CHAPTER 15

Leadership Models, Methods, and Applications: Progress and Remaining Blind Spots

BRUCE J. AVOLIO, JOHN J. SOSIK, AND YAIR BERSON

CATCHING UP WITH THE FIELD OF LEADERSHIP

Since the last version of this chapter was published in 2002, much has been added to the leadership literature in terms of both breadth and depth (Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney & Cogliser, 2010). The leadership literature now comprises a body of work that is maturing in a number of areas, including the sophistication of the methodologies (both quantitative and qualitative) used to test leadership models and theory, a more in-depth conceptualization of the models being tested that better reflect the complexities of leadership, a growing number of studies that are using non-U.S. samples from around the globe, more field studies versus student samples and a growing recognition of the importance of the follower and context in both the formulation of theory and research, as well as understanding that leadership occurs in many forms, across many levels of analysis, and is itself a complex dynamic embedded in a complex and changing world (Gardner et al., 2010). Nevertheless, there remain important topics of leadership research that are still lagging behind in terms of what we have learned this past decade. These areas include examining what constitutes shared leadership, followership, distributed strategic leadership, destructive leadership, innovative leadership, and genuine or authentic leadership development.

In terms of research design methods used by leadership researchers, we are now seeing more use of mixed methods to examine leadership and its impact, as well as a greater occurrence of including competitive comparisons of models and measures within the same research study. Competitive model testing is becoming more the norm versus the exception, especially in construct validation research, where new measures such as ethical, authentic, servant, and spiritual leadership were tested (e.g., Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing & Peterson, 2008).

Most leadership research now examines what was referred to as the "black box" of leadership processes (Bass & Bass, 2008). The black box includes mechanisms that explain how leadership is manifested in terms of its impact on performance. Today, one would be hard-pressed to find articles in top-tier journals that are not testing one or two mediators, as well as incorporating important moderators to explain how leadership is transmitted through to performance. We are also witnessing an emergence of new models that fill in niche areas in the literature heretofore not considered in mainstream leadership research. These models include focusing on what constitutes spiritual, servant, cross-cultural, complexity, and abusive leadership. Although these areas were being discussed back when we published our earlier chapter, each of these areas has advanced in terms of both theory and research.

One of the biggest gaps in the leadership literature includes the gap between interest in investing in leadership development, and what we know that works and doesn't work in this domain of leadership studies. Although as reviewed in this chapter, some promising conceptual frameworks are emerging that capture a broader range of individual and contextual factors that may impact leadership development, the evidence to support the large investments made each year in developing leaders is noticeably absent in the literature.

There still remains relatively little research examining how different ethnic groups, such as Asians, Hispanics, or African Americans, fare in leadership roles. We are hard-pressed to find leadership research that has examined how race impacts any aspect of leadership including assessment, selection, development, and performance. This is in contrast to the ongoing focus on male and female issues related to leadership.

What can we then conclude regarding the past decade worth of leadership research? There have not necessarily been any giant leaps in the leadership field. It seems fair to say that the field has pursued systematic and in-depth examinations into exploring a broader range of constructs comprising leadership, with some interesting new additions that may very well frame the debate on what constitutes leadership in the future, for example, shared or networked leadership.

As we did in our last chapter, we will focus on balancing our attention to emerging streams of research, while also reviewing relevant prior literature, keeping in mind our space limitations. Thus, by necessity, we will not cover all of the material we covered last time, plus new research and theory. Rather, we will selectively retain relevant literature important to explaining the emergence of new research.

Revising the Definition of Leadership

Referring back to how we defined leadership in 2002, we suggested that leadership was a social influence process that can occur at individual, dyadic, group, and/or strategic levels, where it can be shared within a top management team or distributed throughout an organization. In our view, this definition of leadership anticipated some of the subsequent criticisms of the field over this past decade as being too focused on the individual as the locus of leadership. However, we now would include in our definition what Katz and Kahn (1978, pp. 271–272) referred to as distributed leadership, suggesting it was "... the exertion of influence on organizationally relevant matters by any member of any organization." We also believe the original definition of leadership that was included in our last chapter a decade ago by Katz and Kahn's (1978) still remains relevant, in that it suggests that leadership is also, "the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization" (p. 528).

In addition to providing these general definitions of what constitutes leadership, we also offer to readers more specific definitions of key constructs in the leadership literature to help guide our review, analysis, and update of this literature in the appendix to this chapter. However, it should be noted, that even with in the same leadership construct, there may be multiple operational definitions of the leadership construct.

EMERGING AND CURRENT AREAS OF EXPLORATION

Follower-centric Research

We start in one of the most unlikely places talking about leadership and that is by focusing on the follower. There has been a great deal of writing on the topic of followership over the last several years, with authors taking the position that "the follower matters" in terms of how leadership should be conceptualized and measured, along with how it ultimately impacts the followers' and leaders' ways of thinking, motivation, behavior, and performance. For example, Kark and Van Dijk (2007), using regulatory theory as their theoretical framework for examining followers, argued that followers who have more of a promotion versus a prevention regulatory focus would respond better to transformational leadership. Why? Transformational leaders help followers to focus on positive future states/outcomes due to their visionary leadership and would align better with a promotion-oriented follower, who would be better able to adapt and respond to the future.

De Cremer, Mayer, Schouten, Bardes and van Dijke (2009) examined how the regulatory focus of followers affected how they viewed a leader's self-sacrifice—an aspect of leadership frequently associated with transformational leaders, and how those perceptions produced prosocial behavior in followers. In a series of four studies, they provided consistent evidence supporting the idea that follower regulatory focus moderated the effect of self-sacrificial leadership on follower prosocial behavior whereby this relationship was stronger for followers who

had more of a prevention focus. In their follower-centered perspective on leadership, Lord and Brown (2004) have further advanced the work on implicit theories by examining what constitutes the self-regulatory mechanisms that are considered central to follower motivation. This work has begun to explain how a leader changes the way followers think about themselves and its impact on performance. It suffices to say that these shifts toward understanding followership and how it integrates within the larger complex dynamic of leadership are a useful addition to the leadership literature. However, adding followership to the equation should not deter researchers from examining the leader as locus, as much still needs to be understood about the role of the leader in leadership, as well as the role of the follower.

State of Leadership Development

In 2009, approximately 24% of the $50 billion that organizations spent on organizational learning and development was targeted specifically at leadership development (O'Leonard, 2010). Yet, one of the most common questions still asked of leadership researchers and practitioners is whether leadership is born versus made. Recent research set out to examine whether leaders were born versus made, concluding that leadership is on average 30% heritable and 70% developed or experientially based, which falls below the typical amount of variance observed for heritability levels associated with personality and intelligence (see Arvey, Zhang, Avolio, & Kruger, 2007; Avolio, Rotundo, & Walumbwa, 2009). Arvey et al. (2007) demonstrated with a female sample of identical and fraternal twins that the emergence in leadership roles across these twins' careers was largely due to the accumulated experience they had versus heritability. Avolio et al. (2009) generalized those findings to a sample of all male identical and fraternal twins, reporting a similar breakdown in terms of 30% born versus 70% made based on experiences, while showing that authoritative parenting style was an important predictor of leader emergence across the career span.

In addition to the work on addressing the question of heritability, there have also been a series of meta-analyses examining whether leadership training positively impacts leader development. Prior meta-analytic research now offers consistent and positive evidence to support the differential effects of various management and leadership training interventions on changes in leader behavior and performance (e.g., Avolio, Reichard, Hannah, Walumbwa, & Chan, 2009). Indeed, even relatively short leadership interventions lasting no more than a day have been shown to have a positive impact on leader development (Avolio et al., 2009). Also, as noted in the work reported by Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002), rigorous training methods applied in a field experiment yielded significant and positive effects on leader development, with confirming evidence provided by other leader development research (e.g., Barling, Loughlin, & Kelloway, 2002). Collins and Holton (2004) reported effect sizes of 0.35 to 1.37 for leadership interventions, which varied depending on the type of outcome for leadership development interventions, while Avolio et al. (2009) reported effect sizes for leadership interventions (0.30 to 1.20, with average effect of 0.65). Collins and Holton concluded that managers can benefit when "the right development is offered to the right leaders" (p. 217).

As we noted in our last review, even though there has been some discussion on how experiential events impact leadership development (DeRue & Wellman, 2009), we still have relatively little research examining how certain events/experiences impact how and when leadership develops. This remains the case even though authors such as McCauley (2001) have come out in favor of designing leadership interventions to examine how *natural learning experiences* at work trigger development in leaders.

Focusing on the future, Orvis and Langkamer-Ratwani (2010) suggested that we will see more attention to leadership development that focuses on self-development. Organizations across all sectors of the economy are moving toward promoting ways to enhance leadership self-development, with development frequently embedded within one's job assignments and supported through advanced technology. It appears we will see more attempts to develop leadership embedded at work versus accomplished at off-site training locations (Boyce, Zaccaro, & Wisecarver, 2010).

In sum, there has not been considerable progress in demonstrating the merits of leadership development, in spite of the large investment being made in this area. However, there has been significant progress in the area of conceptualizing what constitutes leader and leadership development (Avolio, 2011; Day, Harrison, & Halpin, 2009), which provides a strong foundation for future leadership research in this area.

Evolution of Implicit Leadership Theory (ILT)

Since leadership categorization theory was first introduced into the literature and reviewed in our last chapter, there have been numerous social cognitive theories and general advances in the cognitive science literature applied

to advancing work on leadership (see Shondrick, Dinh, & Lord, 2010). Generally speaking, this work has promoted our understanding of the cognitive mechanisms and processes underlying leaders' and followers' perceptions, interpretations, and the way they choose to respond in terms of both leadership and followership behaviors (Shondrick & Lord, 2010). This work has led to a deeper understanding of how leadership is cocreated, as well as providing insights into how we might measure it.

As research on leadership has focused more on how it is codetermined, shared, and strategic in focus, it has also become increasingly more difficult to rely upon the foundational ILT work to explain how people behave at these different levels of analysis. To account for these more dynamic forms of leadership, leadership categorization theory has been integrated into what have been referred to as connectionist models of knowledge, whereby ILTs are now depicted as stable patterns of networks, similar to a neural-like network (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001). With these advances in our understanding of ILT, researchers suggest that it is the aggregate pattern created when such networks are activated that defines leadership categories and therefore how leadership is understood, enacted, and developed. These authors further consider that it is the entire pattern of activation in a "neural" network that is meaningful, not just a single unit. Adopting this view, we may be better able to explain how each team member's self-concept or mental model is tied to individual, shared, and strategic leadership behaviors and frameworks.

Extending ILT work, the social identity theory of leadership examines how leaders seen as more prototypical by followers impact both leaders' and followers' ways of thinking and behaving (Hogg, 2001). According to Hogg's framework, a group member is considered prototypical if he or she represents the image of what members believe is an accurate depiction of member characteristics for that group. When group leaders are considered as more prototypical they are rated as being more effective by group members and receive higher levels of support from their followers (Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003). Van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, de Cremer, and Hogg (2004) suggest the way that individuals perceive themselves, in terms of self-concept or identity, will inform how they feel about their beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. This suggests that follower self-conceptions may mediate the relationship between leadership and follower behavior, and therefore should be regarded as an integral mechanism in regulating one's social interaction with a leader (Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003).

As described earlier, the self-concepts that people hold have implications for how they evaluate justice information and respond to fairness-related events. For example, the effects of fairness on attitudes and behaviors are moderated by self-identity, such that justice information has stronger effects when the information is in line with an individual's self-identity (R. E. Johnson, Selenta, & Lord, 2006). Understanding how perceptions of justice interact with an individual's self-identity could help clarify one of the ways through which justice-related information is turned into behavior and ultimately how followers react to their leaders.

In sum, the ILT work and significant extensions in the broader realm of cognitive science are progressing very rapidly and are becoming a more all-encompassing framework for explaining how leader and follower cognitions impact the leadership dynamic in terms of development and cross-cultural experiences among other areas. Today, it seems more appropriate to say that we must view leadership as being in "the eye of the beholder(s) for both leaders and followers."

Leader Traits, Knowledge, Skills, and Ability

Traits

There has been considerable variation over the years in terms of what authors have included in their definitions of what constitutes leader traits or individual differences that matter in terms of determining who leads and who doesn't. Generally speaking, leader traits have been defined as representing consistent integrated patterns or constellations of personal characteristics that foster effective leadership performance across a wide range of situations (see the definition provided by Zaccaro, Kemp, & Bader, 2004, p. 104). This definition of traits contrasts with attributes of leaders that are more statelike and open to change, such as a leader's level of efficacy.

Going back to the early part of the 20th century, leader traits were represented as being relatively enduring characteristics of leaders that provide for cross-situational stability in a leader's performance. Leadership research in the early 1900s was based on the idea that certain traits predisposed an individual to emerge as a leader (Bass & Bass, 2008). This view persisted up until reviews by Mann (1959) and Stogdill (1948) appeared in the leadership literature questioning the validity of traits for predicting leader effectiveness. Subsequently, the research attention allocated to examining the traits of leaders waned for several decades as the field shifted to more behavioral models to

predict leadership effectiveness. A shift back to focusing on traits began to take place when Kenny and Zaccaro (1983) reported that 48 to 82% of the variance in leadership emergence was accounted for by the traits of the leader. Similarly, Lord, DeVader, and Alliger (1986) conducted a meta-analysis of the literature reviewed by Mann, reporting many of the relationships between personality and leadership emergence had been underestimated. Lord et al. (1986) concluded that traits were associated with leadership perceptions to a much greater extent than had been previously reported.

Numerous studies spanning over a 100-year period of time have now linked stable personality attributes to leader effectiveness, providing a substantial foundation for supporting the position that traits do matter when predicting leader performance (cf. Bass & Bass, 2008). For example, Judge, Bono, Ilies, and Werner (2000) completed a meta-analysis of 94 studies examining the relationship between the Big Five personality traits, leadership emergence, effectiveness, and transformational leadership, reporting a multiple R of 0.47 in predicting leadership effectiveness. The authors reported that extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to experience were consistently correlated with leadership effectiveness (also see Bono & Judge, 2004).

Also coinciding with the rise in interest concerning research on leader traits, we are beginning to see attention shift to what predicts bad leadership. Hogan and Kaiser (2005) refer to the "bright side" of personality as representing, in part, leaders that show others their true selves. The array of personality traits that fall under this label have been shown to be positively correlated with a broad range of leader performance measures. For example, core self-concept (see Judge & Bono, 2001) encompasses four positive traits, including self-esteem, internal locus of control, generalized self-efficacy, and high self-regulation or low neuroticism. Core Self-Concept has been shown to be positively related to leadership effectiveness and positive forms of leadership such as transformational.

On the dark side of personality are leaders who are self-promoters and grandiose. These leaders are typically characterized as masking the way they truly are to their followers. Leslie and Van Velsor (1996) suggested that managerial failures were frequently due to leaders with these dark-sided personalities manifested by exhibiting a lack of candor, an inability to control emotions, and being arrogant, cold, and inconsistent. These dark-sided leaders lack empathy, are overly dominant, and frequently view themselves as being more important than others (Bass & Bass, 2008). Focusing in on such dark-sided attributes, Chatterjee and Hambrick (2007) reported that narcissistic CEOs were more likely to pursue grandiose initiatives, producing a much higher degree of variance in organizational performance.

Most prior research on leader traits has portrayed them as occupying various points on a continuum ranging from positive to negative. These studies have assumed linear measures of statistical associations between traits and leader effectiveness. However, evidence exists for curvilinear relations between some leader traits and leader effectiveness. For example, Ames and Flynn (2007) conducted a series of three studies that demonstrated a curvilinear pattern between leader assertiveness (i.e., extraversion and competitiveness in pursuing one's own interests) and leader effectiveness. These authors found that moderate levels of assertiveness were associated with significantly higher levels of leader effectiveness than both low and high levels of assertiveness. The assertiveness–effectiveness link was mediated by instrumental outcomes at lower levels of assertiveness, and by social outcomes at higher levels of assertiveness. These results suggest that future research on leader traits should test for potential curvilinear relationships with effectiveness. Many seemingly significant relationships between leader traits and effectiveness may be undetected by testing only for linear relationships when considering the range of positive and negative traits associated with leadership.

Moving beyond the long lists of negative and positive traits associated with leadership, we find that there have been relatively few attempts in this literature to organize the lists of traits into a more coherent and meaningful constellation of traits. Some authors argue that since leadership represents complex patterns of behavior, these patterns would be better explained by multiple leader attributes or by profile comparisons. Yet, rarely do studies consider how the joint combinations of particular leader traits influence leadership behavior (Zaccaro et al., 2004). In addition to focusing on more integrated profiles of leadership traits, it has also been suggested that future leadership research include the situation as a corresponding source of significant variance in leadership (Chen, Gully, Whiteman, & Kilcullen, 2000).

Additional work on personality traits is now expanding into some interesting new areas. For example, Popper and Mayseless (2003) examined how differences in leader attachment styles predicted leadership style and performance. Popper, Mayseless, and Castelnovo (2000) reported that more secure leaders were rated by superiors and followers as more transformational, while those

leaders with higher levels of attachment insecurities, such as being anxious and avoidant, were evaluated as possessing lower levels of transformational leadership. Popper et al. (2000) concluded that more attached individuals had greater potential to become transformational leaders. In sum, we see a growing emphasis in the leadership literature on examining leader traits spanning the bright to the dark side of leadership. In addition, there is increased attention in the literature to examining leader traits not in isolation but in terms of profiles and constellations.

Leader Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities

A growing base of literature has been exploring the link between leadership abilities/expertise, behavior, and performance. For example, the leadership skills model (see Mumford, Campion, & Morgeson, 2007) identifies four basic skill sets required for all leaders. These skill sets include leaders' *cognitive abilities* to generate solutions to multiple, rapidly unfolding problems, while also being able to come up with the best alternative solutions in the shortest period of time. Leaders need such skills to *persuade* followers—often in very difficult, complex social situations—to accept and support their proposed solutions. Leaders also need *interpersonal skills* to develop and implement solutions with followers, peers, teams, larger units, and/or their supervisors operating in complex, dynamic, and technology-connected contexts. Leaders also need *business skills* to obtain, manage, and build assets used in accumulating human, social, structural, and financial capital. Leaders in the top ranks of organizations also need *strategic skills* to guide work toward the organizational mission and to sustain the growth of an organization facing instability, crises, and turbulence in markets (Mumford et al., 2007).

In addition to heroic views of charismatic leadership styles required in times of change, pragmatic leadership styles emphasizing the central role of problem-solving skills in leadership processes have emerged as an important research topic. Work in this area posits that leaders' ability to be influential is related to the knowledge they gain through experience and the models they create from those experiences. Leaders then use this information as they engage in environmental scanning, case analysis, forecasting, idea generation, and planning (Mumford, Friedrich, Caughron, & Antes, 2009). In sum, leaders across all organizational levels require a mix of cognitive, interpersonal, business, and strategic skills to be effective. Cognitive skills appear to be most important across management levels, whereas strategic skills emerge as being essential in top management ranks, although this may change as leadership is more distributed throughout organizations. We now expect more attention to be paid to the way leaders collect information and experiences and integrate them into their self-concepts on how best to lead and/or perhaps follow others.

Emotional Intelligence (EI) Skills

Despite debates over its conceptual grounding, measurement, and trainability, the EI of leaders and followers appears to be an important correlate of effectiveness at the individual and group level. Organizational challenges have encouraged researchers to pay more attention to understanding what constitutes EI and its relationship with leadership. Some of this research has linked EI to leadership emergence over and above cognitive intelligence, personality traits, and gender (Cote, Lopes, Salovey, & Miners, 2010), while other research has raised concerns over the meaningfulness of the EI construct as it relates to leadership generally and performance in particular (Antonakis, Ashkanasy, & Dasborough, 2009). Results of a meta-analysis of 62 independent samples indicated a validity estimate of 0.59 when ratings of EI, transformational, and transactional leadership were provided by the same source (Harms & Crede, 2010). This estimate dropped to 0.12 when different sources were used to measure these constructs, with the trait measures of EI demonstrating higher validities than ability-based measures. Evidence is still out on the effects of EI on leadership, however some research already shows that EI directly and indirectly (through transformational leadership) affects project performance (Leban & Zulauf, 2004).

In sum, there are several important issues to consider in this emerging area of research interest. First, what processes guide the manner in which emotionally intelligent leaders influence their followers? Recent research by Joseph and Newman (2010) supports a cascading model of EI, in that one's perception of emotions comes before understanding, which then translates into emotional regulation and job performance. We might then ask, How might leaders build competencies in EI, given the need for interpersonal and effective communications across diverse, global business settings?

The Development of Authentic, Moral, and Immoral Leadership

Leaders who are evaluated as being more ethical and authentic have followers who exhibit higher levels of organizational commitment, extra effort, job satisfaction, performance, organizational citizenship behaviors

(OCBs), and exhibit a higher frequency of reporting ethical issues and problems (Avey, Palanski, & Walumbwa, 2010). Brown and Mitchell (2010) noted that transformational leadership has been linked to "ethics-related outcomes," such as followers' perceptions of leader trust and fairness, as well as follower OCBs. Authentic leadership has also been shown to be positively related to a variety of follower outcomes, including OCBs, empowerment, and ratings of performance (Walumbwa, Wang, Wang, Schaubroeck, & Avolio, 2010). Yet, there has not been a considerable amount of work linking ethical, authentic, transformational, or charismatic leadership to performance.

Authentic leadership has been defined as being a multidimensional construct comprised of four dimensions: internalized moral perspective, self-awareness, relational transparency, and balanced processing (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Internalized moral perspective refers to higher levels of moral development and leader behaviors that are guided by internal moral standards and values as opposed to being driven by external norms, standards, or pressure. Authentic leaders are expected to behave in a more prosocial and ethical manner in line with their highly developed internal moral value structures (Hannah, Lester, & Vogelgesang, 2005). Authentic leaders also display a higher level of self-awareness, which helps them to adjust the way they come across to followers, while promoting and reinforcing higher moral and ethical conduct in themselves and others. Authentic leaders are more relationally transparent, which involves the leader promoting more positive interactions with followers, peers, and superiors based on higher disclosures and open sharing of information, including what constitutes the leader's true thoughts and feelings. Relationally transparent leaders are characterized by a greater openness, accountability, and honesty with followers (Walumbwa et al., 2008).

The final component, referred to as balanced processing, involves objectively analyzing available relevant information before coming to a decision. Leaders who exhibit balanced processing solicit views from followers, indicating their willingness to have their positions or beliefs challenged before coming to a decision. Such leadership can also promote a greater sense of ownership and identification with the leader's ideas and decisions, which should instill a sense of positivity and engagement, leading to enhanced follower motivation for taking ethical actions (Wagner, Parker, & Christiansen, 2003). Moreover, leaders demonstrating balanced processing spend time trying to comprehend what caused problems and outcomes, thereby helping followers understand what should be attributed to internal and external causes of ethical behavior and performance (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005).

Although there is some overlap, authentic leadership has been both theoretically (see Gardner et al., 2005) and empirically (Walumbwa et al., 2008) differentiated from ethical and transformational leadership. For example, Walumbwa et al. (2008) demonstrated in a comprehensive construct validation study that authentic and ethical leadership were distinct higher order constructs.

Paralleling well-publicized corporate scandals, a significant amount of research on ethical leadership (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005), spiritual leadership (Fry, 2003), and the character of leaders (Sosik & Cameron, 2010; Sosik, Gentry, & Chun, in press) has recently emerged in the leadership literature. Continuing work on transformational/charismatic leadership has begun to focus on linking such leadership to levels of moral reasoning (Simola, Barling, & Turner, 2010; Sosik, Juzbasich, & Chun, 2011) and constructive–developmental levels (Strang & Kuhnert, 2009). Building on seminal work by Burns (1978) and Bass and Steidlmeier (1999), who both viewed leaders as moral agents, this emerging literature highlights the personal morality of authenticity and integrity, ethical reasoning/behavior, and social structures based upon normative principles of morality, as being important determinants of effective leader–follower relations and outcomes.

Brown and his colleagues (2005) define ethical leadership as "the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making" (p. 120). For Brown and Trevino (2006), ethical leadership involves being both a moral person and a moral manager, attributes that have been associated with both transformational and constructive transactional leadership (Simola et al., 2010). This stream of research examines how ethical leaders promote organizational effectiveness, while also helping create a moral community and culture that continues to foster followers' moral development. Buchko (2007) found that followers of values-driven leaders were more likely to display behaviors reflecting the same values, as would be predicted by social learning theory (Bandura, 1977). These prosocial values articulated by ethical leaders have also been shown to cascade from leaders in one organizational level to leaders and followers in the next lower level, with positive relationships reported between top management and supervisory leadership and group-level OCB and

negative relationships with group-level deviance (Mayer, Kuenzi, Greenbaum, Bardes, & Salvador, 2009).

We are now seeing the emergence of work on moral and ethical leadership that includes a focus on levels of analysis in the theoretical framing of this research, as well as in the empirical analyses. As referenced above, recent research has begun to focus on both the direct and indirect effects of ethical leaders (Mayer et al., 2009). Mayer and colleagues asked employees across different organizations to evaluate both their immediate leader's level of ethical leadership and the ethical leadership of "top management." Mayer et al. reported ratings of ethical leadership were positively correlated across levels. In addition, both levels of ethical leadership were positively related to incidents of OCB, while also being negatively related to deviant behavior. Their results showed that the ethical leadership of one's direct leader mediated the effects of top management ethical leadership on group deviance and group OCB.

Yang, Zhang, and Tsui (2010) examined ethical transformational leadership across levels, reporting that there were positive relationships between ratings of transformational leadership behavior across three levels of management. Yang et al. (2010) reported that the middle managers' level of transformational leadership had a direct effect on employees at the next level down, as well as an indirect effect that was mediated by the transformational leadership of the leader at the lower level.

These studies are beginning to examine leadership more as a total system of interacting parts and process, then isolating the analysis of leadership to an individual level. What we are discovering is that leadership can cascade across organizational levels, and it can be mediated through other levels of leadership or can bypass those levels to have important effects on the behaviors of individuals at lower levels. By viewing leadership in a more integrative way, it appears we can now conclude that such leadership can produce direct, indirect, or bypass effects.

Overall, the literature on moral and immoral leadership offers a range of theoretical models to examine how leaders can bring out the best in themselves and others (Sosik & Cameron, 2010). Today, exciting advances in areas such as the neurobiological roots of leader ethics that are being shaped by unconscious emotional systems and life experiences hold great promise for advancing future research in this area (see Narvaez, 2008). We are now seeing researchers focus on alternative measures of moral reasoning that can be applied to leadership research, such as behavioral-based measures of managerial moral judgment (Loviscky, Trevino, & Jacobs, 2007). Nevertheless, much more research is needed on what constitutes moral and immoral leadership, including how to measure authentic versus immoral leadership styles and processes, how moral personality traits interact with situational variables, how genetics influences character in terms of both virtue and vice, and how crisis affects the display of various forms of ethical leadership.

Abusive Leadership

Over the last decade researchers have begun examining what constitutes abusive leadership and the impact such leadership has on individuals, units, and organizations. Tepper (2000) defines abusive leadership as being based on "subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact" (p. 178). Most of the research on abusive leadership has primarily focused on negative psychological and behavioral outcomes (see Tepper, Moss, Lockhart, & Carr, 2007, for a review). This research stream has linked abusive leadership with levels of psychological strain and exhaustion (e.g., Tepper et al., 2007), lower job satisfaction and commitment (e.g., Aryee, Chen, Sun, & Debrah, 2007), workplace deviance (Thau, Bennett, Mitchell, & Marrs, 2009), and higher levels of aggression (Dupre, Innes, Connelly, Barling, & Hoption, 2006). What have not typically appeared in this literature are comparisons between abusive and more positive forms of leadership. Also, the contextual factors that moderate abusive leadership, how abusive leadership is mediated, and how follower attributes mediate the effects of abusive leadership are all areas requiring future inquiry.

Leadership Styles, Leader–Member Exchange, and Contingency Leadership Behaviors

Since the 1950s, there has been extensive research on differences in leadership styles and behaviors accumulated in the leadership literature (Bass & Bass, 2008). Much of this research emerged following the disappointing conclusions reported by Mann and Stogdill's reviews of leadership traits and the relationship to leader emergence and performance. These findings led to a shift in focus toward leader behaviors and a stream of research on the people versus production styles of leaders, as well as on initiation of structure and consideration generated in research conducted at the University of Michigan and Ohio State University (Bass & Bass, 2008). The past decade has seen a reemergence of interest in research on

two-factor theories of leadership at both the individual and team level. For example, Carmeli, Ben-Hador, Waldman, and Rupp (2009) examined how relational leadership behavior builds social capital that can enhance feelings of vigor at work. Burke, Stagl, Klein, Goodwin, Salas, and Halpin (2006) examined the relationship between leadership behavior and behaviorally based team performance outcomes, concluding that task-focused leadership behaviors were moderately related to perceived team effectiveness and productivity, whereas person-focused leadership was related to perceived team effectiveness, productivity, and learning. These results highlight the important role of empowerment behaviors in team leadership, reporting they accounted for almost 30% of the variance in team learning. An empowering style of team leadership has also been shown to be positively related to team performance mediated through the effects of knowledge sharing and team efficacy (Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, 2006).

Building on research emerging from two-factor theories of leadership, Yukl (2008) developed the flexible leadership theory. This theory proposes that leaders positively influence an organization's financial performance through efficiency, adaptation, and human capital development. Yukl argued that leaders must display a wide range of leadership behaviors in order to effectively collaborate and cooperate with multiple leaders at multiple levels of organizations, to enhance an organization's performance.

(Non)Contingent Rewards and Punishment Styles

Other research on leadership styles has included how leaders used rewards and punishment to influence follower motivation and performance. The use of transactional contingent rewards has been associated with higher follower satisfaction, advancement opportunities, and performance over a large number of samples, levels, and cultures (Bass & Bass, 2008). Hinkin and Schriesheim (2008) examined how leaders' omission of rewards (and punishments) predicted follower performance, reporting omissions can be as important as positive forms of leadership in predicting performance outcomes.

Fieldler's Contingency Theory

Additional work on leadership styles and behaviors based on Fiedler's (1967) contingency model of leadership has generated considerable controversy over the last 40 years (Schriesheim, Tepper, & Tetrault, 1994). Part of the controversy stems from Fielder's measurement of relational- versus task-focused leadership styles, using what he called the least preferred coworker (LPC) scale. According to Fiedler's theory, leaders are categorized according to their scores on the LPC scale as being more task oriented (i.e., being primarily motivated to achieve task objectives) than people oriented (i.e., being primarily motivated to have close interpersonal relationships). Fiedler then classified the context in terms of those situations being more or less favorable using the following three dimensions: leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. Fiedler argued that task-oriented leaders were more effective in highly favorable and unfavorable situations, whereas relationship-oriented leaders were more effective in the middle range.

Another aspect of the controversy concerns Fiedler's insistence that leader effectiveness is based on changing the situation versus the leader. Fiedler argued in favor of changing the context to match the leader's preferred style, but situations are not always easily changed given the complexity of contemporary organizations and the ever-changing environments in which leaders operate. Unfortunately, research on the leader-match process has produced both support (see Peters, Hartke, & Pohlmann, 1985) and discrepancies for Fiedler's model (e.g., Jago & Ragan, 1986).

Leader–Member Exchange Theory

LMX theory represents the second-most-researched leadership topic over the past 2 decades. Roots of LMX theory can be traced to the work of Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975), which was originally referred to as vertical dyad linkage (VDL) theory. Graen, Novak, and Sommerkamp (1982) extended this work into what is now called LMX theory by focusing on exchanges and relationships that were not necessarily vertical.

A review by Nishii and Mayer (2009) showed that the LMX scale in its various forms was correlated with a broad range of variables, including follower satisfaction, performance, and turnover, at both the individual and group levels of analysis. Martinko, Harvey, and Douglas (2007) concluded that many of the propositions associated with LMX have been empirically supported. However, controversy still surrounds this construct's assumptions and measurement. For instance, researchers have debated whether LMX theory creates inequities or even injustices in organizations based on its assumption that leaders create in-groups and out-groups (e.g., Harter & Evanecky, 2002).

Schriesheim, Castro, and Cogliser (1999) pointed to problems with how LMX was defined, measured, and analyzed. They also criticized LMX research for not incorporating an explicit level of analysis when examining LMX relationships. Existing LMX measures also suffer

from relatively low levels of agreement between leader and member perceptions of their relationship, although agreement levels do increase with length of relationship, dyadic interaction intensity (Sin, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2009), and member similarity to leader competence and personality (Goodwin, Bowler, & Whittington, 2009).

The past decade has given rise to a wide variety of studies attempting to better explain how leader–member exchanges are created and involved in other leadership processes. For example, followers who have a stronger mastery orientation have been shown to be more effective because they establish high-quality LMX relationships with their superiors (Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004). Two studies suggest that LMX makes transformational leadership processes more meaningful and effective. Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, and Chen (2005) demonstrated how LMX fully mediates the relationships between transformational leadership, task performance, and OCB. The relationships between transformational leadership and task performance and OCB appear to be stronger for followers who rate their relationship with the leader as representing a high leader–member exchange (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006).

Taken together, the research on leadership styles and behaviors has identified a number of styles that consistently show up, differentiating more or less effective leadership. Recently, this literature was significantly extended by examining the behaviors and styles of charismatic and transformational leaders.

Transformational, Charismatic, and Visionary Theories

The literature focusing on the neocharismatic theories of leadership has generally reported more positive relationships with a variety of performance outcomes versus more traditional theories of leadership (e.g., Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Since this chapter was first published in 2003, the work on transformational leadership and related constructs has continued to grow and outpace every other theoretical framework in terms of frequency of being researched. Although the emphasis on charismatic leadership has waned to some extent, there has been a continual uptick in interest in determining how to best measure transformational leadership, examining how it relates to myriad mediating mechanisms, how the followers' characteristics impact how transformational leaders are perceived, how it can be shared, what are the antecedents to such leadership, whether it can be developed, how it manifests across different cultures, and even how followers perceive their job characteristics as a function of working for a more transformational leader.

Turning to the followers' characteristics and how they might impact the transformational leadership dynamic, Gong, Huang, and Farh (2009) examined why in some prior research transformational leadership was positively correlated with creativity (Shin & Zhou, 2003), while in other studies (Jaussi & Dionne, 2003) there was no relationship observed. Gong et al. (2009) reasoned that the followers' learning orientation might moderate the effects of transformational leadership, thus helping to explain the discrepant findings noted in the literature. These authors reported that learning goal orientation and transformational leadership predicted employee creativity, and that one's learning goal orientation and transformational leadership were mediated in their impact on creativity through employee creativity self-efficacy. This is the sort of research that is delving into the black box of leadership referred to at the outset of this chapter.

Beyond focusing on creativity, research on transformational leadership has also examined associations with the level of innovation exhibited by individuals and teams. For example, Keller (2006) examined how transformational leadership predicted team innovation in research and development (R&D) settings over a 1-year period, reporting that transformational leadership positively predicted R&D team performance. Nederveen Pieterse, van Knippenberg, Schippers, and Stam (2010) reported that transformational leadership was positively related to follower innovative behavior only when they reported higher levels of psychological empowerment, whereas transactional leadership was negatively related to follower innovative behavior.

There has also been considerable interest in escalating the focus on transformational leadership to the unit or group level. For example, Williams, Parker, and Turner (2010) investigated the determinants of team proactive performance with teams from a chemical processing plant. Using independent ratings of team proactive performance, the authors reported that the most proactive teams had leaders rated higher in transformational leadership. These authors also reported that the relationship between transformational leadership and team proactive performance was mediated by the interpersonal norms established in these teams.

Additional research at the team level focusing on Army operational training performance in the United States and Singapore reported that the transformational leadership of unit leaders positively predicted unit performance in very

challenging team performance contexts (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Lim & Ployhart, 2004). In fact, Lim and Ployart (2004) reported a validity coefficient that was nearly twice as large for transformational leadership when predicting the most versus the least challenging operational team exercises.

Schaubroeck, Lam, and Cha (2007) investigated the relationship between transformational leadership and group performance in 218 financial services teams that were bank branches in Hong Kong and the United States. Ratings of team leader transformational leadership predicted team performance through the mediating effects of team potency. Transformational leadership effects on team potency were also moderated by the level of team power distance and collectivism, such that higher power distance and collectivistic teams produced stronger positive effects of transformational leadership and team potency.

The emerging literature linking safety to transformational leadership offers empirical support for the positive impact of transformational leadership on workplace safety attitudes and behavior. Moreover, recent research has shown that by training leaders to be more conscious of how their transformational leadership impacts safety climate, the resulting effects were improved safety climate outcomes (Mullen & Kelloway, 2009).

An interesting extension of the work on transformational leadership was provided by Bono and Anderson (2005) in their examination of the linkages between transformational leadership and the characteristics of the social networks created by such leaders. Picking up on Burns's (1978) description of transformational leadership as affecting not only a follower's behavior, but also the channels through which followers and leaders interact, Bono and Anderson reported that transformational leaders were more centrally positioned in advice and influence networks within their organizations. Zohar and Tenne-Gazit (2008) similarly examined the linkages between transformational leadership and social networks with a focus on how they impact the emergence of organizational climates. Transformational leadership was partially mediated by the density of the group's communication network, which predicted the level of safety climate strength observed in military units. The effect of transformational leadership on safety-climate strength was mediated by the density of the communication network.

Liao and Chuang (2007) focused on how transformational leadership predicts at different levels of analysis the service climate of a unit, the service orientation of employees, and customer satisfaction over time. Results revealed that transformational leadership was positively related to employee service performance, and customers' intentions to maintain a long-term service relationship. Store-level transformational leadership was positively related to store-level service climate, which further enhanced the relationship between the leader's level of transformational leadership and employee service performance.

It seems fair to say that much of the empirical research on transformational leadership has supported the basic premises put forth by Bass and Burns over 25 years ago. Specifically, transformational leaders are different from transactional leaders in terms of their personalities, moral perspectives, values attitudes, and behaviors (see, for example, Bono & Judge, 2004). Transformational leadership also has generally been shown to have a more positive impact on motivation and performance, as suggested in Bass's (1985) title, "Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations." Finally, we also have evidence that this style of leadership is not born into leaders, but rather can be developed over time.

Reciprocal and Shared Leadership

House and Aditya (1997) commented:

> There is some speculation, and some preliminary evidence, to suggest that concentration of leadership in a single chain of command may be less optimal than shared leadership responsibility among two or more individuals in certain task environments . . . leadership involves collaborative relationships that lead to collective action grounded in shared values of people who work together to effect positive change. (p. 457)

They referred to collective leadership in their review of the leadership literature, borrowing the term *peer leadership* from work published by Bowers and Seashore (1966), stating:

> It is also possible that some of the specific leader behaviors required to enact generic functions can be distributed throughout the entire work group or work unit being managed. Thus several individuals could enact the same specific leaders' behaviors contemporaneously. The research by Bowers and Seashore (1966) clearly demonstrates that the exercise of leaders' behaviors can be shared by members of work units, as well as conducted by formal work unit managers. (pp. 458–459)

Several authors described leadership as being a "collective" social influence process (e.g., Bales, 1954) or as "co-leadership" (Pearce & Sims, 2000). For example,

while summarizing the Harvard Laboratory Studies on leadership, Bales (1954) referred to the term *coleadership,* suggesting that it might be beneficial for groups to allocate the task and relational leadership roles to different individuals. Research on self-managing teams (e.g., Manz & Sims, 1993) has now helped to move the leadership field toward recognizing the importance of leadership *by* the team versus leadership *of* the team. However, most prior research on leadership in teams has assessed the leadership of a single individual leading a team (Cohen, Chang, & Ledford, 1997). While several authors have introduced the concept of distributed or collective leadership within teams (e.g., Katzenbach, 1997; Pearce & Sims, 2000), there have been relatively few attempts to examine leadership as a group-level construct prior to the current decade.

Burns (1997) extended his work on individual transformational leadership to include a focus on "collective leadership." He argued there was "the existence of webs of potential collective leadership" (p. 1). He then suggested, "the initiator (referring to leader) may continue as a single dominating 'leader' a la Castro, but more typically she will merge with others in a series of participant interactions that will constitute collective leadership . . . I see crucial leadership acts in the collective process" (pp. 2–3). Similar to Burns's extensions to transformational leadership, Bass (1998) noted:

> Transformational leadership could be shared among the team members . . . Instead of motivation being supplied by identification of members with an idealized, charismatic leader, similar motivation would be supplied by identification with the team . . . Inspiration would come from a sharing of mutually articulated goals. (p. 157)

Pearce (1997) and Pearce and Sims (2002) reported that shared leadership was related to group potency, citizenship, and group effectiveness. Sivasubramaniam, Murry, Avolio, and Jung (2002) reported similar findings with MBA teams performing over a 3-month interval. These authors reported that shared leadership using the team as referent was related to team potency and performance. While still relatively novel, the notion that leadership may be a shared process, and that in certain cases shared leadership can be more effective than traditional hierarchical leadership, has gained momentum over the past decade (Carson, Tesluk, & Marrone, 2007).

While most of the discussion of shared or collective leadership has been theoretical (e.g., Friedrich Vessey, Schuelke, Ruark, & Mumford, 2009), there are a growing number of empirical studies emerging in the literature. For instance, Pearce and Ensley (2004) reported a significant relationship between shared vision and several aspects of team dynamics as well as team innovation in product development teams. Carson et al. (2007) utilized a social networks approach and measured network density as the total amount of leadership displayed by team members. The internal environment of the team and coaching by an external leader were antecedents of shared leadership. When the internal team environment was weak, the external leader's role became even more central for shared leadership.

Future work on the topic of shared leadership needs to examine the content of shared leadership. To date, most work has examined whether leadership is shared or not, but what may also be needed is for future research to establish what comprises the construct of shared leadership. Furthermore, future research may go beyond testing the effects of hierarchical versus shared forms of leadership, to test how these different sources of leadership interact. Finally, while Carson et al.'s (2007) work provides an alternative solution to measuring shared leadership, others have measured shared visionary leadership using a consensus model (Chan, 1998) or a "group as a whole" approach (Pearce & Conger, 2003, p. 297). More work is needed to establish appropriate measures of shared leadership.

Strategic Leadership

Strategic leadership often refers to the management of an enterprise, focusing most specifically on CEOs and top management teams (Hitt & Ireland, 2002). As such, strategic leadership pertains to processes such as decision making, rather than emphasizing relational aspects of leadership typical to smaller entities (Finkelstein, Hambrick, & Cannella, 2008). The study of top executives has proliferated dramatically in the last decade, introducing new research methods beyond the focus on the demographics of executives.

Beginning with Hambrick and Mason's (1984) seminal work, research within the upper echelon perspective has examined strategic leadership taking into consideration the role of leaders as representing strategic assets of firms. Central to this approach is the notion that organizations are reflections of their top managers (Hambrick & Mason, 1984). Top managers face ambiguous environments and often experience information overload. Consequently, their success as leaders is determined by the frame of reference upon which they rely, consisting of their personal background, experiences, education, and

other biographical characteristics (Hambrick & Mason, 1984).

Dozens of studies have supported the upper echelon model, with more recent interest focusing on the personal background of executives. For example, by employing a highly creative set of unobtrusive measures of CEO narcissism, Chatterjee and Hambrick (2007) found that narcissistic CEOs engaged in bold actions, resulting in unstable financial performance of their firms (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007). CEOs' narcissism was assessed by the prominence of the CEOs' pictures in press releases, the use of first-person-singular pronouns in media mentions, and the CEOs' relative compensation with respect to the second-highest-paid person in their organization.

In line with earlier calls to go beyond reliance on executives' biographic and unobtrusive data as proxies of CEOs' personal makeup (e.g., Priem, Lyon, & Dess, 1999), several studies (e.g., Berson, Oreg, & Dvir, 2008; Simsek, Heavey, & Veiga, 2010) have used surveys to measure CEOs' psychographic data. A recent study examined CEOs' core self-evaluations as predictors of their entrepreneurial orientation, demonstrating that this relationship was particularly strong in firms that operate in dynamic contexts (Simsek et al., 2010). Another study (Berson et al., 2008) found that CEOs' personal values (self-direction, security, and benevolence) were associated with the organizational culture of their firms (innovative, bureaucratic, and supportive), and had positive indirect effects on the firms' performance. Ling, Simsek, Lubatkin, and Veiga (2008) examined the impact of CEO transformational leadership on performance in smaller, privately held firms. Survey ratings of CEOs and their top management team's transformational leadership for both time-lagged measures of objective and perceived performance were more positively related to objective firm performance in smaller versus larger firms. The effects for transformational leadership were also stronger for CEO founders versus nonfounders.

In the previous edition of this review, we called for more research examining links between transformational/charismatic and strategic leadership (Berson & Avolio, 2004). In line with our call, over the last decade an impressive number of studies (e.g., Agle, Nagarajan, Sonnenfeld, & Srinivasan, 2006; Colbert, Kristof-Brown, Bradley, & Barrick, 2008; Ling et al., 2008; Oreg & Berson, 2011) focusing on transformational/charismatic leadership of executives have been published. A rise in research focusing on transformational/charismatic styles of senior organizational leaders in part is due to its relevance to the type of challenges organizations have faced these past 10 years. Transformational/charismatic leaders are by definition unconventional (Conger & Kanungo, 1998), emphasize risk taking (Bass, 1985), appeal to followers' values, and inspire them to identify with the leader and ultimately the goals of the organization (e.g., Colbert et al., 2008), especially during times of change and conflict. Such leaders create adaptive organizational cultures that highlight and lead to innovation and facilitate corporate entrepreneurship (e.g., Ling et al., 2008). Transformational/charismatic leaders use vision to align followers with the need to constantly change, despite many followers' resistance to change (Oreg & Berson, 2011).

Given the current state of this literature, there still remains a significant debate with respect to the contribution of transformational/charismatic leadership of executives to organizational-level outcomes (e.g., Agle et al., 2006). From a theoretical perspective, strategic leadership scholars (e.g., Finkelstein et al., 2008) argue that charisma may narrow the executive's information processing orientation, thereby restricting both the leader's and followers' range of strategic choices. Another source of criticism originates in the romantic view of leadership (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985), which suggests that when organizations perform well, individuals associated with the organization tend to attribute performance to leaders. In support of this view, Agle et al. (2006) found a stronger link between firm performance (measured at Time 1) and charisma (measured at Time 2) than between charisma (measured at Time 2) and firm performance (measured at Time 3). Nevertheless, using their data, Agle et al. (2006) could not substantiate whether firm performance measured at Time 1 was not associated with previous leadership.

In sum, prior strategic leadership research has examined the effects senior leadership teams have on organizational performance (Certo, Lester, Dalton, & Dalton, 2006). However, with relatively few exceptions there has not been a lot of research examining how top management attributes, intentions, values, ethical standards, and team processes influence their organization's performance (e.g., Barrick, Bradley, Kristof-Brown, & Colbert, 2007). More research is needed to isolate the effects of top-, middle-, and first-level leaders of organizations on firm outcomes. Furthermore, even in studies that supported links between leadership and firm performance, the effect sizes of transformational/charismatic leadership have been relatively small. To expand the existing research base, we call for future research to examine new leadership constructs at the executive level, for example, ones that more specifically tap risk-taking and unconventional leadership.

Finally, we will likely account for more variance in organizational performance if we go beyond the leadership of CEOs to examine other sources of leadership, such as shared leadership by top management team (TMT) members, and how the leadership at the top cascades down below the TMT.

E-Leadership and Its Distribution in Organizations

Over the past decade, we have witnessed a proliferation of a wide variety of advanced information technology tools and applications that impact the way we all work in organizations. It should therefore come as no surprise that researchers have turned their attention to exploring how leadership processes and technology interact to influence group and organizational processes, a process Avolio, Kahai, and Dodge (2000) termed *e-leadership*.

Building upon theories of social–technical systems (Trist, 1993) and adaptive structuration (DeSanctis & Poole, 1994), e-leadership theory attempts to explain how one-to-one, one-to-many, and within- and between-group and collective interactions evolve via advanced information technology. Adaptive structuration theory proposes that information technology affects human interaction by providing structures (e.g., rules, resources) stemming from the technology, task, environment, emergent structures, and the group. People also influence the interpretation and use of technology (i.e., adoption, resistance, or rejection). These theories view leaders as "making meaning" by promoting technology adoption, while considering the impact of existing organizational norms and culture on the use of this technology.

Early research on e-leadership focused on the types of facilitation and leadership that had an impact in group support systems (GSS) contexts, while also highlighting the potential for how this technology structures or processes (e.g., anonymity) to substitute for or moderate leadership effects on group processes and outcomes (Avolio & Kahai, 2003). During the 1990s researchers began to shift attention to experimental studies examining the manipulation of leadership styles such as directive, participative, transactional, and transformational and their effects on group process and outcomes in computer-mediated contexts, such as group support systems (e.g., Kahai, Sosik, & Avolio, 2003).

The past decade has seen some attention given to leadership emergence and processes in virtual teams, which are characterized by computer-mediated communication, geographical dispersion, organizational and cultural diversity, little history, and weak interpersonal relationships (Bosch-Sijtsema, 2007). This stream of research has attempted to explain how leadership in virtual teams differs from leadership in face-to-face teams based on the type of technology used. For example, Hambley, O'Neill, and Kline (2007) investigated differences between transformational and transactional leadership styles on team interactions and outcomes using face-to-face, teleconference, and chat. They found no differences across these leadership styles for process and outcome variables, but face-to-face teams interacted more constructively and face-to-face and videoconference teams were more cohesive than chat teams. In contrast, Purvanova and Bono (2009) tested whether face-to-face or virtual team contexts were more favorable for transformational leadership's impact on team performance using a repeated measures design, reporting that the most effective leaders were those who increased their transformational leadership in virtual team contexts. Hambley et al. (2007) investigated the effects of transformational, transactional leadership styles and communication media on team interactions and outcomes using three different types of communication media: face-to-face, desktop videoconference, or text-based chat in a controlled experimental setting. Unlike other findings using computer-mediated interactions, their results indicated that transformational and transactional leadership did not affect team interaction styles or outcomes.

Balthazard, Waldman, and Warren (2009) found that virtual team members whose personality traits included extraversion and emotional stability were more likely to emerge as leaders in face-to-face but not in virtual teams, where linguistic quality of written communication predicted the emergence of transformational leadership. Emergent leaders in virtual teams sent more and longer emails than did their team members, whose e-mails were more task oriented, focused on explaining coordination tactics in a logical manner, and integrating action plans for team members' enhanced understanding of the project's mission (Yoo & Alavi, 2004). Virtual team leaders' language in written communications (e.g., e-mails) that is both directive and empathic has been shown to be positively related to their team's creative performance (Wang, Fan, Hsieh, & Menefee, 2009). The positive effects of communication on virtual team outcomes have also been shown to be mitigated by cultural diversity often found in such teams (Shachaf, 2008).

Radostina, Purvanova, and Bono (2009) examined transformational leadership in the context of traditional teams using face-to-face communication and virtual teams using computer-mediated communication in an

experimental context. They reported the most effective leaders were those who exhibited a higher level of transformational leadership in virtual teams, and reported that the effects of transformational leadership on team performance were stronger in virtual than in face-to-face teams.

Not only has e-leadership research focused on group-level topics, more recent research has also focused on leadership and the adaptation of information technology systems for enhanced organizational effectiveness. Adaptation is necessary for organizations facing contemporary information technology challenges such as data privacy and management, meeting legal requirements, and computer hackers (Smith, Koohang, & Behling, 2010). To test core propositions in e-leadership theory, Elenkov and Manev (2005) examined the role of leadership in promoting organizational innovation with data from 12 European cultures of varying technological adaptation. They found that leadership presence in top management ranks was positively related to organizational innovation, and that sociocultural context directly influenced leadership, while also moderating its relationship with level of innovation.

In sum, e-leadership research accumulated over the last decade has evolved from examining effects of appointed leaders and technology features (e.g., anonymity) on team processes and outcomes to studying naturally existing virtual teams where leaders emerge or leadership is shared. The experimental work in this area has been augmented with field studies using quasi-experimental and longitudinal designs to better understand how virtual team dynamics evolve over time. Macro-level research has shown that leadership plays an important role in supporting organizational innovation and technology adaptation. However, an updated perspective of e-leadership paying more attention to team members' personal attributes, cognitive styles, and character strengths that contribute to positive team dynamics and outcomes is warranted. In addition, as large multiplayer simulations become more of the norm in management development work, the more likely we will see research examining how people interact not just in teams, but with their entire organization through these virtual simulations.

Gender and Cultural Differences

Gender Differences

Leadership has traditionally been described in masculine terms as being action-oriented behavior aimed at demonstrating strength, assertiveness, and competence, and possessing position power, providing access to social status and resources (Bass & Bass, 2008). However, as the number of women in managerial positions has continued to increase over the last decade, issues of gender diversity, identity, prototypes, and managerial effectiveness have captured the attention of researchers (Ayman & Korabik, 2010). These research issues parallel organizational trends toward what might be referred to as a "feminization" of leadership (Eagly & Carli, 2003), with a greater emphasis on inclusion, networking, interaction, and calls for managers to be more collaborative, participative, empathetic, nurturing, and developmentally oriented.

The conventional wisdom has suggested that men and women differ in terms of leadership styles and behaviors. The literatures on sex role types and social roles indicate that men tend to be seen as more task-oriented and typically occupy roles of higher status and power, whereas women are viewed as more relationship-oriented and typically occupy roles of lower status and power. Despite the suggested "female advantage," women's leadership placement in top management may still suffer from disadvantages of prejudicial evaluations of leadership traits, behaviors, and competence (Scott & Brown, 2006), gender bias stemming from cognitive processes (Hogue & Lord, 2007), and stereotypes such as women lacking the capabilities required for aggressive behavior (S. K. Johnson, Murphy, Zewdie, & Reichard, 2008). As such, the representation of women in top management teams within Fortune 1000 companies greatly lags that of men, although research demonstrates a positive relationship between firm performance and the proportion of women on such teams for both mature (Krishnan & Park, 2005) and start-up (Welbourne, Cycyota, & Ferrante, 2007) organizations.

Men and women can lead equally effectively, but may differ in terms of how they lead (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). Ayman and Korbik (2010) argued that gender is only one of many equally important individual difference variables influencing effectiveness, and aspects of the leader–follower situation, while context such as culture may also play a decisive role in how they are evaluated. For example, Eagly (2005) proposed that because women traditionally have not had as much access to leadership roles as men, they may find it more difficult to achieve relational authenticity ascribed to them by followers. Nonetheless, much of the research on this topic has not reported reliable male–female differences (e.g., Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2000; Eagly, Karu, Miner, & Johnson, 1994). Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2000) conducted a meta-analysis of literature comparing male to female leadership styles. Most differences were relatively small, but there was a tendency for women to

be more interpersonally oriented, less autocratic, and more participative.

Meta-analytic results (Eagly et al., 2003) show women are rated more transformational and transactional (contingent rewarding) than men, while men are rated as displaying more active and passive forms of management-by-exception and laissez-faire behaviors than women.

Sosik, Jung, Berson, Dionne, and Jaussi (2005) examined leadership styles of U.S. and Israeli executives in technology firms and found female executives were rated by their direct reports as displaying less passive management-by-exception and laissez-faire behavior. Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2000) examined the normative database for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Form 5X (see Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramanium, 2003), reporting that female leaders were rated higher on two aspects of transformational leadership: attributed charisma and individualized consideration. Male leaders were rated higher on all aspects of passive, or less effective, leadership.

These "female advantages" regarding leadership effectiveness, however, may produce disadvantages and challenges for women in the long run. For example, given their slight advantages with ratings of transformational leadership, women are more likely to be appointed to leadership positions with increased risk of failure based on their perceived ability to lead during periods of change or crisis, or what Haslam and Ryan (2008) described as the "glass cliff."

In sum, the traditional masculine prototype of agentic leadership behavior appears to persist despite calls for more nurturing and developmental forms of leadership to be practiced in organizations. While men and women diverge on relatively few leadership styles and behaviors, they may differ regarding personality traits (e.g., Big Five) and across contexts/culture, which may be correlated with gender and leadership styles.

Cultural Differences

A global survey of 223 senior executives from large corporations across 17 industrial sectors in 44 countries found that a majority of business executives believe their companies face leadership shortages to meet the future global business risks that are threatening their corporate performance (Mercer Delta, 2006). To further compound the problem, a recent survey of multinational leaders in global corporations (Howard & Wellins, 2008) points to important concerns about the state of affairs in developing global, multinational leaders with over 60% of respondents considering their own preparation as poor or fair. Almost 50% viewed the support from their own corporations as poor or fair. Only 12% considered their preparation very good and only 19% felt they received very good support from their companies.

Notwithstanding the need, a concern that has pervaded the cross-cultural leadership literature is how authors have defined global leadership. Definitions of global leadership have varied based on how scholars have defined it for their respective stream of research. For instance, Hollenbeck (2001) reported that there were different perspectives on what constituted global leadership, which could reduce the potential contribution of this literature to the broader leadership literature (Hollenbeck, 2001).

The GLOBE project initiated by House and his international research team (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanila, & Dorfman, 1999) represents the most comprehensive undertaking into examining cross-cultural leadership research. The foundational work for the GLOBE project came from Hofstede's (1980) original work with IBM. Hofstede initially identified four key dimensions/values that could be used to compare different cultures and societies, which included power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, and masculinity/femininity, later adding long-term orientation. These five cultural dimensions have been used extensively to examine potential boundary conditions for leadership theories that have been applied across numerous cultures (Dorfman, 1996).

Building on Hofstede's work, Brodbeck and his associates (2000) reported there were differences in terms of the prototypes individuals used to characterize leaders across 22 European countries. The authors found that some leadership concepts were culturally endorsed and grouped according to the values representing a cluster of nations. Findings from these studies have shown reliable cross-cultural differences in terms of the value orientation of different countries and regions of the world.

The GLOBE project focused first on identifying the implicit theories and attributes that individuals from different cultures associated with effective leaders. The GLOBE researchers pursued this focus to determine how an individual's ILT and culture impacts their view of effective leaders. During the first phase of the GLOBE project, House and his colleagues expanded the number of dimensions associated with different cultures, adding constructs such as humane orientation, performance orientation, and family versus institutional collectivism. House and his colleagues reported there were some aspects of leadership that could be considered universal

across cultures, such as charismatic leadership, while other constructs such as human orientation were more prevalent in a specific culture. We have also learned from this and other subsequent cross-cultural research that people across cultures may universally value integrity and trust; however, how trust and integrity is established in an Eastern versus Western culture may differ (Bass, 1997). Based on this conclusion, leaders and followers will need to navigate through cultural factors that may inhibit or contribute to more effective leadership, depending on how the cultural context moderates the leadership dynamic. This has led to recent discussions of trying to understand what constitutes a leader's global mind-set, and how such mind-sets help leaders to figure out what to do and not do in different cultures.

To achieve an appropriate level of cross-cultural functioning, researchers have suggested the importance of developing a global mind-set to management and leadership (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2004). Global mind-set has been defined as "the cognitive ability that helps individuals figure out how to best understand and influence individuals, groups, and organizations from diverse socio/cultural systems" (Clapp-Smith, Luthans, & Avolio, 2007, p. 110). Preliminary evidence provided by Javidan, Teagarden, and Bowen (2010) suggests that individuals with a more developed global mind-set are better able to identify and enact the appropriate methods that would help effectively influence all stakeholders to work toward achieving an organization's strategy and goals.

It is important to keep in mind that culture is an essential facet of the social context in which leadership is embedded and that we have to consider how culture moderates and/or mediates leader and follower interactions, particularly as more individuals work in a global economic context (Triandis, 1994). As we suggested in our last review, leadership studies have examined a broad range of questions with a specific focus on leadership and culture, including whether leadership styles vary in their impact across cultures, and whether a theory developed in one culture generalizes to another culture. Now attention is turning to how leaders learn to adapt their orientations toward leadership when working across multiple cultures (Clapp-Smith et al., 2007), in order to accommodate different cultural norms and reference points (McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002).

With respect to developing leadership with a global mind-set, an interesting line of work is emerging that examines how certain cultural events or triggers impact the development of a cultural or global mind-set. These cultural trigger events typically offer paradoxical information that challenges existing frames of reference or schema that supports how individuals come to make meaning and to understand a situation. Prior research shows that the development of global executives may be based on experiencing certain cultural developmental moments that have shocked executives in to changing their frame of reference or schema (Hollenbeck & McCall, 2001, p. 53). Such events expose the individual to the limitations of their cultural frames of reference, and with appropriate guidance those individuals can derive meaning from the experience, ultimately creating greater cultural awareness (Clapp-Smith & Hughes, 2007).

In sum, research on integrating cross-cultural differences and similarities and leadership is in the early stages of development. Much has been learned over the last decade, with work coming from the cognitive sciences, cross-cultural research, and leadership that is now laying the foundation for how we might go about accelerating the development of a global mind-set. What we are seeing emerge is research examining what actually comprises cultural intelligence and how such intelligence can be nurtured and developed. Cultural intelligence includes being able to learn how to select the appropriate behaviors considered effective for adjusting to and interacting with individuals from a culture different from one's own (Thomas, 2006).

Expanding Leadership Research Into Other Domains

Much of the ongoing research we cite in the leadership literature comes from organizational scientists working in psychology departments or business schools. The organizations that these researchers typically focus on tend to be large governments or businesses such as information technology, manufacturing, sales, retail, and government services. Increasingly, we are seeing more work being published in the leadership literature that is focusing on samples drawn from the military, healthcare, security services, and extreme contexts such as trauma units. We also see that there are a significant number of researchers in other disciplines that focus on leadership theory and research, including political scientists, sociologists, anthropologists, historians, and educational researchers. Indeed, the most commonly researched theory over the past decade, transformational leadership, was originally conceived by a political scientist (Burns, 1978). As we examine the evolution of leadership theory and research, it is useful for us to look to these other disciplines to determine the types of issues these literatures are discussing.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The field of leadership studies has grown substantially over the last decade in terms of the volume and complexity of research and the sophistication of leadership theory and models. Much of what has been accumulated in terms of the findings from this research has direct application to how leaders and followers and teams engage in leadership in every type of organizational context and culture.

Perhaps, one of the greatest challenges before the leadership field today, is to figure out how to translate the breadth and depth of leadership work into manageable learning outcomes for improving the practice of leadership. By doing so, those practicing leadership will have evidenced-based measures and interventions that have been proven effective to choose from in terms of selecting, developing, and evaluating leaders.

It is remarkable, how much evidence there is available that practicing leaders fail to consider or be aware of, as is true of those individuals charged with developing those leaders. It is time for the field of leadership to move forward by integrating "rigor and relevance" into everything the field does and promotes in organizations. We know from this review and many others that leadership makes a difference in organizations, and today we know a lot more about why it does, how it does, and how it can be enhanced. It is time to spread that word to others who can make an even bigger difference with their leadership and a more positive impact for all people on our planet.

REFERENCES

Agle, B. R., Nagarajan, N. J., Sonnenfeld, J. A., & Srinivasan, D. (2006). Does CEO charisma matter? An empirical analysis of the relationships among organizational performance, environmental uncertainty, and top management team perceptions of CEO charisma. *Academy of Management Journal, 49,* 161–174.

Ames, D. R., & Flynn, F. J. (2007). What breaks a leader: The curvilinear relation between assertiveness and leadership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92* (2), 307–324.

Antonakis, J., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dasborough, M. T. (2009). Does leadership need emotional intelligence? *The Leadership Quarterly, 20* (2), 247–261.

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Examining the contextual nature of the nine-factor, full range leadership theory using the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14* (3), 261–295.

Arvey, R. D., Zhang, Z., Avolio, B. J., & Kruger, R. (2007). Understanding the developmental and genetic determinants of leadership among females. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 693–706.

Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 191–201.

Avey, J. B., Palanski, M., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2010). When leadership goes unnoticed: The moderating role of follower self-esteem on the relationship between ethical leadership and follower behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics, 98* (4), 573–582.

Avolio, B. J. (2011). *Full range leadership development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B. J., & Kahai, S. (2003). Placing the "E" in e-leadership: Minor tweak or fundamental change. In R. Riggio & S. Murphy (Eds.), *The future of leadership development* (pp 49–70). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Avolio, B. J., Kahai, S., & Dodge, G. (2000). E-leading in organizations and its implications for theory, research and practice. *Leadership Quarterly, 11* (4), 615–670.

Avolio, B. J., & Luthans, F. (2006). *High impact leader: Moments matter in authentic leadership development.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Avolio, B. J., Reichard, R. J., Hannah, S. T., Walumbwa, F. O., & Chan, A. (2009). A meta-analytic review of leadership impact research: Experimental and quasi-experimental studies. *Leadership Quarterly, 20* (5), 764–784.

Avolio, B. J., Rotundo, M., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2009). Early life experiences as determinants of leadership role occupancy: The importance of parental influence and rule breaking behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 20* (3), 329–342.

Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2010). Leadership: Why gender and culture matter. *American Psychologist, 65* (3), 157–170.

Bales, R. F. (1954). In conference. *Harvard Business Review, 32,* 44–50.

Balthazard, P. A., Waldman, D. A., & Warren, J. E. (2009). Predictors of the emergence of transformational leadership in virtual decision teams. *Leadership Quarterly, 20* (5), 651–663.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84,* 191–215.

Barling, J., Loughlin, C., & Kelloway, E. K. (2002). Development and test of a model linking safety-specific transformational leadership and occupational safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 488–496.

Barrick, M. B., Bradley, B. H., Kristof-Brown, A. L., & Colbert, A. E. (2007). The moderating role of top management team interdependence: Implications for real teams and working groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 50,* 544–557.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectation.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist, 22,* 130–142.

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 207–218.

Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 10,* 181–217.

Berson, Y., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). Transformational leadership and the dissemination of organizational goals: A case study of a telecommunication firm. *Leadership Quarterly, 15* (5), 625–646.

Berson, Y., Oreg, S., & Dvir, T. (2008). CEO values, organizational culture and firm outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29* (5), 615–633.

Bono, J. E., & Anderson, M. H. (2005). The advice and influence networks of transformational leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 1306–1314.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* 901–910.

Bosch-Sijtsema, P. (2007). The impact of individual expectations and expectation conflicts on virtual teams. *Group and Organization Management, 32* (3), 358–388.

Bowers, D. G., & Seashore, S. E. (1966). Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 11,* 238–263.

Boyce, L. A., Zaccaro, S. J., & Wisecarver, M. Z. (2010). Propensity for self-development of leadership attributes: Understanding, predicting, and supporting performance of leader self-development. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21* (1), 159–178.

Brodbeck, F. C., Frese, M., Akerblom, S., Audia, G., Bakacsi, G., Bendova, H. (2000). Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73,* 1–29.

Brown, M. E., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Ethical and unethical leadership: Exploring new avenues for future research. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 20,* 583–616.

Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Charismatic leadership and workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 954–962.

Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning theory perspective for construct development. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 97,* 117–134.

Buchko, A. A. (2007). The effect of leadership on values-based management. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 28* (1), 36–50.

Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Halpin, S. M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly, 17* (3), 288–307.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Burns, J. M. (1997). *Empowerment for change*. Kellogg Leadership Studies (Unpublished). University of Maryland.

Carmeli, A., Ben-Hador, B., Waldman, D. A., & Rupp, D. E. (2009). How leaders cultivate social capital and nurture employee vigor: Implications for job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94* (6), 1553–1561.

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,* 1217–1234.

Certo, S. T., Lester, R. H., Dalton, C. M., & Dalton, D. R. (2006). Top management teams, strategy, and financial performance: A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Management Studies, 43,* 813–839.

Chan, D. (1998). Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different levels of analysis: A typology of composition models. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83,* 234–246.

Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2007). It's all about me: Narcissistic CEOs and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 52,* 351–386.

Chen, G., Gully, S. M., Whiteman, J., & Kilcullen, R. N. (2000). Examination of relationships among trait-like individual differences, statelike individual differences, and learning performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,* 835–847.

Clapp-Smith, R., & Hughes, L. (2007). Unearthing a global mindset: The process of international adjustment. *Journal of Business and Leadership: Research, Practice, and Teaching, 3,* 99–107.

Clapp-Smith, R., Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). The role of psychological capital in global mindset development. In M. A. Hitt, R. Steers & M. Javidan (Eds.), *The global mindset: Advances in international management* (Vol. 19, pp. 105–130). Oxford, England: Elsevier.

Cohen, S. G., Chang, L., & Ledford, G. E. (1997). A hierarchical construct of self- management leadership and its relationship to quality of work life and perceived group effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology, 50,* 275–308.

Colbert, A. E., Kristof-Brown, A. L., Bradley, B. H., & Barrick, M. R. (2008). CEO transformational leadership: The role of goal importance congruence in top management teams. *Academy of Management Journal, 51,* 81–96.

Collins, D. B., & Holton, E. F. (2004). The effectiveness of managerial leadership development programs: A meta-analysis of studies from 1982 to 2001. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15* (2), 217–248.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cote, S., Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., & Miners, C. T. H. (2010). Emotional intelligence and leadership emergence in small groups. *Leadership Quarterly, 21* (3), 496–508.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 36,* 46–78.

Day, D. V., Harrison, M. M., & Halpin, S. M. (2009). *Integrative approach to leader development: Connecting adult development, identity, and expertise*. New York: Taylor and Francis.

De Cremer, D., Mayer, D. M., Schouten, B. C., Bardes, M., & Van Dijke, M. (2009). When does self-sacrificial leadership motivate prosocial behavior: It depends on followers' prevention focus. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94,* 887–899.

Den Hartog, D., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, A., & Dorfman, P. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly, 10* (2), 219–257.

DeRue, D. S., & Wellman, N. (2009). Developing leaders via experience: The role of developmental challenge, learning orientation, and feedback availability. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94* (4), 859–875.

DeSanctis, G., & Poole, M. S. (1994). Capturing the complexity in advanced technology use: Adaptive structuration theory. *Organization Science, 5,* 121–147.

Dorfman, P. (1996). *International and cross-cultural leadership*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Dupre, K. E., Innes, M., Connelly, C. E., Barling, J., & Hoption, C. (2006). Workplace aggression in teenage part-time employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 987–997.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership training on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal, 45* (4), 735–744.

Eagly, A. H. (2005). Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: Does gender matter? *Leadership Quarterly, 16* (3), 459–474.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *Leadership Quarterly, 14* (6), 807–834.

Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. (2000). *The leadership styles of women and men* (Unpublished).

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin, 129,* 569–591.

Eagly, A. H., Karu, S. J., Miner, J. B., & Johnson, B. T. (1994). Gender and motivation to manage in hierarchic organizations: A meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly, 5* (2), 135–159.

Elenkov, D. S., & Manev, I. M. (2005). Top management leadership and influence on innovation: The role of sociocultural context. *Journal of Management, 31,* 381–402.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Finkelstein, S., Hambrick, D., & Cannella Jr., A. (2008). *Strategic leadership: Theory and research on executives, top management teams and boards.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Friedrich, T. L., Vessey, W. B., Schuelke, M. J., Ruark, G. A., & Mumford, M. D. (2009). A framework for understanding collective leadership: The selective utilization of leader and team expertise within networks. *Leadership Quarterly, 20*(6), 933–958.

Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*(6), 693–727.

Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2005). Can you see the real me? A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 434–372.

Gardner, W. L., Lowe, K. B., Moss, T. W., Mahoney, K. T., & Cogliser, C. C. (2010). Scholarly leadership of the study of leadership: A review of the leadership quarterly's second decade, 2000–2009. *Leadership Quarterly, 21*(6), 922–958.

Gong, Y., Huang, J. C., & Farh, J. L. (2009). Employee learning orientation, transformational leadership, and employee creativity: The mediating role of employee creative self-efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal, 52,* 765–778.

Goodwin, V. L., Bowler, V. M., & Whittington, J. L. (2009). A social network perspective on LMX relationships: Accounting for the instrumental value of leader and follower networks. *Journal of Management, 35,* 954–980.

Graen, G., Novak, M. A., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader–member exchange and job design on productivity and job satisfaction. Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 30,* 109–131.

Gupta, A. K., & Govindarajan, V. (2004). *Global strategy and organization*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Hambley, L. A., O'Neill, T. A., & Kline, T. J. B. (2007). Virtual team leadership: The effects of leadership style and communication medium on team interaction styles and outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 103,* 1–20.

Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review, 9,* 193–206.

Hannah, S. T., Lester, P. B., & Vogelgesang, G. R. (2005). Moral leadership: Explicating the moral component of authentic leadership. In W. B. Gardner & B. J. Avolio (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects, and development. Monographs in leadership and management* (pp. 43–82). London, UK: Elsevier/JAI Press.

Harms, P. D., & Crede, M. (2010). Emotional intelligence and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 17*(1), 5–17.

Harter, N., & Evanecky, D. (2002). Fairness in Leader–Member Exchange theory: Do we all belong on the inside? *Leadership Review, 2*(2), 1–7.

Haslam, S. A., & Ryan, M. K. (2008). The road to the glass cliff: Differences in the perceived suitability of men and women for leadership positions in succeeding and failing organizations. *Leadership Quarterly, 19*(5), 530–546.

Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2008). A theoretical and empirical examination of the transactional and non-leadership dimensions of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). *Leadership Quarterly, 19*(5), 501–513.

Hitt, M. A., & Ireland, R. D. 2002. The essence of strategic leadership: Managing human and social capital. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 9,* 3–14.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Cultural consequences: International differences in work related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology, 9,* 169–180.

Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5,* 184–200.

Hogg, M. A., & Van Knippenberg, B. (2003). Social identity and leadership processes in groups. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 35, pp. 1–52).

Hogue, M., & Lord, R. G. (2007). A multilevel, complexity theory approach to understanding gender bias in leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 18*(4), 370–390.

Hollenbeck, G. P. (2001). A serendipitous sojourn through the global leadership literature. In W. H. Mobley & M. W. J. McCall (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 2, pp. 15–47). New York, NY: JAI Press.

Hollenbeck, G. P., & McCall, M. W. (2001). What makes a successful global executive? *Business Strategy Review, 12,* 49–56.

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management, 23,* 409–473.

Howard, A., & Wellins, R. (2008). *Global leadership forecast, 2008/2009.* Bridgeville, PA: Development Dimensions International.

Ireland, R. D., & Hitt, M. A. 1999. Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: The role of strategic leadership. *Academy of Management Executive, 13,* 43–57.

Jago, A. G., & Ragan, J. W. (1986). The trouble with Leader Match is that it doesn't match Fielder's contingency model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 555–559.

Janssen, O., & Van Yperen, N. W. (2004). Employees' goal orientations, the quality of leader–member exchange, and the outcomes of job performance and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal, 47,* 368–384.

Jaussi, K. S., & Dionne, S. D. (2003). Leading for creativity: The role of unconventional leader behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*(4–5), 475–498.

Javidan, M., Teagarden, M., & Bowen, D. (2010). Making it overseas. *Harvard Business Review, 88*(4), 109–113.

Johnson, R. E., Selenta, C., & Lord, R. G. (2006). When organizational justice and the self-concept meet. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 99,* 175–201.

Johnson, S. K., Murphy, S. E., Zewdie, S., & Reichard, R. J. (2008). The strong, sensitive type: Effects of gender stereotypes and leadership prototypes on the evaluation of male and female leaders. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 6*(1), 39–60.

Joseph, D. L., & Newman, D. A. (2010). Emotional intelligence: An integrative meta-analysis and cascading model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95,* 54–78.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluation traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 80–92.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Werner, M. (2000). *Personality and leadership: A review.* (Unpublished). University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755–768.

Kahai, S., Sosik, J. J., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Effects of leadership style, anonymity and rewards in an electronic meeting systems context. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*(1), 499–524.

Kark, R., & Van Dijk, D. (2007). Motivation to lead, motivation to follow: The role of the self-regulatory focus in leadership processes. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 500–528.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations.* New York, NY: Wiley.

Katzenbach, J. R. (1997). The myth of top management team. *Harvard Business Review, 75,* 83–93.

Keller, R. T. (2006). Transformational leadership, initiating structure, and substitutes for leadership: A longitudinal study of R&D project team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 202–210.

Kenny, D. A., & Zaccaro, S. J. (1983). An estimate of variance due to traits in leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,* 678–685.

Krishnan, H. A., & Park, D. (2005). A few good women-on-top management teams. *Journal of Business Research, 58,* 1712–1720.

Leban, W., & Zulauf, C. (2004). Linking emotional intelligence abilities and transformational leadership styles. *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 25* (7), 554–564.

Leslie, J. B., & Van Velsor, E. (1996). *A look at derailment today*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Liao, H., & Chuang, A. C. (2007). Transforming service employees and climate: A multilevel, multisource examination of transformational leadership in building long-term service relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 1006–1019.

Lim, B., & Ployhart, R. E. (2004). Transformational leadership: Relations to the five-factor model and team performance in typical and maximum contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89* (4), 610–621.

Ling, Y., Simsek, Z., Lubatkin, M. H., & Viega, J. F. (2008). Transformational leadership's role in promoting corporate entrepreneurship: Examining the CEO-TMT interface. *Academy of Management Journal, 51,* 557–576.

Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2004). *Leadership processes and follower identity.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Harvey, J. L., & Hall, R. J. (2001). Contextual constraints on prototype generation and their multilevel consequences for leadership perceptions. *Leadership Quarterly, 12* (3), 311–338.

Lord, R. G., De Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relationship between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 402–410.

Loviscky, G., Trevino, L., & Jacobs, R. (2007). Assessing managers' ethical decision making: An objective measure of managerial moral judgement. *Journal of Business Ethics, 73* (3), 263–285.

Mann, R. D. (1959). A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin, 56,* 241–270.

Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. (1993). *Business without bosses: How self-managing teams are building high performance companies*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Martinko, M. J., Harvey, P., & Douglas, S. C. (2007). The role, function, and contribution of attribution theory to leadership: A review. *Leadership Quarterly, 18* (6), 561–585.

Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. (2009). How long does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle down model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 108,* 1–13.

McCall, M. W. J., & Hollenbeck, G. P. (2002). *Developing global executives: Lessons of international experience*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

McCauley, C. D. (2001). Leader training and development. In S. J. Zaccaro & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *The nature of organizational leadership: Understanding the imperatives confronting today's leaders* (pp. 347–383). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30,* 521–551.

Mercer Delta. (2006). *Global study finds effective leadership development critical to corporate performance and competitive advantage*. Press Release. Marsh & McLennan Companies.

Mullen, J., & Kelloway, E. K. (2009). Safety leadership: A longitudinal study of the effects of transformational leadership on safety outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 20,* 253–272.

Mumford, T. V., Campion, M. A., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Leadership skills strataplex: Leadership skill requirements across organizational levels. *Leadership Quarterly, 18* (2), 154–166.

Mumford, M. D., Friedrich, T. L., Caughron, J. J., & Antes, A. L. (2009). Leadership development and assessment: Describing and rethinking the state of the art. In K. A. Ericsson (Ed.), *Development of professional expertise: Toward measurement of expert performance and design of optimal learning environments* (pp. 84–107). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Narvaez, D. (2008). Triune ethics: The neurobiological roots of our multiple moralities. *New Ideas in Psychology, 26* (1), 95–119.

Nederveen Pieterse, A., Van Knippenberg, D., Schippers, M. C., & Stam, D. A. (2010). Transformational and transactional leadership and innovative behavior: The moderating role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31* (4), 609–623.

Nishii, L. H., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Do inclusive leaders help to reduce turnover in diverse groups? The moderating role of leader-member exchange in the diversity to turnover relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94,* 1412–1426.

O'Leonard, K. (2010). *The corporate learning factbook 2009: Benchmarks, trends and analysis of the U.S. training market*. Oakland, CA: Bersin & Associates.

Oreg, S., & Berson, Y. (2011). Leaders' characteristics and behaviors and employees' resistance to organizational change. *Personnel Psychology, 64* (3), 627–659.

Orvis, K. A., & Langkamer-Ratwani, K. (2010). Leader self-development: A contemporary context for leader development evaluation. *Leadership Quarterly, 21* (4), 657–674.

Pearce, C. L. (1997). *The determinants of change management team effectiveness: A longitudinal study.* (Unpublished). University of Maryland, College Park.

Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. (2003). *All those years ago: The historical underpinnings of shared leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearce, C. L., & Ensley, M. D. (2004). A reciprocal and longitudinal investigation of the innovation process: The central role of shared vision in product and process innovation teams (PPITs). *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25,* 259–278.

Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P. (2000). *Vertical vs. shared leadership as predictors of the longitudinal effectiveness of change.* (Unpublished).

Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P. (2002). Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, & Practice, 6,* 172–197.

Peters, L. H., Hartke, D. D., & Pohlmann, J. T. (1985). Fiedler's contingency theory of leadership: An application of the meta-analysis procedures of Schmidt and Hunter. *Psychological Bulletin, 97,* 274–285.

Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal, 49,* 327–340.

Popper, M., & Mayseless, O. (2003). Back to basics: Applying a parenting perspective to transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 14* (1), 41–65.

Popper, M., Mayseless, O., & Castelnovo, O. (2000). Transformational leadership and attachment. *Leadership Quarterly, 11* (2), 267–289.

Priem, R. L., Lyon, D. W., & Dess, G. G. (1999). Inherent limitations of demographic proxies in top management team heterogeneity research. *Journal of Management, 25,* 935–953.

Purvanova, R. K., & Bono, J. E. (2009). Transformational leadership in context: Face-to-face and virtual teams. *Leadership Quarterly, 20* (3), 343–357.

Radostina, K., Purvanova, R. K., & Bono, J. (2009). Transformational leadership in context: Face-to-face and virtual teams. *Leadership Quarterly, 20*(3), 343–357.

Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K., & Cha, S. E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the relationship between leader behavior and team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 1020–1030.

Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., & Cogliser, C. C. (1999). Leader–member exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement and data analytic practices. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(1), 63–113.

Schriesheim, C. A., Tepper, B. J., & Tetrault, L. A. (1994). Least preferred co-worker score, situational control, and leadership effectiveness. A meta-analysis of contingency model performance predictions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 561–573.

Scott, K., & Brown, D. J. (2006). Female first, leader second? Gender bias in the encoding of leadership behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 101*(2), 230–242.

Shachaf, P. (2008). Cultural diversity and information and communication technology impacts on global virtual teams: An exploratory study. *Information and Management, 45,* 131–142.

Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2003). Transformational leadership, conservation, and creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academy of Management Journal, 4*(6), 703.

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. *Leadership Quarterly, 21*(6), 959–978.

Shondrick, S. J., & Lord, R. G. (2010). Implicit leadership and follower theories: Dynamic structures for leadership perceptions, memory, and leader–follower processes. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 25,* 1–34.

Simola, S. K., Barling, J., & Turner, N. (2010). Transformational leadership and leader moral orientation: contrasting an ethic of justice and an ethic of care. *Leadership Quarterly, 21*(1), 179–188.

Simsek, Z., Heavey, C., & Veiga, J. F. (2010). The impact of CEO core self-evaluation on the firm's entrepreneurial orientation. *Strategic Management Journal, 31,* 110–119.

Sin, H. P., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2009). Understanding why they don't see eye-to-eye: An examination of leader-member exchange (LMX) agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94,* 1048–1057.

Sivasubramaniam, N., Murry, W. D., Avolio, B. J., & Jung, D. I. (2002). A longitudinal model of the effects of team leadership and group potency on group performance. *Group and Organization Management, 27,* 66–96.

Smith, T., Koohang, A., & Behling, R. (2010). Understanding and prioritizing technology management challenges. *Journal of Computer Information System, 51*(1), 91–98.

Sosik, J. J., & Cameron, J. C. (2010). Character and authentic transformational leadership behavior: Expanding the ascetic self towards others. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62*(4), 251–269.

Sosik, J. J., Gentry, W. A., & Chun, J. U. (in press). The value of virtue in the upper echelons: A multisource examination of executive character strengths and performance. *Leadership Quarterly*.

Sosik, J. J., Jung, D. I., Berson, Y., Dionne, S. D., & Jaussi, K. S. (2005). Making all the right connections: The strategic leadership of top executives in high-tech organizations. *Organizational Dynamics, 24*(1), 47–61.

Sosik, J. J., Juzbasich, J., & Chun, J. U. (2011). Effects of moral reasoning and management level on ratings of charismatic leadership, in-role and extra-role performance of managers: A multisource examination. *Leadership Quarterly, 22*(2), 434–450.

Srivastava, A., Bartol, K. M., & Locke, E. A. (2006). Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(6), 1239–1251.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personality factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Personality, 25,* 35–71.

Strang, S., & Kuhnert, K. W. (2009). Personality and leadership development levels as predictors of leader performance. *Leadership Quarterly, 20*(3), 421–433.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43,* 78–190.

Tepper, B. J., Moss, S., Lockhart, D., & Carr, J. (2007). Abusive supervision, upward maintenance communication, and subordinates' psychological distress. *Academy of Management Journal, 50,* 1169–1180.

Thau, S., Bennett, R., Mitchell, M., & Marrs, M. (2009). How management style moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance: An uncertainty management theory perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 108*(1), 79–92.

Thomas, D. C. (2006). Domain and development of cultural intelligence: The importance of mindfulness. *Group and Organization Management, 31*(1), 78–99.

Triandis, C. H. (1994). *Cross-cultural industrial and organizational psychology.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Trist, E. L. (1993). A socio-technical critique of scientific management. In E. Trist & H. Murray (Eds.), *The social engagement of social science: A Tavistock anthology* (pp. 580–598). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Van Knippenberg, B., Van Knippenberg, D., de Cremer, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2004). Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly, 15*(6), 825–856.

Wagner, S. H. S., Parker, C. P. C., & Christiansen, N. D. N. (2003). Employees that think and act like owners: Effects of ownership beliefs and behaviors on organizational effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology, 56*(4), 847–871.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management, 34,* 89–126.

Walumbwa, F. O., Wang, P., Wang, H., Schaubroeck, J., & Avolio, B. J. (2010). Psychological processes linking authentic leadership and follower behavior. *Leadership Quarterly, 21*(5), 901–914.

Wang, C., Fan, K., Hsieh, C., & Menefee, M. (2009). Impact of motivating language on team creative performance. *Journal of Computer Information Systems, 50*(1), 133.

Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R., Wang, D. X., & Chen, Z. X. (2005). Leader–member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management, 48,* 420–432.

Welbourne, T. M., Cycyoto, C. S., & Ferrante, C. J. (2007). Wall Street reaction to women in IPOs: An examination of gender diversity in top management teams. *Group and Organization Management, 32*(5), 524–547.

Williams, H. M., Parker, S. K., & Turner, N. (2010). Proactively performing teams: The role of work design, transformational leadership, and team composition. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83,* 301–324.

Yang, J., Zhang, Z., & Tsui, A. S. (2010). Middle manager leadership and frontline employee performance: Bypass, cascading, and moderating effects. *Journal of Managerial Studies, 47,* 654–678.

Yoo, Y., & Alavi, M. (2004). Emergent leadership in virtual teams: What do emergent leaders do? *Information and Organization, 14*(1), 27–58.

Yukl, G. (2008). How leaders influence organizational effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly, 19*(6), 708–722.

Zaccaro, S. J., Kemp, C., & Bader, P. (2004). Leader traits and attributes. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo & R. J. Stemberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 101–124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zohar, D., & Tenne-Gazit, O. (2008). Transformational leadership and group interaction as climate antecedents: A social network analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93,* 744–757.

APPENDIX

Core Leadership Constructs and Definitions

Authentic leadership: This construct is defined as a pattern of leader behavior that focuses on fostering self-awareness, clarity around one's moral perspectives, balanced and fair decision making, and high levels of transparency in both leaders and their followers (see Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Walumbwa et al., 2008).

Transactional leadership: In the full-range model of leadership (Avolio, 2011), transactional leadership, based on the foundation work of Bass (1985), is defined as comprising factors such as contingent reward leadership and active and passive management-by-exception. The more constructive forms of transactional leadership involve setting clear expectations and goals and following through with resources and support as contracted. The more corrective forms of transactional leadership, such as managing-by-exception, involve monitoring followers' work to identify and correct mistakes even before they occur, or more passively to address mistakes after they have happened.

Transformational leadership: Within the full-range model, transformational leadership has been defined as being comprised of five components, including Idealized Influence (Attributed, Behavioral), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. Idealized Influence, whether attributed or behavioral, encompasses the leader's core beliefs, values, ethical and moral standards, and grew out of the work on socialized charisma. Inspirational Motivation involves the visionary aspects of leadership energizing followers to perform above contractual exchanges, and being a role model. Intellectual Stimulation involves challenging the basic assumptions, frameworks, and ideas of others to get them to think in different ways and for pursuing different possibilities. Individualized Consideration involves getting to know followers' capabilities, needs, beliefs, strengths, weaknesses, and aspirations, and then using that knowledge to help followers perform at their optimal level and to develop them into leaders.

Charismatic leadership: There is a vast literature on this construct, and depending on the authors' background they may take a slightly different view of what constitutes charismatic leadership (see Bass & Bass, 2008). Moreover, some refer to the socialized charismatic, who is very much like the transformational leader described above, while others refer to the personalized charismatic leader, who is not transformational. Charismatic leaders generally are described as being both verbally and nonverbally expressive. They are typically referred to as articulate speakers who can attract followers to idealized visions in the case of social charismatic, or more idolized in the case of personalized charismatic leaders. Such leaders typically exude high levels of energy, are seen as unique and nonconforming, tend to be associated with visions, self-sacrifice, self-confidence, and insights others have either not thought of or articulated as well. Followers oftentimes attribute to such leaders various endowments that appear to give them extraordinary capabilities. Such leaders whether socialized or personalized, tend to emerge in times of extreme challenge or crisis where people are searching for a better way, or a way out of the situation they find themselves in presently.

Strategic leadership: Ireland and Hitt (1999) postulate that strategic leadership represents the ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, think strategically, and work with others to initiate changes that will create a viable future for the organization. Their definition stresses the importance of having a forward-looking perspective regarding the organization and being able to create a viable future. Their definition has been extended to how these strategic leaders work in teams and how their leadership gets distributed throughout the organization.

Shared leadership: Shared leadership can involve any member of a team stepping up and influencing the course of events in the team. Indeed, every member of the team may assume responsibility for leadership at any one point in time, rapidly transferring leadership (constituting any style of leadership, such as transformational, strategic, etc.) among its members.