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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.
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.
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.
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
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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/turbulence, 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.
“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 Hooft 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).
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).


