. (1994). Leadership in collaboration: A longitudinal study of two interorganizational rule-making groups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(3), 253-270. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1048984394900167>. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(94\)90016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(94)90016-7)
27. Fleishman, E. A., Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Levin, K. Y., Korotkin, A. L., & Hein, M. B. (1991). Taxonomic efforts in the description of leader behavior: A synthesis and functional interpretation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2(4), 245-287.
28. Gren, L., Torkar, R., & Feldt, R. (2017). Group development and group maturity when building agile teams: A qualitative and quantitative investigation at eight large companies. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 124, 104-119. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0164121216302266>. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2016.11.024>
29. Hackman, J. R., & Wageman, R. (2004). WHEN AND HOW TEAM LEADERS MATTER. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 26, 37-74. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191308504260026>. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085\(04\)26002-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(04)26002-6)
30. House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative science quarterly*, 321-339.
31. Larsson, & Vinberg. (2010). Leadership behaviour in successful organisations: Universal or situation-dependent? *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 21(3), 317-334. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360903561779>. doi:10.1080/14783360903561779
32. Larsson, M., & Lundholm, S. (2013). Leadership as Work-embedded Influence: A Micro-discursive Analysis of an Everyday Interaction in a Bank. *Leadership*, 6(2), 159-184. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715010363208>. doi:10.1177/1742715010363208
33. Lensges, M., Kloppenborg, T., & Forte, F. (2018). Identifying Key Agile Behaviors That Enhance Traditional Project Management Methodology. *Journal of Strategic Innovation and Sustainability*, 13. doi:<https://doi.org/10.33423/jsis.v13i2.604>
34. 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. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749597899928327>. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1999.2832>
35. Loughry, M. L., & Tosi, H. L. (2008). Performance Implications of Peer Monitoring. *Organization Science*, 19(6), 876-890. Retrieved from <https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc.1080.0356>. doi:10.1287/orsc.1080.0356
36. Mayfield, J., & Mayfield, M. (2012). The Relationship Between Leader Motivating Language and Self-Efficacy: A Partial Least Squares Model Analysis. *The Journal of Business Communication* (1973), 49(4), 357-376. Retrieved from

- <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0021943612456036>
36. doi:10.1177/0021943612456036
37. Mintzberg, H. (1975). The manager's job: Folklore and fact.
38. Moe, N. B., Dingsøyr, T., & Dybå, T. (2010). A teamwork model for understanding an agile team: A case study of a Scrum project. *Information and Software Technology, 52*(5), 480-491. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950584909002043>. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2009.11.004>
39. Nwabueze, U. (2011). Implementing TQM in healthcare: The critical leadership traits. *Total Quality Management, 22*(3), 331-343.
40. Pfeffer, J. (1981). Management as symbolic action: the creation and maintenance of organizational paradigm. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 3*, 1-52.
41. Pondy, L. (1978). Leadership is a language game. *Leadership: Where Else Can We Go?* MW McCall Jr. and MM Lombardo. In: Durham, NC, Duke University Press.
42. Riggio, R. E., Chaleff, I., & Lipman-Blumen, J. (2008). *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations* (Vol. 146): John Wiley & Sons.
43. Rogelberg, S. G., Scott, C., & Kello, J. (2007). The science and fiction of meetings. *MIT Sloan management review, 48*(2), 18-21.
44. Scott, C. W., Shanock, L. R., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2012). Meetings at Work: Advancing the Theory and Practice of Meetings. *Small Group Research, 43*(2), 127-129. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1046496411429023>. doi:10.1177/1046496411429023
45. Shamir, B. (2007). From passive recipients to active co-producers: Followers' roles in the leadership process. *Followers-centered perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R. Meindl*, (Information Age Publishers, Charlotte, NC (2007)), ix-xxxix.
46. Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behavior*: New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
47. Smith, P. B., & Bond, M. H. (1999). *Social psychology: Across cultures*: Allyn & Bacon.
48. Svennevig, J. (2008). *Exploring Leadership Conversations* (Vol. 21).
49. Uhl-Bien, M., & Carsten, M. K. (2007). Being ethical when the boss is not.
50. 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. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1048984313001227>. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.007>
51. van Vree, W. (1999). Meetings: The Frontline of Civilization. *The Sociological Review, 59*(1_suppl), 241-262. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2011.01987.x>. doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2011.01987.x
52. Vine, B., Holmes, J., Marra, M., Pfeifer, D., & Jackson, B. (2008). Exploring Co-leadership Talk Through Interactional Sociolinguistics. *Leadership, 4*(3), 339-360. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715008092389>. doi:10.1177/1742715008092389
53. Waldman, D. A. (1993). A theoretical consideration of leadership and total quality management. *The Leadership Quarterly, 4*(1), 65-79. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/1048984399000132>. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(99\)00013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00013-2)
54. Werner, H., & Kaplan, B. (1963). Symbol formation.
55. Wilkinson, A., & Fay, C. (2011). New times for employee voice? *Human Resource Management, 50*(1), 65-74. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/hrm.20411>. doi:10.1002/hrm.20411
56. Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2), 285-305. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1048984399000132>. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(99\)00013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00013-2)
- Yukl, G. (2012). *Effective Leadership Behavior: What We Know and What Questions Need More Attention* (Vol. 26).

APPENDIX

Table 1. Representativeness of video-recorded meeting

Survey question	Group					
	Leaders*			Followers**		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
1.How different was the videorecorded meeting in comparison to non-videorecorded meetings?	5.10	1.50	108.00	5.56	1.40	1410.00
2.How different was your behavior during the video recorded meeting?	5.61	1.17	108.00	5.92	1.09	1410.00
3.How different was the behavior of your leader during the video recorded meeting (in comparison to the non-video recorded meetings)	5.53	1.25	108.00	5.72	1.20	1410.00

* $\alpha=0.83$

** $\alpha=0.82$

Table 2. Overview of behaviors studied

Behavior category	Behavior	Definition
Self-oriented	1. Showing disinterest	Not showing interest, not taking things seriously
	2. Defending own position	Protecting the position or the own
	3. Providing negative feedback	Criticizing feedback
Steering	4. Disagreeing	Having contradicting ideas
	5. Agreeing	Saying that something is right
	6. Directing: correcting	Telling what the normal procedure is
	7. Directing: delegating	Giving tasks to other team members
	8. Directing: interrupting	Cutting others off when speaking
	9. Verifying	Checking on earlier made agreements
	10. Structuring the conversation	Providing structure in a meeting by telling the agenda, end time, etc.
	11. Informing	Giving factual information
	12. Visioning: sharing opinion	"I think that..."
	13. Visioning: sharing long term vision	"In the future, we should..."
	14. Visioning: sharing opinion on organization	"As an organization, we should grow towards..."
Supporting	15. Positive feedback	Complementing, rewarding
	16. Intellectual stimulation / Professionally challenging	Pushing people to think along, come up with new ideas
	17. Individual consideration	Being friendly, showing empathy
	18. Humor	Make a funny comment, make people laugh
	19. Personally informing	Giving personal, non-factual information

Table 3. Duration of verbal behaviors in leaders and followers (%)

Behavior	Group	Mean	Std.		
			Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
1. Showing disinterest	Leaders	.04%	.19%	.00%	1.46%
	Followers	1.98%	4.29%	.00%	30.79%
2. Defending own position	Leaders	1.02%	1.96%	.00%	9.82%
	Followers	1.25%	3.01%	.00%	18.32%
3. Providing negative feedback	Leaders	.35%	.77%	.00%	4.25%
	Followers	2.36%	4.43%	.00%	28.43%
4. Disagreeing	Leaders	.28%	.38%	.00%	1.72%
	Followers	.81%	1.44%	.00%	9.86%
5. Agreeing	Leaders	1.63%	1.61%	.00%	12.25%
	Followers	2.36%	4.79%	.06%	49.26%
6. Directing: correcting	Leaders	.38%	.73%	.00%	5.09%
	Followers	.20%	.43%	.00%	2.59%
7. Directing: delegating	Leaders	1.51%	1.58%	.00%	8.32%
	Followers	.24%	.44%	.00%	3.08%
8. Directing: interrupting	Leaders	.38%	.64%	.00%	5.07%
	Followers	1.09%	1.48%	.00%	8.16%
9. Verifying	Leaders	5.90%	4.32%	.86%	32.75%
	Followers	7.74%	4.69%	.62%	25.52%
10. Structuring the conversation	Leaders	8.73%	5.88%	.67%	31.62%
	Followers	1.40%	2.25%	.00%	10.14%
11. Informing	Leaders	47.01%	13.41%	4.61%	81.21%
	Followers	41.15%	15.08%	8.66%	79.37%
12. Visioning: sharing opinion	Leaders	21.45%	9.98%	2.39%	48.45%
	Followers	31.66%	14.11%	1.40%	65.87%
13. Visioning: sharing long-term vision	Leaders	2.16%	4.20%	.00%	20.20%
	Followers	.58%	1.86%	.00%	16.28%
14. Visioning: sharing opinion on organization	Leaders	.50%	1.77%	.00%	11.55%
	Followers	.20%	.85%	.00%	6.72%
15. Providing positive feedback	Leaders	.98%	1.11%	.00%	4.69%
	Followers	.31%	.50%	.00%	2.85%
16. Professionnaly challenging	Leaders	2.96%	2.85%	.00%	11.44%
	Followers	.93%	1.53%	.00%	9.66%
17. Individual consideration	Leaders	2.32%	2.64%	.00%	13.64%

Table 4. Independent Samples Test for mean duration of behaviors

Behavior	Group				95% CI For Mean Difference	t	df
	Leaders		Followers				
	M	SD	M	SD			
1. Showing disinterest	.04%	.19%	1.98%	4.29%	-2.75, -1.11	-4.68*	107.40**
2. Defending own position	1.02%	1.96%	1.25%	3.01%	-0.91, 0.45	-.67	214.00
3. Providing negative feedback	.35%	.77%	2.36%	4.43%	-2.87, -1.16	-4.66*	113.42**
4. Disagreeing	.28%	.38%	.81%	1.44%	-0.82, -0.25	-3.71*	122.00**
5. Agreeing	1.63%	1.61%	2.36%	4.79%	-1.69, 0.23	-1.50	214.00
6. Directing: correcting	.38%	.73%	.20%	.43%	0.02, 0.34	2.22*	173.42**
7. Directing: delegating	1.51%	1.58%	.24%	.44%	0.96, 1.58	8.04*	123.32**
8. Directing: interrupting	.38%	.64%	1.09%	1.48%	-1.01, -0.40	-4.53*	145.46**
9. Verifying	5.90%	4.32%	7.74%	4.69%	6.13, 8.53	-3.00*	214.00
10. Structuring the conversation	8.73%	5.88%	1.40%	2.25%	2.04, 9.69	12.10*	137.56**
11. Informing	47.01%	13.41%	41.15%	15.08%	-13.49, -6.94	3.02*	214.00
12. Visioning: sharing opinion	21.45%	9.98%	31.66%	14.11%	-13.49, -6.93	-6.14*	192.61**
13. Visioning: sharing long-term vision	2.16%	4.20%	.58%	1.86%	0.70, 2.45	3.57*	147.57**
14. Visioning: sharing opinion on organization	.50%	1.77%	.20%	.85%	-0.08, 0.67	1.58	154.22**
15. Providing positive feedback	.98%	1.11%	.31%	.50%	0.44, 0.90	5.76*	148.67**
16. Professionnaly challenging	2.96%	2.85%	.93%	1.53%	1.42, 2.65	6.55*	163.92**
17. Individual consideration	2.32%	2.64%	1.84%	6.53%	-0.86, 1.82	.70	214.00
18. Humor	1.48%	1.40%	2.97%	2.64%	-2.06, -0.92	-5.19*	162.46**
19. Personally informing	.91%	2.09%	.94%	2.28%	-0.61, 0.56	-.09	214.00

* p < .05 (two-tailed).

** equal variance not assumed

Table 5. Frequency of verbal behaviors in leaders and followers (%)

Behavior	Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
1. Showing disinterest	Leaders	.06%	.21%	.00%	1.29%
	Followers	1.21%	2.04%	.00%	9.92%
2. Defending own position	Leaders	1.22%	1.99%	.00%	11.39%
	Followers	1.29%	1.98%	.00%	11.45%
3. Providing negative feedback	Leaders	.47%	.82%	.00%	5.08%
	Followers	2.02%	2.75%	.00%	16.34%
4. Disagreeing	Leaders	.89%	.99%	.00%	4.43%
	Followers	1.83%	2.09%	.00%	17.56%
5. Agreeing	Leaders	5.55%	3.12%	.00%	12.25%
	Followers	6.49%	3.46%	.36%	16.80%
6. Directing: correcting	Leaders	.71%	1.10%	.00%	6.83%
	Followers	.32%	.51%	.00%	3.08%
7. Directing: delegating	Leaders	1.92%	1.58%	.00%	6.72%
	Followers	.33%	.42%	.00%	1.65%
8. Directing: interrupting	Leaders	1.79%	2.03%	.00%	11.57%
	Followers	3.81%	3.79%	.00%	15.52%
9. Verifying	Leaders	13.17%	6.01%	2.90%	40.94%
	Followers	13.86%	5.51%	2.61%	32.44%
10. Structuring the conversation	Leaders	11.77%	4.99%	1.29%	30.07%
	Followers	1.95%	2.61%	.00%	14.05%
11. Informing	Leaders	27.85%	8.70%	3.21%	55.69%
	Followers	28.18%	10.18%	6.86%	67.78%
12. Visioning: sharing opinion	Leaders	19.84%	7.82%	2.06%	36.53%
	Followers	28.60%	10.98%	2.49%	59.80%
13. Visioning: sharing long-term vision	Leaders	1.08%	1.87%	.00%	9.14%
	Followers	.27%	.81%	.00%	7.01%
14. Visioning: sharing opinion on organization	Leaders	.27%	.86%	.00%	5.97%
	Followers	.13%	.64%	.00%	6.08%
15. Providing positive feedback	Leaders	1.90%	1.68%	.00%	7.16%
	Followers	.59%	.74%	.00%	3.55%
16. Professionnaly challenging	Leaders	3.48%	3.29%	.00%	16.46%
	Followers	.88%	1.29%	.00%	8.40%
17. Individual consideration	Leaders	4.34%	3.88%	.00%	17.14%
	Followers	1.86%	2.61%	.00%	13.79%
18. Humor	Leaders	2.81%	2.31%	.00%	12.27%
	Followers	5.28%	3.57%	.00%	16.88%
19. Personally informing	Leaders	.88%	1.87%	.00%	14.29%
	Followers	1.10%	2.09%	.00%	12.39%

Note: N=108

Table 6. Independent Samples Test for mean frequency of behaviors

Behavior	Group				95% CI For Mean Difference	t	df
	Leaders		Followers				
	M	SD	M	SD			
1. Showing disinterest	.06%	.21%	1.21%	2.04%	-1.54, -0.76	-5.80*	109.29**
2. Defending own position	1.22%	1.99%	1.29%	1.98%	-0.61, 0.46	-.27	214.00
3. Providing negative feedback	.47%	.82%	2.02%	2.75%	-2.10, -1.00	-5.61*	126.09**
4. Disagreeing	.89%	.99%	1.83%	2.09%	-1.38, -0.51	-4.25*	153.05**
5. Agreeing	5.55%	3.12%	6.49%	3.46%	-1.83, -0.06	-2.11*	214.00
6. Directing: correcting	.71%	1.10%	.32%	.51%	0.16, 0.62	3.32*	151.02**
7. Directing: delegating	1.92%	1.58%	.33%	.42%	1.28, 1.91	10.11*	122.26**
8. Directing: interrupting	1.79%	2.03%	3.81%	3.79%	-2.84, -1.20	-4.88*	163.78**
9. Verifying	13.17%	6.01%	13.86%	5.51%	-2.23, 0.86	-.87	214.00
10. Structuring the conversation	11.77%	4.99%	1.95%	2.61%	8.75, 10.89	18.13*	161.49**
11. Informing	27.85%	8.70%	28.18%	10.18%	-2.87, 2.21	-.25	214.00
12. Visioning: sharing opinion	19.84%	7.82%	28.60%	10.98%	-11.32, -6.20	-6.75*	193.36**
13. Visioning: sharing long-term vision	1.08%	1.87%	.27%	.81%	0.42, 1.20	4.14*	145.78**
14. Visioning: sharing opinion on organization	.27%	.86%	.13%	.64%	-0.06, 0.35	1.41	197.52**
15. Providing positive feedback	1.90%	1.68%	.59%	.74%	0.96, 1.66	7.40*	147.21**
16. Professionnaly challenging	3.48%	3.29%	.88%	1.29%	1.93, 3.27	7.65*	139.05**
17. Individual consideration	4.34%	3.88%	1.86%	2.61%	1.60, 3.37	5.52*	187.55**
18. Humor	2.81%	2.31%	5.28%	3.57%	-3.28, -1.67	-6.05*	183.47**
19. Personally informing	.88%	1.87%	1.10%	2.09%	-0.75, 0.31	-.82	214.00

* $p < .05$ (two-tailed).

** equal variance not assumed