Claremont Colleges
Scholarship @ Claremont

CMC Senior Theses | CMC Student Scholarship

2011

The Relationship of Leadership Styles, Context, and Outcomes

Max A. Anawalt
Claremont McKenna College

Recommended Citation
Anawalt, Max A., "The Relationship of Leadership Styles, Context, and Outcomes" (2011). *CMC Senior Theses.* Paper 215.
http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc_theses/215

This Open Access Senior Thesis is brought to you by Scholarship@Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in this collection by an authorized administrator. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Imagine observing a situation that takes place at a large, retail home improvement company (HIC) at the store level. Looking forward, the situation will demonstrate the essential relationship between leadership style, context, and outcomes.

The store promoted department supervisor, Jack, to assistant manager, and promoted Alex to department supervisor. In this particular department at HIC, there were three different jobs. The bottom position was the sales associate. They were responsible for the in stock merchandise maintenance and customer service. At the next level, the sales specialist worked primarily on the special orders. They also assisted the sales associates in their responsibilities. The department supervisor was responsible for overseeing the specialists, associates, and managing the department. The supervisor was also responsible for coordinating with the expeditor (special orders), impact team (in stock merchandise), and compiling weekly and monthly reports on sales and inventory. There were two positions above the department level: assistant manager and store manager. Five Assistant managers supervised three to five departments each. One store manager oversaw the entire store operation and reported directly to the regional HIC superior.

CHAPTER 2

"ON THE JOB"

Jack and Alex worked together two years as supervisor and specialist, during this time Jack trained Alex on the managerial aspects of supervising the department. Over the two years, both men emerged as leaders within the organization. Around this time, many employees in the department left for various reasons. This left the department understaffed with only two specialists, one of whom was Alex. Marshall and Nancy were two of the four new sales associates under Alex, and Marshall was in training to become a sales specialist.

During the first few months, Alex arranged the schedule so Marshall would have a specialist there to assist and train him. One instance illustrated some of the difficulties Alex faced training Marshall. Marshall and another new employee, Nancy, were working in the department alone. Alex was busy preparing for the HIC yearly audit. Marshall and Nancy needed assistance to process a special order. A long line of impatient customers formed at front of the desk, and everyone was upset. Alex arrived and stood behind Marshall seated in the chair and quickly apologized to the customers for keeping them waiting. Alex asked Nancy to assist customers at the other side of the desk. Instead, she walked off in frustration. She was aware from working in the department under Alex that emotions ran high when it got busy and mistakes happened. She walked away when things were going wrong to avoid Alex and the tension.

Alex asked the customer the specific questions to find out what they needed. He crosschecked it with Marshall's order and found a discrepancy between the two orders. At this point, Alex had to start the order over. The new, correct order was more expensive. The confusion, the time it took, and the increase in cost made the customer angry. Marshall also was frustrated with his own mistake, and upset that Alex took over the order. Marshall wanted the opportunity to finish the order.

CHAPTER 3

BACKGROUND

Both men had experience in a leadership position but in unique and different contexts. The following describes their traits and the context that shaped their leadership development and style.

Jack was Hispanic, and spoke English and Spanish. He was in his mid-twenties and had a U.S. Army military background. After his service, he went to work for HIC.

Initially, Jack was the department supervisor. However, he was not a trained specialist. Therefore, he focused his efforts on the associate and supervisor responsibilities. When he arrived, the department employed four associates and five specialists, who had experience and training. As a supervisor, he focused on managing the department. He compiled the weekly and monthly reports, monitored and ordered both in stock and special order merchandise, delegated tasks, planned, and organized. Under his supervision, the department was efficient and profitable. Jack was fair, competent, consistent, reliable, confident, and friendly.

Alex was Caucasian, and spoke English and Spanish. He was in his early twenties, and recently out of college. He was intelligent, a fast learner, energetic, confident, outgoing, curious, analytical, and competitive.

Alex had previous experience in a leadership position working at his small, family-owned home improvement company. There he was trained in all departments, and

became knowledgeable of the home improvement business. Alex's development as a leader began when he was a young boy. He accompanied his father and grandfather, especially during summer vacations, to the store, where he watched intently and helped at any chance he could. In the beginning, he did small jobs and as he learned the jobs became bigger and more important. He brought projects home. He designed and built displays at his home shop to take to work. As the years passed, he took the initiative and focused on improving problem areas at the store. The lumber department had random types and sizes of wood left over from different jobs. He built, labeled, and installed special bins to organize and sell the products.

Initially Alex had come to work for HIC as a sales specialist. At that time, there were four trained specialists in the department to train him. Since he came to HIC with knowledge and experience, he learned the special order system in record time. He was personable and motivated the other specialists in several ways. He immediately sparked a healthy competitive atmosphere in the department. Even though he was the newest specialist, his sales were consistently among the highest in the department. This caused the other four specialists to work harder, which increased the department sales overall. His consistent high marks in customer service and satisfaction, as well as sales, inspired higher than normal performance in his coworkers. After a brief time working for Jack, Alex carried out the work and assumed the responsibilities of a department supervisor without the title.

Marshall was Vietnamese and in his late twenties. He spoke Chinese, (Mandarin and Cantonese) which made him an asset to the company because of the large number of Chinese speaking customers living in the area. From the first day, he was a hard worker

and eager to please. He had no experience, no knowledge of the product, and limited training. When Alex trained Marshall on the special order system, they both struggled because of the language barrier. As a result, Marshall did not have command of the job specific language he needed and made ordering mistakes.

Nancy was a new mother and recently returned to work. She was in her late twenties. Nancy was Hispanic, and spoke English and Spanish. She had a high school diploma and planned on taking classes at the junior college.

CHAPTER 4

CORE VALUES AND TRAITS

HIC was preparing for the annual company-wide inventory audit. The department reports showed a decline in sales and increase in overhead inventory indicating that the department had problems. The department's inventory was over the set limit because of the increased number of special order returns. The special orders were custom merchandise and were unable to return to the vendor. It was the department supervisor's responsibility to reduce the overall inventory. Alex's department was now well over the inventory cap, as a result of the inexperience of the new associates and the mistakes they made on special orders. Special orders were typically high dollar value items. Sales on the other hand, had not returned to the previous high levels because of the inexperience of the employees in the department.

In order to investigate leadership style, context, and outcomes, we are going to describe the traits that Jack and Alex possessed that past studies have identified to be "universal" qualities that followers desired in a leader. In addition, we will identify those traits that are in agreement with the core values of the organization.

Bruce J. Avolio's *Promoting More Integrative Strategies for Leadership Theory-Building* examined the progress of the field of leadership psychology to "advocate a fuller and more integrative focus that is multilevel, multicomponent, and interdisciplinary and that recognizes that leadership is a function of both the leader and the led and the

complexity of the context" (Avolio, 2007). In exploring individual differences, Avolio (2007) criticized early research for their narrow "focus on the role that individual differences such as personality and general mental ability play in determining who emerges as a leader and how effective the person is in leadership positions". Other universal traits that the "accumulated" research now showed to be "repeatedly associated with effective leadership" were "persistence, tolerance for ambiguity, self-confidence, drive, honesty, integrity, internal locus of control, achievement motivation, and cognitive ability." (Avolio, 2007; Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Yukl, 1998). Early research believed these traits to be more "fixed than malleable", but developmental psychologist Riegel (1975) suggested that "human development can only be understood by conceiving the emergence of behavior over time as a result of an ongoing exchange between the organism and the environment" (p. 46). With respect to the leader and context, Dweck and Leggett (1998) added, "that some traits may be more malleable and interact with facets of the context in contributing to leadership emergence and effectiveness" (Avolio, 2007).

In agreement with the role that individual differences play in leadership, it is easy to see why Jack and Alex both emerged and were effective in past leadership positions. Both possessed some or most of the aforementioned universal traits.

Jack was driven and honest. He had integrity, internal locus of control (belief that the events were the result of his own behaviors and actions), and achievement motivation. These traits explained Jack's emergence and success as a leader in the U.S. army. Jack's traits were in line with army's values and beliefs. These traits were desirable in the context of the military.

“The Seven Core Army Values are what being a Soldier is all about: Loyalty, Duty, Respect, Selfless Service, Honor, Integrity, and Personal Courage. Soldiers learned these values in detail during Basic Combat Training (BCT), from then on they live them every day in everything they do — whether they’re on the job or off” ("Living the Army Values | GoArmy.com").

Alex was persistent and self-confident. He had integrity, achievement motivation, tolerance for ambiguity, and cognitive ability. Alex’s characteristics differed from Jack’s in the area of internal locus of control, tolerance for ambiguity, and cognitive ability. Alex did not have the internal locus of control that Jack possessed. Unlike Jack, Alex had a high tolerance for ambiguity, and his strength was in his cognitive ability.

The family home improvement company Alex worked for had strong core values and offered exceptional customer service. For over 100 years, they had provided quality products, exceptional service, and experienced management. The core values were Honesty, Integrity, Sincerity, Quality Service, Value, Knowledge, and Resourcefulness.

Both Jack and Alex’s traits were in line with the values of their previous organizations. One reason they emerged as leaders was their values matched the values and the context of their respective organizations. They were good candidates for hire at HIC because of their strong values and positive qualities. Both of them received promotions because they had experience in a leadership position and performed at a high level.

CHAPTER 5

LEADERSHIP STYLES

Avolio (2007) described the field of leadership and management studies. The field evolved over the past 100 years, but despite being synonymous, the fields have developed two different meanings over time. Burns (1978) made the distinction as simply the difference between a transactional (management) and transformational (leadership) leadership style. A transactional leader emphasizes procedures, contingent reward, and management by exception, whereas a transformational leader emphasized charisma, personnel relationships, and creativity.

"Leadership style literature may be characterized by referring to two main phases of evolution: approximately 30 years of studying leader consideration and initiating structure" up until the mid-1980s, followed by approximately "25 years of studying charismatic-transformational leadership" (De Vries et al., 2010). Around the time the focus changed, "Penley and Hawkins (1985) concluded that consideration (or: human-oriented leadership) is mainly communicative, while initiating structure (or: task-oriented leadership) is much less so" (De Vries et al., 2010).

Jack entered the U.S. Army and rose in rank to a leadership position. The context of the military developed and shaped Jack's personality and traits, supported by Dweck and Leggett's theory "that some traits may be malleable and interact with the facets of the

context, and contribute to their emergence and effectiveness as a leader" (Avolio, 2007). Jack's leadership development and style followed him to the HIC.

The task-oriented context of the military developed Jack's leadership style that he brought to HIC, and worked well in the context of the department. This was because the experienced employees in the department did not require consideration. Instead, the department functioned optimally with a supervisor that focused on the planning, organizing, and other managerial aspects of running the department.

Models based on personality traits, which can be considered the primary determinants of leadership styles, predominantly either omit the most essential feature of leadership, interpersonal communication, or do not capture it adequately.

"The distinction was made between the interpersonal aspects of leadership, which revolve around communicative activities in interpersonal relationships, and the managerial aspects of leadership, which revolve around non-interpersonal activities such as planning, organizing, decision-making, problem-solving, and controlling" (Daft, 2003; De Vries, 2010; McCartney & Campbell 2006).

Leary's (1957) Interpersonal Circumplex model consisted of the following two main interpersonal (communicative) dimensions: friendliness/affiliation and dominance.

"Several authors have noted that attributional processes play a key role in leadership ratings" (De Vries, 2010). Conger and Kanungo (1988, p. 79) stated "charismatic leadership is an attribution based on followers perceptions of their leaders behavior".

"A recognition-based process (Lord and Maher 1993) involves the perception of leadership behaviors and the matching of these behaviors with relevant implicit

leadership theories. The perception process of actual observable behaviors seems to be most important in the judgment of a person's leadership style. Those implicit leadership theories seem to be, to a large extent, culturally universal" (De Vries, 2010; Den Hartog et al. 1999).

CHAPTER 6

COMMUNICATION STYLES

Alex was in a leadership position in his family home improvement company, in part because his values matched those of the organization. Alex was perceived in the light of being the son of the owner. Therefore, the perception of Alex's traits and communication style were less important in determining whether he emerged and was effective. The experience and context shaped his development as a leader, which became apparent when he assumed the department supervisor position at HIC.

Over two years, the same department at HIC employed Jack and Alex as department supervisor. They were two different types of leaders at two different times in the same department but each context was different.

"Communicative style behaviors are in a large part determined by personality, and what exactly constitutes the set of behaviors" is described by De Vries et al. (2009) as the "seven main communication style dimensions, which they labeled: expressiveness, preciseness, niceness, supportiveness, verbal aggressiveness, (expressed) emotional tension (or, reversed, assuredness), and argumentativeness." (De Vries et al 2009).

"Few studies have tried to operationalize a leaders' interpersonal communication style, to uncover the relations between common leadership style measures and measure of a leader's communication style. To find out about the differential and incremental

predictions of several important leadership outcomes using both common leadership style measures and leaders communication style measures." (De Vries et al. 2010).

In order to determine leadership style, De Vries et al. (2010) study linked the seven main communication style dimensions to leadership styles (task-oriented, human-oriented, and charismatic) and the leadership outcomes. Their results showed that there was a strong correlation between the communication styles of a leader and his/her leadership style. They found that the "strongest predictors" of a task-oriented leader were preciseness and assuredness. The "strongest predictors" of human-oriented leader were supportiveness, expressiveness, and a lack of verbal aggressiveness. The "strongest predictors" of a charismatic leader were assuredness, supportiveness, and argumentative.

The leadership outcomes they identified were knowledge sharing behaviors, satisfaction with leader, perceived leader performance, and subordinate's team commitment (De Vries, 2010). They found that Supportiveness had the strongest correlation with all leadership outcomes. Furthermore, they found that Verbal Aggressiveness had a strong negative correlation with human-oriented leadership, medium negative correlation with charismatic leadership, and small but positive correlation with task-oriented leadership.

Avolio (2007) defined the different contextual factors: "The proximal context is the context that is the immediate in terms of time and impact on both leaders and followers and their relationships. (work or unit climate, task and group characteristics, and performance domain).

The distal context comprises the organizational culture and characteristics of the broader social-cultural environment (stability/turbulance, nature of competitors, cycle time in terms of innovation, national events, and culture).

The historical context is what transpired before the emergence of a leader.

The organizational climate refers to the shared perceptions among organization's members with regard to the organization's fundamental properties (procedures, policies, and practices)" (Avolio, 2007).

CHAPTER 7

PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP STYLES

Jack's communication style was assured and precise, and his emphasis was on the managerial aspects of leadership. Therefore, the overall perception of his leadership style was as a task-oriented leader. Jack's leadership style was effective while serving in the U.S. Army because his personality traits and leadership style fit perfectly with the military organization.

Jack was effective as the department supervisor at HIC because of the proximal context. The task and group characteristics were best suited for a task-oriented leader. This was because the department employees were highly experienced, which gave him the opportunity to fulfill the managerial duties. The department was established and the employees functioned independently with little need for his direction.

Jack was less effective in his position as an assistant manager. This was because the job required more communication with employees than the department supervisor position. To accomplish the tasks now required that he consider the feelings of his public, which was not in his repertoire of leadership behaviors.

"Grint (2000) described the field of leadership studies as being theoretically inadequate from its inception, because it primarily excluded followers when explaining what constituted leadership. Grint stated that "it only requires the good follower to do

nothing for leadership to fail" (p. 133) and that it is the followers who teach leadership to leaders. Howell and Shamir (2005) concluded "followers also play a more active role in constructing the leadership relationship, empowering the leader and influencing his or her behavior, and ultimately determining the consequences of the leadership relationship" (p. 97). Lord, Brown, and Frieberg (1999) asserted that, "the follower remains an unexplored source of variance in understanding leadership processes" (p. 167). Howell and Shamir (2005) suggest that a followers' decision to follow a leader may be a more active process, based on the extent to which the leader is perceived as representing the followers' values and identity (Howell and Shamir, 2005). Studies that focused on the role of the follower in determining the leadership relationship are the relational models of leadership, such as the vertical dyad linkage or the leader-member exchange theory" (Avolio, 2007).

Nancy perceives Alex as precise, expressive, and emotionally tense as well. She found Alex to be verbally aggressive during training sessions, especially with Marshall. Nancy formed a negative perception of Alex and his communication behaviors. She perceived his verbal and nonverbal behaviors during training as demeaning. She found Alex and his teaching style difficult to deal with. Furthermore, she felt Alex's behaviors were negative towards her and Marshall. She felt sorry for Marshall and how he was treated. Her perception of Alex may be the result of a gender difference or sensitivity to emotional tension. She formed these perceptions based on his communication behaviors, which resulted in unfavorable leader outcomes. Her disapproval affected her own satisfaction, performance, and team commitment, as well as other employees in the department. According to Kolm and Putnam's (1992) definition of a conflict: "it may be said to exist *when there are real or perceived differences that arise in specific*

organizational circumstances and that engender emotion as a consequence" (Kolm & Putnam, 1992).

Marshall's perception of Alex is that he is supportive, assured, and precise. Marshall did not share Nancy's negative perceptions of Alex. In fact, Marshall and Alex, despite their cultural differences, identified with each other's values and beliefs. They had a mutual respect for each other, and did not take the frustration of the training sessions personally.

CHAPTER 8

COMMUNICATION STYLE MEANS LEADERSHIP STYLE

"Few leaders understand the full significance of how influential their leadership style is on the performance and satisfaction of their employees. Leaders control both interpersonal and material rewards and punishments that often shape employee behavior and influence an employee's performance, motivation, and attitude. They can affect an employee's self-image and resulting potential in either a positive or a negative way by being supportive, fair, and encouraging, or unsupportive, inconsistent, and critical… The influence of a leader's style reaches greater proportions as the effects on individuals begin to have a cumulative effect on group performance" (Warrick, 1981, p.155).

"The communication style of a team member is likely to have an effect on the willingness and eagerness of team members to share knowledge with each other. Team members were more willing to share knowledge with team members who were more agreeable and extroverted in their communication style. Consequently, not only is satisfaction likely to be affected by the communication style of a communication partner, but also the likelihood that one shares knowledge with a communication partner" (De Vries, 2010).

A leaders' effectiveness is determined by the perception of the follower. The assessment of leaders' communication behaviors contributes to the followers' perception

of a leaders' communication style. This perception of their communication style indicates the leadership style.

"The concept of knowledge sharing is defined as the process where individuals mutually exchange their (tacit and explicit) knowledge and jointly create new knowledge" (Van den Hooff and De Ridder, 2004). Communication styles facilitate or determine knowledge sharing behaviors. Srivastava et. al (2006) found that knowledge sharing determined team performance and may determine satisfaction as well. This is because the process of knowledge sharing involves communication" (De Vries, 2010).

"With respect to communication styles, charismatic leadership training studies have looked at the effects of training inspirational delivery style on the trainees and their public" (Frese et. al. 2003, Towler 2003). Awomleh & Gardner's (1999) study "showed that and expressive (enthusiastic) delivery style had a much stronger effect then the content of the speech" (De Vries, 2010).

De Vries et al. (2010) study's model links communication styles to leadership. The study assessed "whether the communication styles were significantly related to the outcome variables, whether the communication styles were significantly related to the proposed mediators (the leadership styles), and whether the mediators were significantly related to the outcome variables." They found "several strong correlations between the communication styles of the leader and his/her leadership style. With respect to the outcome variables in their study, the main communication style correlate of the outcomes was leader's supportiveness. They found that a leader's verbal aggressiveness correlated negatively with all outcomes. Verbal aggressiveness also had a strong negative correlation with human-oriented leadership, medium negative correlation with

charismatic leadership, and small positive correlation with task-oriented leadership" (De Vries, 2010).

The communication behaviors that described a human-oriented leader were supportiveness, a lack of verbal aggressiveness, and expressiveness. The study profiled a charismatic leader by their assuredness, supportiveness, preciseness, argumentativeness, and as verbally non-aggressive. Lastly, they described a task-oriented leader as precise and assured.

"The study tried to clarify the essential ingredients of charismatic and human-oriented leadership" and found that "both charismatic and human-oriented leadership styles are to a considerable extent grounded in communication styles" (De Vries et. al 2010). They found that leadership equals communication for charismatic and human-oriented leadership, but disconfirmed for task-oriented leadership.

"The results show that not only do the leadership styles differ in the extent to which communication styles *in general* play a role in the perception of leadership, but also in the extent to which *different* communication styles play a role" (De Vries et. al 2010).

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSION

Charismatic leaders are characterized by and assured, supportive, argumentative, precise, and verbally non-aggressive communication style.

Their results show that in the "assessment of charismatic and human-oriented leadership styles by subordinates, a leader's communication style seems to play a crucial role" (De Vries, 2010).

To draw conclusions, the way that a follower perceives and interprets a leader's traits and communication behaviors form the perception of the leader's communication and leadership style. All of which, while considering the context, determines the leader follower relationship and outcomes.

Marshal and Nancy perceived and interpreted Alex's communication behaviors in different ways. They perceived it subjectively, and interpreted it according to their implicit theories according to Lord and Maher's (1993) recognition-based process. Each formed a belief about Alex's communication style based on the way they connected or generalized information about his individual traits and observed behaviors. These generalizations were according to their culturally learned implicit theories. The individual differences of Marshall and Nancy contributed to different perceptions they formed about Alex's communication style.

A linguistic style “refers to a person's characteristic speaking pattern it includes such features as directness or indirectness, pacing and pausing, word choice, and the use of such elements as jokes, figures of speech, stories, questions, and apologies. In other words, linguistic style is a set of culturally learned signals by which we not only communicate what we mean but also interpret others' meaning and evaluate one another as people” (Tannen, 1995).

Marshall and Nancy each perceived Alex and his communication style differently, therefore, each formed a different opinion of his leadership style. So, from the way they generalized Alex’s traits and communication behaviors, they formed a perception of his communication and leadership style. All of which affected the outcomes: their satisfaction with the leader, perceived leader performance, knowledge sharing behaviors, and team commitment. In addition, the outcome variables explained the consequences of the leadership relationship or perception of his leadership style.

Marshall did not perceive Alex’s communication behaviors to be emotionally tense or verbally aggressive. Marshall was relatively unaffected compared to Nancy, because of his culture, gender, and understanding. Marshall and Alex understood the emotional nature of the training process, and both personally found the difficulties to be a learning experience. Alex recognized that his coaching skills and internal locus of control needed improvement, and expressed to Marshall that it was his immaturity that was responsible, and not Marshall’s inexperience. Marshall understood the difficulties to be the result of a number of contextual factors. For instance, he knew that when Alex was busy preparing for the inventory audit, he was trying his best to be supportive despite the

numerous responsibilities on his plate. On the contrary, Marshall's culture, gender, and understanding contributed to the mutual trust and respect between them.

The interactions between Alex and Marshall were not ideal from a leadership perspective, but since both understood the context and identified with one another's values and beliefs, the behaviors were accepted. Marshall did not take Alex's impatience or emotional tension personally, and found Alex to be assured rather than emotional tension. Marshall did not perceive Alex's communication behavior to be verbally aggressive, but viewed him as fair, supportive, assured, precise, and positively argumentative. Therefore, he would classify Alex as a charismatic leader embedded in a difficult context facing many demands and responsibilities as new leader. This perception of Alex contributed to positive outcomes for Marshall: he was satisfied with Alex, perceived Alex's performance favorably, was always willing to collect knowledge and share it, and was very committed to the team.

Nancy perceived Alex's communication behaviors in a negative light, and found him to be unfair, emotionally tense, and verbally aggressive. She felt he was unfair because of the way he treated Marshall, compared to the other employees. Her perceptions were reinforced by the many interactions she observed while he was training Marshall. She viewed Alex's communication behaviors as tense and aggressive based on those interactions, which affected not only her perceptions of his communication and leadership style, but her outcomes as well.

Nancy's behaviors after Alex asked her if she would help customers at the other side of the desk reflect her perceptions of Alex as a communicator and leader. She feared that the situation had taken a turn for the worst when Alex found the mistake made by

Marshall. She expected that Alex was going to be difficult to deal with, and was not willing to stick around to experience it first hand. Therefore, she decided to walk away to avoid being involved in what she presumed would be an emotionally tense situation. Nancy was uncomfortable with verbal aggression directed towards anyone.

Nancy's unfavorable perception of Alex contributed to some negative outcomes. She was not satisfied with Alex as a leader, was unwilling to collect knowledge from Alex, and was not committed to the team as a result. She broadcasted her opinions of him verbally and nonverbally and it negatively affected others in the department. It became contagious, and others in the department became dissatisfied too. The team commitment level fell and knowledge sharing behaviors suffered as a result.

Nancy's perceptions of Alex's communication style identified his leadership style to be task-oriented. It did not identify his leadership style to be human-oriented or charismatic because she perceived Alex as unsupportive and verbally aggressive. Supportiveness and a lack of verbal aggression are key component of human-oriented and charismatic leadership.

Marshall found Alex to a positive and effective leader for him. Nancy found Alex to be a negative and ineffective leader for her. Marshall was aware of and understood the context, which contributed to his positive perception of Alex as a leader. Nancy did not find a need to attend to the contextual factors, and instead based her negative opinions of Alex on her emotional judgments. Down the road, Marshall developed into a high performing specialist in the department. Nancy transferred departments and eventually quit working at HIC.

The traits, communication behaviors, and context together result in a leadership style and determine outcomes. Furthermore, the follower's perception of the leader determines whether a leader emerges or is effective.

Leadership psychology continues to explore the different "elements that constitute leadership" (Avolio, 2007). He argued that with a more integrated approach to leadership, the field would be better positioned to address questions such as: "the degree to which leaders are born versus made: whether what constitutes leadership effectiveness is more universal or culturally specific; whether different forms of leadership, such as charismatic or transformational, are more or less likely to emerge on the basis of the stability or criticality of the context; and whether one style of leadership is more or less effective depending on the contingencies and demands facing leaders and followers" (Avolio, 2007).

REFERENCES

Allen NJ, Meyer JP. The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology.* 1990;63:1–18.

Ambady N, LaPlante D, Nguyen T, Rosenthan R, Chaumeton N, Levinson W. Surgeons' tone of voice: A clue to malpractice history. *Surgery.* 2002;132:5–9.

Arvey, R. D., Rotundo, M., Johnson, W., Zhang, Z., & McGue, M. (2006). The determinants of leadership role occupancy: Genetic and personality factors. Leadership Quarterly, 17, 1–20.

Avolio, B. J. (1999). Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B. J. (2005). Leadership development in balance: Made/born. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D.(2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. Leadership Quarterly,15, 801– 823.

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

Avolio, B. J., Sosik, J. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Leadership models, methods, and applications. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.) & W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. Klimoski (Vol. Eds.), Handbook of psychology, Vol. 12: Industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 277–307). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting More Integrative Strategies for Leadership Theory-Building.*American Psychologist*, *62*(1), 25-33.

Awamleh R, Gardner WL. Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *The Leadership Quarterly.*1999;10(3):345–373.

Ayman, R. (2003). Situational and contingency approaches to leadership. In J. A. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), The nature of leadership (pp. 148 – 171). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baldwin TT. Effects of alternative modeling strategies on outcomes of interpersonal-skills training. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 1992;77(2):147–154.

Balkundi, P., & Kilduff, M. (2005). The ties that lead: A social network approach to leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 16, 941–961. Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.

Baron RM, Kenny DA. The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 1986;51:1173–1182.

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

Bass, B. M. (1990). Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational boundaries? American Psychologist, 52, 130 –139.

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

Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. Journal of Early Adolescence, 11, 56 –95.

Beyer, J. M. (1999). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. Leadership Quarterly, 10, 307–330.

Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2001). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. Leadership Quarterly, 11, 515–549.

Booth Butterfield M, Booth Butterfield S. Conceptualizing affect as information in communication production. *Human Communication Research.* 1990;16(4):451–476.

Brass, D. J., Galaskiewicz, J., Greve, H. R., & Tsai, W. (2004). Taking stock of social networks: A multi-level perspective. Academy of Management Journal, 47, 795– 817.

Bray, D., Campbell, R. J., & Grant, D. L. (1974). Formative years in business: A long-term AT&T study of managerial lives. New York: Wiley.

Bugental DB, Lyon JE, Lin EK, McGrath EP, Bimbela A. Children “tune out” in response to the ambiguous communication style of powerless adults. *Child Development.* 1999;70(1):214–230.

Buller MK, Buller DB. Physicians’ communication style and patient satisfaction. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior.* 1987;28(4):375–388.

Bultman DC, Svarstad BL. Effects of physician communication style on client medication beliefs and adherence with antidepressant treatment. *Patient Education and Counseling.*2000;40(2):173–185.

Burgoon JK, Pfau M, Parrott R, Birk T, Coker R, Burgoon M. Relational communication, satisfaction, compliance-gaining strategies, and compliance in communication between physicians and patients. *Communication Monographs.* 1987;54(3):307–324.

Canella, A. A., Jr., & Monroe, M. J. (1997). Contrasting perspectives on strategic leaders: Toward a more realistic view of top managers. Journal of Management, 23, 213–237.

Carlyle, T. (1907). Heroes and hero worship. Boston: Adams.

Chan, K. Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 481– 498.

Christensen A. Dysfunctional interaction patterns in couples. In: Noller P, Fitzpatrick MA, editors. *Perspectives on marital interaction.* Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters; 1988.

Conger, J. A. (2004). Developing leadership capability: What’s inside the black box? Academy of Management Executive, 18, 16 –139.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness. San Francisco: JosseyBass.

Daft RL. *Management.* 6. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western; 2003.

Gilder D, Heuvel H, Ellemers N. Het 3-componenten model van commitment. /A three component model of organizational commitment. *Gedrag & Organisatie.* 1997;10:95–106.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G. B., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 13, 46 –78.

Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. Leadership Quarterly, 11, 581– 614.

DeGroot T, Kiker DS, Cross TC. A meta-analysis to review organizational outcomes related to charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences.* 2000;17:356–371.

Den Hartog, D. N., & Koopman, P. L. (2001). Leadership in organizations. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds). Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology, Vol. 2: Organizational psychology (pp. 166 –187). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Den Hartog D.N., Verburg RM. Charisma and rhetoric: Communicative techniques of international business leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly.* 1997;8(4):355–391.

Den Hartog D.N., Muijen JJ, Koopman PL. Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology.* 1997;70(1):19–34.

Den Hartog D.N., House RJ, Hanges PJ, Ruiz-Quintanilla SA, Dorfman PW., Globe-Associates Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *The Leadership Quarterly.*1999;10:219–256.

Dillard JP, Solomon DH, Palmer MT. Structuring the concept of relational communication.*Communication Monographs.* 1999;66(1):49–65.

Dvir, T., & Shamir, B. (2003). Follower developmental characteristics as predictors of predicting transformational leadership: A longitudinal field study. Leadership Quarterly, 14, 327–344.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. (1988). A social– cognitive approach to motivation and personality. Psychological Review, 95, 256 –273.

Eden D, Leviatan U. Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 1975;60:736–741.

Ehrhart, M. G., & Klein, K. (2001). Predicting follower's preference for charismatic leadership: The influence of follower value and personality. Leadership Quarterly, 12, 153–179.

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

Finkelstein, S., & Hambrick, D. C. (1996). Strategic leadership: Top executives and their effects on organizations. Minneapolis/St. Paul, MN: West.

Fleishman EA. The description of supervisory behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology.*1953;37:1–6.

Fuller JB, Patterson CEP, Hester K, Stringer DY. A quantitative review of research on charismatic leadership. *Psychological Reports.* 1996;78(1):271–287.

Frese M, Beimel S, Schoenborn S. Action training for charismatic leadership: Two evaluations of studies of a commercial training module on inspirational communication of a vision.*Personnel Psychology.* 2003;56(3):671–697.

Gardner, J. W. (1990). On leadership. New York: Free Press.

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, 343–372.

Goldberg LR. An alternative "description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 1990;59(6):1216–1229.

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader–member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. Leadership Quarterly, 6, 219 –247.

Graves, C. W. (1959). An emergent theory of ethical behavior: Based upon an epigenetic model. Retrieved from the Dr. Clare W. Graves Web site: http://www.clarewgraves.com/articles_content/1959/I.html

Grint, K. (2000). The arts of leadership. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Grint, K. (2005). Leadership: Limits and possibilities. Hong Kong, China: Palgrave Macmillan.
Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. Training and Development Journal, 23, 26 –34.

Gudykunst WB, Matsumoto Y, Ting Toomey S, Nishida T, Kim K, Heyman S. The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human Communication Research.* 1996;22(4):510–543.

Gudykunst WB, Ting Toomey S. Culture and affective communication. *American Behavioral Scientist.* 1988;31(3):384–400.

Hailey BJ, Willoughby SG, Butler MN, Miller L. Effects of communication style on women's satisfaction with physicians. *Psychology, Health & Medicine.* 1998;3(4):435–438.

Hansford BC, Hattie JA. Perceptions of communicator style and self-concept. *Communication Research.* 1987;14(2):189–203.

Hofmann, D. A., Morgeson, F. P., & Gerras, S. J. (2003). Climate as a moderator of the relationship between leader–member exchange and content specific citizenship: Safety climate as an exemplar. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88, 170 –178.

Hoogh AHB, Hartog DN, Koopman PL. Linking the Big Five-factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership; perceived dynamic work environment as a moderator. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 2005;26(7):839–865.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V.(Eds.). (2004). Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path– goal theory of leadership. Journal of Contemporary Business, 3, 81–97.

Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. Academy of Management Review, 30, 96 –112.

Hunt JW, Baruch Y. Developing top managers: The impact of interpersonal skills training.*Journal of Management Development.* 2003;22(8):729–752.

Ilies, R., Arvey, R. D., & Bouchard, T. J., Jr. (2006). Darwinism, behavioral genetics, and organizational behavior: A review and agenda for future research. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27, 121–141.

James LR. On the path to mediation. *Organizational Research Methods.* 2008;11:359–363.

Judge TA, Piccolo RF, Ilies R. The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 2004;89(1):36–51.

Judge TA, Bono JE. Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 2000;85(5):751–765.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review: Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 530 –541.

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

Kark, R., & Van-Dijk, D. (in press). Motivation to lead, motivation to follow: The role of the self-regulatory focus in leadership processes. Academy of Management Review.

Kenny DA. Reflections on mediation. *Organizational Research Methods.* 2008;11:353–358.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? Academy of Management Executive, 5, 48 – 60.

Kirkpatrick SA, Locke EA. Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 1996; 81:36–51.

Klein, K. J., & House, R. J. (1995). On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. Leadership Quarterly, 6, 163–198.

Leary T. *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality; a functional theory and methodology for personality evaluation.* Oxford: Ronald Press; 1957.

Levin DZ, Cross R. The strength of weak ties you can trust: The mediating role of trust in effective knowledge transfer. *Management Science.* 2004;50(11):1477–1490.

Levinson W, Roter DL, Mullooly JP, Dull VT, Frankel RM. Physician-patient communication: The relationship with malpractice claims among primary care physicians and surgeons.*Journal of American Medical Association.* 1997;277:553–559.

"Living the Army Values | GoArmy.com." *Go Army Homepage | GoArmy.com*. Web. 29 Apr. 2011. <http://www.goarmy.com/soldier-life/being-a-soldier/living-the-army-values.html>.

London, M., & Maurer, T. J. (2003). Leadership development: A diagnostic model for continuous learning in dynamic organizations. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), The nature of leadership (pp. 222–246). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lord RG, Vader CL, Alliger GM. A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 1986;71:402–410.

Lord RG, Maher KJ. *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance.* New York: Routledge; 1993.

Lowe KB, Kroeck KG, Sivasubramaniam N. Effectiveness correlates of transformation and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly.* 1996;7:385–425.

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

Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., & Frieberg, S. J. (1999). Understanding the dynamics of leadership: The role of follower self-concepts in the leader/follower relationship. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 75, 167–203.

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

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1991). Leadership and information-processing. Boston: Routledge.

Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive developmental approach. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline (pp. 241–258). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Marion, R., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leadership in complex organizations. Leadership Quarterly, 12, 389 – 418.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychological Review, 98, 224 – 253.

Mathieu JE, Taylor SR. Clarifying conditions and decision points for mediational type inferences in Organizational Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 2006;27:1031–1056.

Maurer, T. J. (2002). Employee learning and developmental orientation: Toward an integrative model of involvement in continuous learning. Human Resource Development Journal, 1, 9 – 44.

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

McCauley, C., & Van Velsor, E. (Eds.). (2003). The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McCartney WW, Campbell CR. Leadership, management, and derailment: A model of individual success and failure. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal.*2006;27(3):190–202.

McCroskey JC, Daly JA, Martin MM, Beatty MJ. *Communication and personality: Trait perspectives.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc; 1998.

Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social reconceptualization of personality. Psychological Review, 80, 253–283.

Naidoo LJ, Lord RG. Speech imagery and perceptions of charisma: The mediating role of positive affect. *The Leadership Quarterly.* 2008;19:283–296.

Noels KA, Clement R, Pelletier LG. Perceptions of teachers' communicative style and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Modern Language Journal.* 1999;83(1):23–34.

Noller P, White A. The validity of the communication patterns questionnaire. *Psychological Assessment.* 1999;2(1):478–482.
Norton RW. Foundation of a communicator style construct. *Human Communication Research.*1978;4(2):99–112.

Penley LE, Hawkins B. Studying interpersonal communication in organizations: A leadership application. *Academy of Management Journal.* 1985;28(2):309–326.

Pennebaker JW, Rimé B, Blankenship VE. Stereotypes of emotional expressiveness of northerners and southerners: A cross-cultural test of Montesquieu's hypotheses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 1996;70(2):372–380.

Plomin, R., & Daniels, D. (1987). Why are children in the same family so different from one another? Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 10, 1–16.

Plomin, R., DeFries, J. C., McClearn, G. E., & McGuffin, P. (2001). Behavioral genetics (4th ed.). New York: Worth.

Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Lee JY, Podsakoff NP. Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 2003;88:879–903.

Prisbell M. Students' perceptions of instructors' style of communication and satisfaction with communication in the classroom. *Perceptual and Motor Skills.* 1994;79(3):1398.

Rasku Puttonen H. Communication between parents and children in experimental situations.*Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology & Social Research.* 1988;65:1–71.

Reichers, A. E., & Schneider, B. (1990). Climate and culture: An evolution of constructs. In B. Schneider (Ed.), Organizational climate and culture (pp. 5–39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Riegel, K. F. (1975). Towards a dialectic theory of development. Human Development, 18, 50 – 64.

Riggio RE, Riggio HR, Salinas C, Cole EJ. The role of social and emotional communication skills in leader emergence and effectiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice.* 2003;7:83–103.

Ritchie LD, Fitzpatrick MA. Family communication patterns—measuring intrapersonal perceptions of interpersonal relationships. *Communication Research.* 1990;17(4):523–544.

Rost, J. C. (1991). Leadership for the twenty-first century. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Rush MC, Thomas JC, Lord RG. Implicit leadership theory: A potential threat to the internal validity of leader behavior questionnaires. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance.*1977;20:93–110.

Schmid Mast M, Hall JA, Roter DL. Disentangling physician sex and physician communication style: Their effects on patient satisfaction in a virtual medical visit. *Patient Education and Counselling.* 2007;68(1):16–22.

Schmitt-Rodermund, E. (2004). Pathways to successful entrepreneurship: Parenting, personality, early entrepreneurial competence, and interests. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65, 498 –518.

Shamir B, Arthur MB, House RJ. The rhetoric of charismatic leadership: A theoretical extension, a case study, and implications for research. *The Leadership Quarterly.* 1994;5:25–42.

Shartle, C. L. (1951). Studies of naval leadership: Part I. In H. Guetzdow (Ed.), Group leadership and men (pp. 119 –133). Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Press.

Singelis TM. The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals.*Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.* 1994;20(5):580–591.

Sobel ME. Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models. In: Leinhardt S, editor. *Sociological methodology.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 1982. pp. 290–312.

Sorenson RL, Savage GT. Signaling participation through relational communication: A test of the leader interpersonal influence model. *Group and Organization Studies.* 1989;14(3):325–354.

Spangler WD, House RJ. Presidential effectiveness and the leadership motive profile. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 1991;60:439–455.
Stogdill, R. (1974). Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research. New York: Free Press.

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

Stewart GL. A meta-analytic review of relationships between team design features and team performance. *Journal of Management.* 2006;32:29–55.

Stone Romero EF, Rosopa PJ. The relative validity of inferences about mediation as a function of research design characteristics. *Organizational Research Methods.* 2008;11:326–352.

Street RL. Gender differences in health care provider-patient communication: Are they due to style, stereotypes, or accommodation? *Patient Education and Counseling.* 2002;48(3):201–206.

"Amazon.com: The Power of Talk: Who Gets Heard and Why (HBR OnPoint Enhanced Edition): Deborah Tannen: Books." *Amazon.com: Online Shopping for Electronics, Apparel, Computers, Books, DVDs & More*. Web. 29 Apr. 2011. <http://www.amazon.com/Power-Talk-Heard-OnPoint-Enhanced/dp/B0000691UO>.

Takai J, Ota H. Assessing Japanese interpersonal communication competence. *Japanese Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.* 1994;33(3):224–236.

Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. Harvard Business Review, 36(2), 95–101.

Towler AJ. Effects of charismatic influence training on attitudes, behavior, and performance.*Personnel Psychology.* 2003;56(2):363–381.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism and collectivism. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Van den Hooff B, Ridder JA. Knowledge sharing in context: The influence of organizational commitment, communication climate and CMC use on knowledge sharing. *Journal of Knowledge Management.* 2004;8(6):117–130.

Van den Hooff, B., & Hendrix, L. (2004). *Eagerness and willingness to hare: the relevance of different attitudes towards knowledge sharing*. Paper presented at the Fifth European Conference on Organizational Knowledge, Learning and Capabilities: Innsbruck, Austria.

Vries RE, Bakker-Pieper A, Alting Siberg R, Gameren K, Vlug M. The content and dimensionality of communication styles. *Communication Research.* 2009;36:178–206.

Vries RE, Roe RA, Taillieu TCB. Need for leadership as a moderator of the relationships between leadership and individual outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly.* 2002;13(2):121–137.

Vries RE, Hooff B, Ridder JA. Explaining knowledge sharing: The role of team communication styles, job satisfaction, and performance beliefs. *Communication Research.* 2006;33(2):115–135.

Vries, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., & Oostenveld, W. (2010). Leadership = Communication? The Relations of Leaders' Communication Styles, Knowledge Sharing and Leadership Outcomes. *Journal of Business Psychology*, *25*, 367-380. Retrieved February 11, 2011, from http://springerlink.com/content/

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). Leadership and decision-making. New York: Wiley.

Waldman, D. A., Javidan, M., & Varella, P. (2004). Charismatic leadership at the strategic level: A new application of upper echelons theory. Leadership Quarterly, 15, 355–380.

Warrick, D.D.. (1981). Leadership Styles and Their Consequences. *Journal of Experimental Learning and Simulation*, *3*(4), 155-172.

Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.) New York: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1924.

Wiemann, J., Chen, V., & Giles, H. (1986). *Beliefs about talk and silence in cultural context*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, Chicago.

Wofford, J. C., Whittington, J. L., & Goodwin, V. L. (2001). Follower motive patterns as situational moderators for transformational leadership effectiveness. Journal of Managerial Issues, 13, 196 –211.

Yukl, G. (1998). Leadership in organizations (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. (1999). Evaluation of the conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 10, 285–303.

Yukl, G. (2002). Leadership in organizations (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Zaccaro, S. J., & Klimoski, R. J. (Eds.). (2001). The nature of organizational leadership: Understanding the performance imperatives confronting today's leaders. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.