TU Dortmund University

Department of Educational Sciences and Psychology

The Role of Followership in Leadership: An Empirical Investigation of the Nature and Impact of Followers and Their Following in Organizations

Cumulative Dissertation

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor Philosophiae (Dr. phil.)

submitted by

Mirko Ribbat

Proposed Reviewer:

1. Prof. Dr. Joachim Hüffmeier

2. Prof. Dr. Jens Rowold

Dortmund, September 2024

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge several people who have supported this dissertation project and me. At first, I want to thank my doctoral supervisor Prof. Dr. Joachim Hüffmeier for the opportunity to work on this dissertation project. I would like to thank him for all the support, effort, and for the patience that helped me—an external PhD candidate with a political scientist background—to write this thesis at TU Dortmund University in the field of psychology. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Stefan Krumm, Dr. Christoph Nohe, and Dr. Kai Klasmeier for sharing time, effort and expertise, which definitely enhanced the quality of the here presented research. Likewise, I thank Prof. Dr. Jens Rowold for sharing the time and effort as part of the examination board.

Additionally, I want to thank the German Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health for enabling me to write this thesis. I want to thank my former colleagues especially Götz, Inga, Anita, Birgit, Corinna W., Kai, Anja, Astrid, Corinna S., and Barbara—for the structural, professional, and personal support. I thank my parents, my family, and my friends, who directly or indirectly helped me to persevere, to make progress, and to be successful. Finally, a very special thanks goes to the most important person in my life (along with Lani, of course), Marja. Our conversations and her humor have always been sources of joy and motivation for me. I cannot thank her enough for backing me and believing in me, for her good advice, for her patience, and for her love, which is essential for everything I do and everything I succeed in.

Summary

Most leadership research has focused on the leader and his or her impact on followers and organizations. While the active contribution of followers and their following have been repeatedly acknowledged as an important part of leadership, key questions are still awaiting empirical testing. This dissertation thus focused on the role of followership in leadership. With an empirical investigation of the nature and impact of followers and their following in organizations, I aimed to advance both followership theory and research. Three studies have been conducted to answer seven research questions. Thereby, I focused on two of the most influential followership concepts (i.e., Kelley's [1992] followership styles and Uhl-Bien et al.'s [2014] Formal Theory of Followership; FTF).

Study 1 aimed to provide a basis for further research on followership in Germanspeaking countries. To establish the psychometric properties of a German version of Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire, I first explored the factorial structure of my translation in a heterogeneous employee sample (N = 451). Then, I tested for convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity in another heterogeneous employee sample (N = 413). The results indicate satisfactory psychometric properties for two followership dimensions (i.e., active engagement [AE] and independent, critical thinking [ICT]; see Kelley, 1992). Correlations of these two followership dimensions with other constructs were mostly in line with the expectations.

Study 2 aimed to test Kelley's (1992) prominent concept of followership styles for the first time in a longitudinal design. With a latent-state trait approach, I examined the degree to which followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT) reflect rather stable or rather dynamic behaviors. Furthermore, I examined the relationships of followership behaviors with job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) and self-efficacy in latent states cross-lagged models. First, the hypotheses were tested in a sample of N = 184employees from eleven German service organizations, which were surveyed twice with a time lag of nine to 12 months. To replicate and extend the findings from the first sample, the hypotheses were tested again with a sample of N = 570 participants from a German open-access panel, which were surveyed twice with a time lag of four months. With the second sample, leader humility and perceived organizational support were additionally tested as potential moderators of the relationships between followership and job attitudes. While the findings support Kelley's conceptualization of followership styles as rather consistent behavior patterns, mixed results were found for the relationships with the other variables. These findings raise important questions for future followership research.

Study 3 dealt with the more comprehensive followership framework of the Formal Theory of Followership (FTF; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). Since Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) presented their FTF, followership research has been perceived as an emerging field. However, recent primary studies and reviews show that there is currently no consensus on what followership is and what it is not. To address this lack of clarity and using the lens of Uhl-Bien's et al. (2014) seminal work, I conducted a systematic review of empirical followership research. I analyzed the different approaches to followership that Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) proposed, the methodological approaches, the different measures used, and the studied variables of 89 studies that were included in the systematic review. The analysis reveals that FTF provides a valuable theoretical framework to integrate a wide variety of research that contributes to a better understanding of the role of followers and their following in leadership. While a clear trend toward more pertinent research activity was found, Study 3 also reveals that empirical followership research develops more strongly in terms of number of publications rather than in their quality.

In sum, this dissertation offers new insights into the role of followership in leadership. It provides empirical evidence for prevailing assumptions that have not been tested before, it advances followership theory (Kelley, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018), and it shows promising avenues for future followership research.

Zusammenfassung

Bisher konzentrierte sich die Führungsforschung auf die Führungskraft und ihren Einfluss auf die Mitarbeitenden und die Organisation. Obwohl der aktive Beitrag von Geführten (d.h. den *Followern*) als bedeutender Teil von Führung wiederholt hervorgehoben wurde, sind wichtige Fragen bisher noch nicht empirisch überprüft worden. Diese Dissertation konzentrierte sich deshalb auf die Rolle der Follower im Führungskontext. Mit einer empirischen Untersuchung der Natur und des Einflusses von Followern und ihrem Verhalten (d.h. *Followership*) in Organisationen wollte ich sowohl die Followership-Theorie als auch die empirische Followership-Forschung voranbringen. Dazu wurden drei Studien durchgeführt, um sieben Forschungsfragen zu beantworten. Ich konzentrierte mich dabei auf zwei der einflussreichsten Followership-Konzepte (d.h. Kelleys [1992] Followership-Stile und die Formale Theorie von Followership von Uhl-Bien et al. [2014]; FTF).

Studie 1 hatte zum Ziel, eine Grundlage für die weitere Untersuchung von Followership im deutschsprachigen Raum zu schaffen. Um die psychometrischen Eigenschaften einer deutschen Version von Kelleys (1992) Followership-Fragebogen zu ermitteln, untersuchte ich zunächst die Faktor-Struktur meiner Übersetzung in einer heterogenen Mitarbeiterstichprobe (N = 451). Anschließend testete ich die konvergente, diskriminante und kriteriumsbezogene Validität in einer weiteren heterogenen Mitarbeiterstichprobe (N = 413). Die Ergebnisse deuten auf zufriedenstellende psychometrische Eigenschaften für zwei Dimensionen von Followership hin (d. h. aktives Engagement [AE] und unabhängiges, kritisches Denken [ICT]; siehe Kelley, 1992). Die Korrelationen dieser beiden Dimensionen von Followership mit anderen Konstrukten entsprachen weitgehend den Erwartungen.

Studie 2 zielte darauf ab, Kelleys (1992) prominentes Konzept der Followership-Stile zum ersten Mal in einem Längsschnittdesign zu testen. Mit einem Latent-State-TraitAnsatz untersuchte ich, inwieweit die Verhaltensweisen der Follower (d.h. AE und ICT) eher stabiler oder eher dynamischer Natur sind. Darüber hinaus untersuchte ich die Zusammenhänge zwischen dem Followership-Verhalten und den Arbeitseinstellungen (d.h. Arbeitszufriedenheit und organisationale Verbundenheit) sowie der Selbstwirksamkeit in sogenannten Latent-States-Cross-Lagged-Modellen. Zunächst wurden die Hypothesen an einer Stichprobe von N = 184 Mitarbeitenden aus elf deutschen Dienstleistungsunternehmen getestet, die zweimal mit einem zeitlichen Abstand von neun bis 12 Monaten befragt wurden. Um die Ergebnisse aus der ersten Stichprobe zu replizieren und zu erweitern, wurden die Hypothesen erneut mit einer Stichprobe von N = 570 Teilnehmenden aus einem deutschen Open-Access-Panel getestet, die zweimal mit einem zeitlichen Abstand von vier Monaten befragt wurden. In der zweiten Stichprobe wurden zusätzlich die Demut der Führungskraft und die wahrgenommene organisationale Unterstützung als potenzielle Moderator-Variablen der Beziehungen zwischen Followership-Verhalten und Arbeitseinstellung getestet. Während die Ergebnisse Kelleys Konzept von Followership-Stilen als eher konsistente Verhaltensmuster unterstützen, wurden für die Beziehungen zu den anderen Variablen gemischte Ergebnisse gefunden. Diese Ergebnisse werfen wichtige Fragen für die künftige Followership-Forschung auf.

Studie 3 befasste sich mit dem umfassenderen Followership-Rahmenwerk der FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). Seit Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) ihre Theorie vorgestellt haben, wird die Followership-Forschung als ein aufstrebendes Feld wahrgenommen. Jüngste Primärstudien und Übersichten zeigen jedoch, dass es derzeit keinen Konsens darüber gibt, was Followership ist und was nicht. Um diesen Mangel an Klarheit zu beheben, führte ich eine systematische Untersuchung der empirischen Followership-Forschung durch und stützte mich dabei auf die bahnbrechende Arbeit von Uhl-Bien et al. (2014). Ich analysierte die verschiedenen von Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) vorgeschlagenen Followership-Ansätze, die methodischen Ansätze, die verschiedenen verwendeten Messinstrumente und die untersuchten Variablen von 89 Studien, die in die systematische Überprüfung einbezogen wurden. Die Analyse zeigt, dass die FTF einen wertvollen theoretischen Rahmen für die Integration einer Vielzahl von Forschungsergebnissen bietet, die zu einem besseren Verständnis der Rolle von Followern und ihrem Verhalten in Führungsprozessen beitragen. Während ein klarer Trend zu mehr einschlägiger Forschungstätigkeit festgestellt werden konnte, zeigt Studie 3 jedoch auch, dass sich die empirische Followership-Forschung eher in Bezug auf die Anzahl der Veröffentlichungen entwickelt, als in Bezug auf ihre Qualität.

Zusammenfassend lässt sich feststellen, dass diese Dissertation neue Erkenntnisse über die Rolle von Followership in Führungsprozessen bietet. Sie liefert empirische Belege für prävalente theoretische Annahmen, die bisher noch nicht getestet wurden, sie entwickelt die Followership-Theorie weiter (Kelley, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) und sie zeigt vielversprechende Wege für die zukünftige Followership-Forschung auf.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	II
Summary	III
Zusammenfassung	V
List of Tables	XIII
List of Figures	XV
List of Abbreviations	XVI
1 Introduction	1
2 Followership Theory and Past Research	3
2.1 Followership Typologies of Behaviors and Characteristics	4
2.2 The Comprehensive Framework of the Formal Theory of Followership (FTF)	19
2.3 Central Objectives of the Dissertation and Research Questions	11
3 Study 1 — Validation of a German Version of Kelley's (1992) Followership	
Questionnaire	17
3.1 Introduction	17
3.2 The Present Research	18
3.2.1 Evidence on the Questionnaire's Structure	18
3.2.2 Correlations with Other Measures	19
3.2.3 Relationship to Criteria	21
3.3 Study 1	23
3.3.1 Method	23
3.3.1.1 Participants	23
3.3.1.2 Instruments	24
3.3.1.3 Data Analysis	24
3.3.2 Results	25
3.4 Study 2	27

3.4.1.1 Participants	27
3.4.1.2 Instruments	
3.4.1.3 Data Analysis	
3.4.2 Results	
3.4.2.1 Results for Convergent and Discriminant Validity.	
3.4.2.2 Results for Criterion-Related Validity	
3.4.2.3 Results for Incremental Validity	
3.5 Discussion	
3.6 Limitations	
3.7 Conclusion	40
4 Study 2 — Followership Styles Scrutinized: Temporal Consiste	ency and Relationships
with Job Attitudes and Self-efficacy	41
4.1 Introduction	41
4.2 Followership	44
4.3 Followership and Job Attitudes	45
4.3 Followership and Job Attitudes4.4 Followership and Self-Efficacy	45
4.3 Followership and Job Attitudes4.4 Followership and Self-Efficacy4.5 Study 1	
 4.3 Followership and Job Attitudes 4.4 Followership and Self-Efficacy 4.5 Study 1 4.5.1 Materials and Methods 	
 4.3 Followership and Job Attitudes 4.4 Followership and Self-Efficacy 4.5 Study 1 4.5.1 Materials and Methods 4.5.1.1 Sample 	
 4.3 Followership and Job Attitudes	
 4.3 Followership and Job Attitudes	
 4.3 Followership and Job Attitudes	
 4.3 Followership and Job Attitudes	
 4.3 Followership and Job Attitudes	

IX

5.5.3.1 Temporal Consistency of Followership Behavior	
5.5.3.2 Followership and Job Attitudes	61
5.5.3.3 Followership and Self-Efficacy	64
5.5.4 Brief Discussion	64
4.6 Study 2	
4.6.1 Followership, Leader Humility, and Perceived Organiz	zational Support66
4.6.2 Materials and Methods	
4.6.2.1 Sample	
4.6.2.2 Measures	
4.6.2.3 Data Analysis Strategy	
4.6.3 Pre-Analyses	
4.6.3.1 Construct Validity	
4.6.3.2 Measurement Equivalence Across Time	71
4.6.4 Results	
4.6.4.1 Temporal Consistency of Followership Behavior	
4.6.4.2 Followership and Job Attitudes	
4.6.4.3 Followership and Self-Efficacy	
4.6.4.4 Followership, Leader Humility and POS	
4.7 Discussion	77
4.7.1 Theoretical Implications	77
4.7.2 Practical Implications	
4.7.3 Limitations	
4.8 Conclusion	
5 Study 3 – Empirical Followership Research Since the Publicati	on of the Formal Theory
of Followership by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) – A Systematic Review	<i>N</i> 88
5.1 Introduction	

5.2 The Formal Theory of Followership
5.3 Review Methodology
5.3.1 Search Strategy
5.3.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria
5.3.3 Review Procedure
5.4 Review Findings
5.4.1 Followership Approaches and Methods102
5.4.2 Investigated Followership Constructs106
5.4.2.1 Followership Characteristics and Behaviors as Conceived by Uhl-Bien et al.
(2014)
5.4.2.2 Framework Extensions: Newly Identified Followership Characteristics 110
5.4.2.3 Framework Extensions: Newly Identified Followership Behaviors111
5.4.2.4 Measures of Followership Characteristics and Behaviors112
5.4.3 Investigated Non-Followership Constructs114
5.4.3.1 The Nomological Network of Followership Characteristics and Behaviors
5.4.3.2 Central Findings of Followership Research Since 2014120
5.5 Discussion
5.5.1 Key Findings, Shortcomings, And Future Directions125
5.5.1.1 The Two Fundamental Approaches to Followership126
5.5.1.2 The Investigated Followership Characteristics and Behaviors
5.5.1.3 The Nomological Network of Followership Characteristics and Behaviors
5.5.1.4 Methodological Approaches and Quality Concerns
5.5.2 Theoretical Implications
5.5.3 Practical Implications

5.5.4 Limitations	
5.6 Conclusion	
6 Overall Discussion	140
6.1 Summary of Findings and Theoretical Contribution	140
6.2 Practical Implications	145
6.3 Limitations and Directions for Future Research	147
7 Conclusion	151
8 References	153
Appendix A. Careless Response Detection	
Appendix B. German Items and Translation Process	
Appendix C. Followership Item and Scale Analysis	
Appendix D. CFA Results, Study 1	204
Appendix E. Local Misspecification Detection	
Appendix F. Study 2 Instruments	210
Appendix G. Ant Colony Optimization	212
Appendix H. Correlations Without "Actively Develop"	
Appendix I. Testing for Measurement Equivalence	
Appendix J. Distribution of AE and ICT Mean Values (at t1)	224
Appendix K. Search String	
Appendix L. Quality Assessment	
Appendix M. Comprehensive Overview of All Included Studies	
Eidesstattliche Erklärung	247

List of Tables

Table 1 Roles and contribution of the (co-)authors according to the Contributor Roles
Taxonomy
Table 2 Results of factor analysis, subsample 1
Table 3 Descriptive statistics and correlations for study variables 32
Table 4 Incremental validity of AE and ICT for job satisfaction and organizational
commitment
Table 5 Incremental validity of AE and ICT for OCBs and emotional exhaustion
Table 6 Descriptives, intercorrelations between latent variables, and internal consistencies
of Study 160
Table 7 Descriptives, intercorrelations between latent variables, and internal consistencies
of Study 272
Table 8 Inclusion and exclusion criteria 99
Table 9 Approaches to followership (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018)
used in the reviewed studies
Table 10 Quality assessment 105
Table 11 Followership characteristics and behaviors that were investigated in the reviewed
studies
Table 12 Measures of followership characteristics and behaviors 115
Table 13 Non-followership variables that were investigated in the reviewed studies (as
dependent, moderator, mediator, or additional independent variables)116
Table 14 Directions for future research 126
Table 15 Followership item analysis for the first subsample of Study 1 202
Table 16 Followership item analysis for the second subsample of Study 1
Table 17 Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Subsample 2
Table 18 Local misspecification detection, results for Study 1 205

Table 19 Local misspecification detection, results for Study 2	207
Table 20 Measurement instruments	210
Table 21 Model fit of personal initiative	212
Table 22 Model fit of self-responsibility	212
Table 23 Model fit of SITs	213
Table 24 Model fit of LMX	213
Table 25 Model fit of job satisfaction	213
Table 26 Model fit of organizational commitment	214
Table 27 Model fit of OCBs	214
Table 28 Model fit of emotional exhaustion	214
Table 29 Model fit of Big Five personality traits	215
Table 30 Measurement equivalence of AE, Study 1	
Table 31 Measurement equivalence of ICT, Study 1	219
Table 32 Measurement equivalence of job satisfaction, Study 1	219
Table 33 Measurement equivalence of organizational commitment, Study 1	
Table 34 Measurement equivalence of self-efficacy, Study 1	
Table 35 Measurement equivalence of AE, Study 2	
Table 36 Measurement equivalence of ICT, Study 2	
Table 37 Measurement equivalence of job satisfaction, Study 2	
Table 38 Measurement equivalence of organizational commitment, Study 2	
Table 39 Measurement equivalence of self-efficacy, Study 2	
Table 40 Comprehensive overview of all included studies	230

List of Figures

Figure 1 Followership styles according to Kelley (1992)	6
Figure 2 Hypotheses for the relationships of AE and ICT with job attitudes and	self-
efficacy	47
Figure 3 Hypotheses for interaction effects	48
Figure 4 Interaction Effect of AE (t1) and ICT (t1) on organizational commitme	nt (t2)63
Figure 5 PRISMA flow chart	98
Figure 6 Amount of empirical followership studies since 2014	102
Figure 7 The distributions of the mean values for both followership scales	224

List of Abbreviations

ACO	ant colony optimization
AE	active engagement
CFA	confirmatory factor analysis
CFI	Comparative Fit Index
EFA	exploratory factor analysis
EPC	expected parameter change
FTF	Formal Theory of Followership
ICT	independent, critical thinking
IFTs (LIFTs; FIFTs)	Implicit Followership Theories (Leader's Implicit Followership
	Theories; Followers' Implicit Followership Theories)
LACS	latent autoregressive/cross-lagged states model
LMX	leader-member exchange
М	mean
ME	measurement equivalence
MI	modification indices
OCBs	organizational citizenship behaviors
POS	perceived organizational support
RMSEA	Root Mean Square Error of Approximation
SD	standard deviation
S.E.	standard error
SITs	subordinate influence tactics
SRMR	Standardized Root Mean Square Residual
STD	standardized estimate
STMS-IS	single-trait multi-state models with indicator-specific residual factors
WLSMV	Weighted Least Square Mean and Variance Adjusted Estimator
WRMR	Weighted Root Mean Square Residual

1 Introduction

Leadership is considered an important factor for effectiveness, success, well-being, and development within organizations (see, for instance, Kozlowski et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2019; Lundqvist et al., 2023; Montano et al., 2023). As leadership research now has a more than hundred year-long tradition (Hunt & Fedynich, 2019; Lord et al., 2017), many facets of leadership have been explored (i.e., various attributes, behaviors, contexts, and skills; for related overviews, see, for instance, Banks et al., 2018; Day et al., 2014; Fischer et al., 2017; Oc, 2018; Zaccaro et al., 2018). However, researchers have predominately focused on leaders, leader behaviors, and its outcomes (i.e., leadership). They have largely neglected the active role of followers and their contributions to goal attainment or failure (i.e., followership; Carsten et al., 2018; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Over the last few decades, several authors have highlighted the importance of followers and their followership for leadership and organizational success (e.g., Chaleff, 1995; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; Kelley, 1988, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Kelley (1988), for instance, stated that organizations are in fact dominated by followership, since almost all members are far more often or in many more situations followers than leaders. Chaleff (1995, p. 11), for instance, emphasized the responsibility that all organizational members share for the common purpose: "Followers and leaders both orbit around the purpose; followers do not orbit around the leader". Both Kelley (1988; 1992) and Chaleff (1995) thus criticized the predominant perspective, in which leaders exert a one-way influence over followers. In contrast, they conceptualized followers as having a great capacity to influence their leader-follower relationships. Furthermore, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) pointed to the simple fact that without followers there would be neither leaders nor leadership. Hence, they called for a better understanding of followers and their followership to fully understand leadership-related phenomena.

While theoretical work on followership has evolved over several decades (see, for instance, Carsten et al., 2010; Chaleff, 1995; 2015; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; Kelley, 1988; 1992; Kellerman, 2008; Sy, 2010; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), its empirical investigation has lagged behind in development (Carsten et al., 2018; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Considering the value that numerous authors see in followers for organizations (e.g., Chaleff, 1995; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; Kelley, 1988, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), the lack of empirical studies is a significant shortcoming of followership research. It limits the understanding of wanted and unwanted effects that different forms of followership may unfold within organizations. Moreover, since modern organizations increasingly focus on participation and empowerment of their members (see, for instance, Maynard et al., 2012; Parker et al., 2019), the role of followership in the leadership process and for organizational functioning are urgently needed.

This dissertation, therefore, aims to advance both followership theory and empirical research. In three studies, I will explore the role of followership in leadership by studying the two probably most influential accounts of followership: (i) Kelley's (1988; 1992) followership styles and (ii) the Formal Theory of Followership (henceforth: FTF; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). First, I will translate and test Kelley's (1992) prominent followership questionnaire to provide a currently missing measurement tool for German-speaking countries, and to examine its psychometric properties. Second, I will undertake the long overdue empirical testing of Kelley's (1992) theoretical assumptions, which are still prevalent today in followership research (see, for instance, Carsten et al., 2018; Khan et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2023). Third, I will explore the impact and practicality of the most comprehensive followership framework of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). In this way, I will contribute to a better understanding of followership in the context of work and organizations (i.e., in view of relevant findings,

methods, strengths, and weaknesses). In addition, I will develop the followership framework of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) further to incorporate the latest developments, and to advance followership theory. In the following, I will first provide an overview of followership theory and past research. Then I will outline the concrete research questions for this project. Subsequently, I will present the three studies of this dissertation, before I will finally discuss the overall findings.

2 Followership Theory and Past Research

For the most part, followership has been a neglected and poorly understood aspect of leadership and organizational functioning (Malakyan, 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). Leadership can be described as a social and goal-oriented influence process, whereby the term 'leadership' typically implies a greater impact of a leader on a follower than vice versa (Fischer et al., 2017). Traditionally, leadership research has thus been leader-centric (Ford & Harding, 2016; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). That is, leader attributes or behaviors have been studied as antecedents of leadership outcomes such as follower behaviors, performance, or team success (see, for instance, Banks et al., 2018; Day et al., 2014; Zaccaro et al., 2018).

Leadership research has acknowledged to some extent that followers themselves can have an impact on leaders and the leadership process (e.g., relational approaches; see Martin et al., 2017; Matthews et al., 2021). Those approaches, however, have still privileged the leader as the driving force of their social interactions and relationships (Law-Penrose et al., 2015; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). So-called follower-centric approaches (e.g., Meind, 1995; Rush et al., 1977) have indeed focused on followers. But they have studied the followers' perspectives on leaders and leadership (e.g., the followers' beliefs about prototypical leaders' attributes; Epitropaki & Martin 2005; Shondrick et al., 2010) rather than their followers' self-conception or role orientation. Hence, those approaches have studied leaders and leadership rather than followership (for a related overview of the follower treatment in leadership research, see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Followership approaches, in contrast, focus on the social constructions, the role, and the contribution of followers and their following (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). They aim for a better understanding of followership and, thus, build models that privilege the followers as the causal agents for related outcomes (such as follower effectiveness or leader-follower relationships; see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). According to the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018), followership refers to (i) followership characteristics and/or to (ii) followership behaviors. Followership characteristics can be described as "characteristics that impact how one defines and enacts followership" (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 96). Followership behaviors are defined as "behaviors enacted from the standpoint of a follower role or in the act of following" (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 96). In sum, "Followership theory is the study of the nature and impact of followers and following in the leadership process" (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 96).

In the following, I will provide an overview of the evolution of followership theory and past research along two essential development lines. First, I will present the development of followership typologies that defined and built upon various forms of followership behaviors and characteristics. Second, I will further outline the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) that incorporates a broad variety of pertinent research and variables into a comprehensive followership research framework.

2.1 Followership Typologies of Behaviors and Characteristics

The evolution of followership theory is characterized by the creation of several typologies. These typologies (e.g., Carsten et al., 2010; Chaleff, 1995; 2008; Kelley, 1992; Kellerman, 2008) involve different approaches to define followership behaviors and characteristics. They either aim to categorize how followers actually see and carry out their follower role (e.g., Kelley, 1992; Potter & Rosenbach, 2006), or propose concepts how

they *should* carry out their follower role (e.g., Chaleff, 1995; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; see also Crossman & Crossman, 2011).

As early as 1965, Zaleznik first offered a typology and suggested that followers can be characterized based on the dynamics of their subordinacy (see also Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). According to Zaleznik (1965), followers either want to dominate their leader or be dominated by their leader. Furthermore, they are conceptualized as either active or passive. Two decades later, Kelley (1988) similarly proposed behavioral styles that followers adopt in organizations. Such characteristic behavior patterns (i.e., styles) result from the level of their independent, critical thinking towards their leader and their active engagement in the leadership process (Kelley, 1988; 1992). Both Zaleznik (1965) and Kelley (1988) were thus among the first to address the need for a better understanding of followers and their followership in organizations. Since Kelley (1992) further developed his theoretical approach in his book "The Power of Followership", his work is, however, widely considered as pioneering and most influential (see, for instance, Crossman & Crossman, 2011; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

According to Kelley (1992), effective followers actively participate in the leadership process and take initiative (i.e., "active engagement" [AE] as the first followership dimension). They also independently think for themselves and provide constructive criticism to their leader (i.e., "independent, critical thinking" [ICT] as the second followership dimension). In contrast, ineffective followers simply take directions, do not independently think for themselves, and do not question their leader's decisions. According to Kelley (1992), the different combinations of AE and ICT result in five styles of followership behavior (see Figure 1). These styles are (i) "passive" (i.e., low in both dimensions), (ii) "conformist" (i.e., high in AE, but low in ICT), (iii) "alienated" (i.e., low in AE, but high in ICT), (iv) "exemplary" (i.e., high in both dimensions), and (v) "pragmatist" (i.e., with medium levels in both dimensions).

Figure 1

Followership styles according to Kelley (1992)



While several studies suggest that Kelley's (1988; 1992) followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT) are positively related to important organizational variables (e.g., job attitudes; see, for instance, Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014; Gatti et al., 2017), the empirical investigation of Kelley's (1992) conception is still in its infancy. Moreover, a couple of validation studies (Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014) have questioned the validity of Kelley's followership questionnaire in its original form (see Kelley, 1992). The factor structure was found to be different to what Kelley (1992) had predicted (see Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2009; Mat predicted (see Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014). Thus, previous findings of studies that used his questionnaire in its original form (e.g., Kim & Schachter, 2015; Tanoff & Barlow, 2002) should be interpreted with due caution.

Several authors built on and followed Kelley (1992) and developed different followership typologies. Thereby, those authors echoed his ideas of passive versus active followers (e.g., Carsten et al., 2010; Chaleff, 1995; Howell & Mendez, 2008; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; Kellerman, 2008; Potter & Rosenbach, 2006; Steger et al., 1982; Sy, 2010) and/or dependent versus independent followers (e.g., Carsten et al., 2010; Chaleff, 2008; Howell & Mendez, 2008; Potter & Rosenbach, 2006; Sy, 2010). Subsequent approaches to followership were thus either comparable or directly related to Kelley's (1992) work. However, they differ in aspects that they emphasized, left out, or added to their approach.

That is, Chaleff (1995; 2008), for instance, called for "The Courageous Follower" who is actively "Standing Up to and for Our Leaders" (Chaleff, 1995). According to Chaleff (1995), the need for the followers' courage is particularly relevant in strong hierarchical (e.g., military) contexts, where leaders often fail to initiate the followers' participation and feedback by themselves. Accordingly, he focused on behaviors that support or challenge the leader (Chaleff, 2008). While he specifically focused on the need for the followers' courage (Chaleff, 1995; 2008), his followership conception is, in fact, largely comparable to Kelley's (1988; 1992) approach. The "courage to support the leader" (Chaleff, 2008) reflects a form of follower engagement in the leadership process (see the AE dimension of Kelley, 1992). The "courage to challenge the leader" (Chaleff, 2008) reflects a form of independent, critical thinking (see the ICT dimension of Kelley, 1992).¹

Similarly, other typologies built upon the earlier concepts of Zaleznik (1965) and Kelley (1992), but highlighted certain aspects or added them to their approach. Potter and Rosenbach (2006), for instance, built upon the idea of proactive versus passive followers, but they also differentiated the followers' initiatives by the means of their purpose. That is, according to Potter and Rosenbach (2006), active followers initiate (i) follower performance (i.e., collaboration and embracing change) as well as (ii) relationship-building with the leader (i.e., identifying with the leader, building trust, and courageous communication). As another example, Kellerman (2008) drew from the proactivity concept

¹ Chaleff (2008, p. 75) stated by himself: "This typology bears resemblance to the one used by Robert Kelley…".

and developed a typology of passive versus active followers in relation to political leaders. Depending on the level of their engagement in the leader's policies and agendas, she categorized followers as "isolates", "bystanders", "participants", "activists", or "diehards" (Kellerman, 2008). Thereby, Kellerman (2004; 2008) also pointed to the dark side of followership, since—according to her—passive followers contribute to producing and maintaining bad (e.g., destructive) leadership (see also Almeida et al, 2021). Furthermore, Hurwitz and Hurwitz (2015) tried to integrate complementary followership and leadership skills into a 'partnership model'. They suggested five areas of desirable followership skills along with their associated behaviors: (i) Adding value to decision making, (ii) taking initiative, (iii) aligning and thriving within the broader organization, (iv) informative and stimulating communication with the leader, and (v) building a trustful relationship with the leader. While followership research has begun to investigate Kelley's (1992) approach to followership, other behavioral approaches (e.g., Chaleff, 1995; 2008; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; Potter & Rosenbach, 2006; Kellerman, 208) are still awaiting empirical testing (for rare exceptions, see Baker et al., 2016; Dixon & Westbrook, 2003).

In addition to those behavioral typologies, most recent approaches have focused on followership characteristics that reflect general beliefs about the follower role or prototypical followers rather than their executed behaviors. That is, Carsten et al. (2010), for instance, developed a typology of follower role orientations based on a qualitative study. In line with previous approaches (e.g., Kelley, 1992), followers are conceptualized to construct follower roles along passive, active, and proactive dimensions (Carsten et al., 2010). Proactive followers are considered active co-producers who are both willing to support and willing to constructively challenge their leaders if needed (Carsten et al., 2010). Later quantitative studies (Carsten et al., 2018; 2021) supported their conception, since followers with a stronger co-production orientation were more likely to speak up to the leader, reported greater effort, and greater performance.

Other prominent typologies that are based on followership characteristics focus on general beliefs about prototypical (or anti-prototypical) followers (i.e., so-called Implicit Followership Theories; IFTs; see, for instance, Junker et al., 2016; Sy, 2010). IFTs describe cognitive structures and schemas about the traits and behaviors that characterize followers (Guo, 2018). According to Sy's (2010) approach, for instance, prototypical followers can be categorized as loyal and reliable (i.e., "good citizen"), arrogant and rude (i.e., "insubordination"), excited (i.e., "enthusiasm"), easily influenced (i.e., "conformity"), inexperienced and slow (i.e., "incompetence"), or hardworking and willing to go above and beyond the mere duties (i.e., "industry"). The findings of several studies suggest that IFTs influence how leaders evaluate their employees and their relationships with them (for related overviews, see Epitropaki et al., 2013; Junker & van Dick, 2014). Most studies, however, have focused on the leader's IFTs (i.e., LIFTs) rather than the followers' selfconceptions (i.e., FIFTs; Epitropaki et al., 2013; Junker & van Dick, 2014). Hence, only little research (e.g., Sy, 2010) has been conducted to study FIFTs as a followership characteristic that may contribute to a better understanding of followers and their followership (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

In sum, followership theory has emerged from conceptualizing followership typologies that define different forms of followership behaviors and characteristics. Those typologies have in common that they largely build on the followers' proactivity (vs. passivity) and/or independence from the leader (vs. conformity). Hitherto, those theoretical approaches to followership have been rarely tested (Carsten et al., 2018; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

2.2 The Comprehensive Framework of the Formal Theory of Followership (FTF)

In addition to the prominent (and early) theoretical approaches that are a core part of the followership concept (see the chapter above), Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) identified even more facets of followership that needed further examination (e.g., constructionist views in addition to role-based views, for details see below). Moreover, they identified numerous research streams (e.g., research on subordinate influence tactics, voice, or feedback seeking) that may contribute to a better understanding of followership and, hence, may complement those early approaches. After reviewing the followership literature in 2014, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014, p. 96) thus concluded: "for followership research to advance, one of the biggest needs is to clearly define and identify theoretical constructs for the study of followership". With their new Formal Theory of Followership (FTF), Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) defined such boundaries for the study of followership (i.e., what followership is and is not).

They generally defined followership characteristics as those characteristics that impact how one defines and enacts followership. They further defined followership behaviors as those behaviors that are enacted from the standpoint of a follower role or in the act of following (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Among the proposed followership behaviors were, for instance, the followers' obedience, resistance, upward influence, voice, or initiative taking. Proposed followership characteristics were, for instance, FIFTs, follower role orientations, or follower identities (see Uhl-Bien et a., 2014). Furthermore, they proposed genuine followership outcomes on the individual follower level (i.e., for instance, high potential), on the individual leader level (i.e., for instance, motivation), and on the relationship level (i.e., for instance, trust). Among the proposed leadership process outcomes was, for instance, unethical conduct (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

To formulate relevant research questions and to create pertinent models, the FTF additionally provides two basic approaches that can be applied in followership research: (i) the role-based and (ii) the constructionist approach. The role-based approach refers to followership characteristics and behaviors that are enacted from the standpoint of a follower role, rank, or position (e.g., subordinate). According to this approach, followership characteristics and behaviors are studied as antecedents of followership outcomes (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). That is, for instance, subordinates may initiate relationship-building activities to increase their supervisor's trust. All followership typologies that were described in the previous chapter are role-based approaches.

The constructionist approach to followership, in contrast, explores why, when, and how following behaviors or identities are constructed (Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Its focus is on how individuals—regardless of any formal rank or position—mutually interact and engage in social and relational contexts to construct (or not construct) followership (and leadership; see also DeRue & Ashford, 2010). Hence, rather than studying behaviors from the standpoint of a subordinate position (see the role-based approach), the constructionist approach centers on the actual act of following. That is, the act of following involves recognizing and granting legitimacy to another's influence attempts (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). This does not necessarily align with formal hierarchical roles (i.e., superiors might not lead and subordinates might not follow; see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

In sum, the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) integrates various concepts and approaches into one comprehensive followership framework. With their FTF, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) defined pertinent theoretical constructs for the study of followership and created promising avenues for subsequent followership research to advance. Since then, followership research has been perceived as an emerging field (see, for instance, Carsten et al., 2018; Khan et al., 2019).

2.3 Central Objectives of the Dissertation and Research Questions

Based on this background of followership theory and past research, I will outline the research questions of this dissertation. The main focus of this dissertation is to test Kelley's (1992) prominent approach to followership for several reasons. First, his work is widely considered as pioneering and most influential (see Crossman & Crossman, 2011; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Second, his ideas are still referred to today (see, for instance, Carsten et al., 2018; Khan et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2023). Moreover, Kelley's (1992) book on "The Power of Followership" is the most cited original work on followership with over 1,600 citations in *googlescholar* in July 2024. Hence, among the different theoretical approaches to followership (see the previous chapters), Kelley's (1988; 1992) work is particularly important. As described above, however, its empirical investigation is still in its infancy. Central assumptions are still awaiting empirical testing. A central objective for this dissertation, therefore, is to test the critical theoretical assumptions of Kelley's (1988; 1992) prominent approach, which are still prevalent today (see, for instance, Carsten et al., 2018; Khan et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2023).

In order to do so, a valid measure of followership in accordance with Kelley's account is necessary. In contrast to other followership approaches, Kelley (1992) provided a questionnaire along with his model that should facilitate its examination. Previous validation studies of Kelley's (1992) questionnaire (Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014), however, reported that the factor structure was different to what Kelley (1992) had assumed. Since most of the previous studies have used Kelley's (1992) questionnaire in the original form (e.g., Kim & Schachter, 2015; Mushonga & Torrance, 2008; Tanoff and Barlow, 2002), their findings were likely to be flawed by incorrect assessment of the followership behaviors. Furthermore, the original questionnaire is in English language. Hence, a valid German version of Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire is needed to conduct followership research in German-speaking countries. The first set of research questions, therefore, is:

Research question 1: How can followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT; Kelley, 1992) be measured in German language? Research question 2: Are active engagement (i.e., AE) and independent, critical thinking (i.e., ICT) two distinctive followership dimensions? In addition to the problematic assessments of Kelley's (1992) followership behaviors (i.e., inadequate factor structure, see above), previous studies were limited to cross-sectional quantitative designs (see, for instance, Blanchard et al., 2014; Byun et al., 2018; Gatti et al., 2014; Gatti et al., 2017). The central assumption of Kelley's (1992) approach is that followers adapt certain followership styles. The conception of styles implies that followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT) reflect rather stable behavior patterns. Previous studies, however, did not test whether this fundamental assumption is true. A longitudinal study with a latent state-trait approach (Geiser, 2020; Steyer et al., 2015) could reveal whether Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire assess more traitlike or more state-like attributes. More trait-like behavior patterns would support Kelley's (1992) conception of styles. A state-like nature of followership behavior would question Kelley's (1992) theory, as followership would then rather be spontaneous, dynamic, or variable. Therefore, I state the following research question:

Research question 3: Do followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT; Kelley, 1992) reflect consistent behavior patterns?

Previous studies on Kelley's (1992) followership behaviors (e.g., Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014; Gatti et al., 2017) suggest significant relationships to critical jobrelated variables (e.g., job satisfaction or organizational commitment). It is an essential assumption of followership theory (Kelley, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) that followership behaviors are (major) predictors for relevant followership outcomes. Due to their crosssectional design, however, previous studies could not provide evidence for the direction of the proposed effects (i.e., are followership behaviors predictors of those critical job-related variables or are they their consequences?; see Blanchard et al., 2014; Byun et al., 2018; Gatti et al., 2014; Gatti et al., 2017). Hence, a longitudinal approach is needed to shed light on the direction of effects between followership behaviors and important variables in the work context. Thus, I state the following research question: Research question 4: Do followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT; Kelley, 1992) predict critical variables in the context of work (i.e., job attitudes and self-efficacy)?

Besides Kelley's (1992) highly influential followership conception, the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) has emerged as an authoritative and already classic theoretical work (with more than 1,800 citations of Uhl-Bien et al. [2014] in googlescholar in July 2024). For a better understanding of the role of followership in leadership, I will thus widen the scope beyond Kelley's (1992) conception and adopt the broader framework of the FTF. While Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) created promising avenues for subsequent followership research, its further development has not been systematically reviewed. Such a review, however, is highly needed to evaluate whether followership is indeed an emerging field as is commonly assumed (see, for instance, Carsten et al., 2018; Khan et al., 2019). Moreover, if this is the case, the followership field may have substantially evolved. New theoretical constructs, measures, or alternative methodological approaches may have emerged since the publication of Uhl Bien et al.'s FTF. The followership framework would then have to be extended or updated. Furthermore, to evaluate whether the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) indeed provides a valuable framework to advance followership research, the theoretical notions of the FTF need to be tested. Therefore, I state the following set of research questions:

Research question 5: How has the field of empirical followership research (in the context of work and organizations) evolved since Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) presented their "Formal Theory of Followership" (FTF)? Research question 6: Can the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) in fact be applied to unambiguously identify the proposed followership approaches and variables within published empirical studies? Research question 7: Which emerging theoretical constructs, measures, or methodological approaches have developed the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) further?

I will address those research questions with three studies. The first study aims to answer research questions 1 and 2 by conducting a validation study for a German version of Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire. Study 2 addresses research questions 3 and 4 by testing Kelley's (1992) followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT) with a longitudinal design and a latent state-trait approach (Geiser, 2020; Steyer et al., 2015). In Study 3, I will systematically review the field of empirical followership research (in the context of work and organizations) since Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) presented their FTF. Hence, Study 3 deals with research questions 5 to 7. I list all three studies of this dissertation hereafter:

- Study 1: Ribbat, M., Krumm, S., & Hüffmeier, J. (2021). Validation of a German version of Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire. *Psychological Test Adaption and Development*, 2(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1027/2698-1866/a000005
- Study 2: Ribbat, M., Nohe, C., & Hüffmeier, J. (2023). Followership styles scrutinized: temporal consistency and relationships with job attitudes and self-efficacy. *PeerJ*, *11*, e16135. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.16135
- Study 3: Ribbat, M., Klasmeier, K., & Hüffmeier, J. (2024). Empirical followership research since the publication of the Formal Theory of Followership by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) A systematic review. *Collabra: Psychology*, *10*(1), 92804. https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.92804

The three studies have been conducted with coauthors. The roles and contributions of all authors are presented in Table 1. Thereby, I refer to the *Contributor Role Taxonomy* (Brand et al., 2015).

Table 1

Roles and contribution of the (co-)authors according to the Contributor Roles Taxonomy

Term	Study 1			Study 2			Study 3		
	MR	SK	JH	MR	CN	JH	MR	KK	ЛН
Conceptualization	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
Methodology	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
Formal Analysis	Х			Х			Х		
Investigation	Х			Х			Х	Х	
Data Curation	Х			Х			Х		
Writing – Original Draft	Х			Х			Х		
Writing – Review & Editing	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
Supervision			Х			Х			Х

Note. MR = Mirko Ribbat, SK = Stefan Krumm, JH = Joachim Hüffmeier, CN = Christoph Nohe, KK = Kai Klasmeier.

3 Study 1 — Validation of a German Version of Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire

Authors: Mirko Ribbat, Stefan Krumm, Joachim Hüffmeier

3.1 Introduction

Traditionally, leadership research has taken the perspective of leaders influencing their followers (i.e., a leader-centric view; Dinh et al., 2014; Lord et al., 2017). In contrast, the contribution of followers to the leadership process has long been neglected. In their review on followership, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014, p. 89) stated that even if "most research on leadership recognizes the follower in some way, the focus on followership as a research area in its own right has not occurred until very recently [...]." Followership can be defined as "behaviors of individuals acting in relation to a leader(s)" (Carsten et al., 2010, p. 545), including the way followers take responsibility relative to their leader, the way they communicate, or the way they try to solve problems with their leader. Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) argued that a deeper understanding of followership is essential for a better understanding of leadership because without followers there would be neither leaders nor leadership.

While Kelley (1988) already stressed the organizational value of the follower in the 1980s, empirical tests of extant theoretical approaches to followership remain scant (Oc & Bashur, 2013; for such approaches, see, for instance, Chaleff, 1995; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; Kellerman, 2008; Kelley, 1992). A problem that prevents progress is that only very few validated instruments to study followership are available (Baker, 2007). To the best of our knowledge, Kelley (1992) was the first to develop a followership questionnaire. The questionnaire is based on his theoretical account, understanding followership behaviors as the followers' active engagement (AE) in the leadership process and their independent, critical thinking (ICT) toward their leader. According to Kelley (1992), the best followers actively participate in the leadership process and take initiative (AE), rather than being

passive and lazy. At the same time, they think for themselves and give constructive criticism to their leader (ICT), rather than simply taking directions and requiring constant supervision. Thus, ideal followers have an adequate balance of actively accepting the follower role and questioning leaders' decisions. In this way, they contribute to leadership and, ultimately, to organizational success.

With the current research, we intend to provide a basis for further followership research in German-speaking countries by adapting and validating a German version of Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire. We therefore translated the original English version into German and conducted two studies to validate our translation. In Study 1, we explored the factorial structure of our questionnaire. In Study 2, we tested the convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity of the measurement instrument.

Our study extends current research because there is no validated questionnaire on followership behavior in German-speaking countries yet. With our study, we provide a questionnaire for researchers and practitioners to assess the followership behavior of German-speaking employees. Furthermore, we study the generalizability of prior findings in another cultural context by testing construct relationships that were also investigated in other validation studies of Kelley's instrument (Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014) in a sample of German employees.

3.2 The Present Research

3.2.1 Evidence on the Questionnaire's Structure

Blanchard et al. (2009) conducted a validation study of Kelley's (1992) questionnaire for the original English items with a sample of faculty members at a large university. Gatti et al. (2014) conducted a validation study for their Italian translation with a sample of employees from different organizational settings. The two factors conceptualized by Kelley (1992) emerged in both studies (i.e., AE and ICT), while the items partly loaded on different dimensions than Kelley had predicted. Notably, Blanchard et al. (2009) found an additional third factor. However, they argued that the first four items of Kelley's questionnaire do not tap into follower behavior but into attitudes and affect (e.g., the first item: "Does your work help you fulfill some societal goal or personal dream that is important to you?"). They suggested eliminating these four items as the goal of Kelley's instrument is to tap into behavior. Hence, we followed the suggestion of Blanchard et al. (2009)—an approach also taken by Gatti et al. (2014). In both validation studies, the final adjusted instrument contained 14 items. Blanchard et al. (2009) reported reliabilities of $\alpha = .86$ for AE and $\alpha = .74$ for ICT with a factor correlation of r = .38, p < .001. In the Italian version, the reliabilities were $\alpha = .94$ for AE and $\alpha = .79$ for ICT with a factor correlation of r = .55, p < .001 (Gatti et al., 2014). While Blanchard et al. (2009) did not conduct a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and therefore did not report model fit indices, Gatti et al. (2014) reported a model fit of $\chi^2(73) = 296.66$, p < .001, $\chi^2/df = 3.90$, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .96, RMSEA = .10, and SRMR = .07, for a two-factorial solution. Because we chose a comparable approach to the two prior studies, we predict the following:

Hypothesis 1: Our German translation of Kelley's questionnaire will show a twofactor solution.

3.2.2 Correlations with Other Measures

To test whether we would obtain evidence for convergent validity, we included the following constructs: personal initiative at work (Frese et al., 1997), self-responsibility (Bierhoff et al., 2005), and subordinate influence tactics (SITs; Blickle & Gönner, 1999).

First, personal initiative at work (Frese et al., 1997) should be associated with AE. Personal initiative is defined as a "behavior syndrome resulting in an individual's taking an active and self-starting approach to work" (Frese et al., 1997, p. 140). Personal initiative and active followership behavior both concern an individual's inclination to take action. However, personal initiative describes general proactive behavior and is not specifically directed to the leader. Thus, it differs from followership, but due to its conceptual relatedness, we expect it to be positively correlated with AE.

Second, we included self-responsibility (Bierhoff et al., 2005) as an indicator of convergent validity for ICT. Bierhoff et al. (2005) defined self-responsibility in organizations as implying calculated risk-taking to increase organizational success by acting self-reliantly. Thus, self-responsibility and ICT focus on the self as an independent and self-contained individual. However, self-responsible action in organizations is not necessarily directed to the leader. Still, due to its conceptual relatedness, we expect a positive relation to ICT.

Third, we gauged SITs (Blickle & Gönner, 1999). SITs refer to employees' ways to assert important issues vis-à-vis their leader (e.g., by using rational influence or exerting pressure). They are conceptually similar to at least one general aspect of followership behavior: SITs imply an intentional and critical approach to carry out the follower role. In sum, we expect a moderate positive correlation for all concerned relationships (r = .50; Cohen, 1988). Our hypotheses on convergent validity are the following:

Hypothesis 2: AE will be positively and at least moderately (i.e., $r \ge .50$; Cohen, 1988) related to (a) personal initiative at work and (b) SITs. Hypothesis 3: ICT will be positively and at least moderately (i.e., $r \ge .50$) related to (a) self-responsibility in organizations and (b) SITs.

In accordance with Gatti et al. (2014), we assess leader-member exchange (LMX) as an indicator for discriminant validity. LMX describes the development of mature relationships between leaders and followers to generate more effective leadership (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Since LMX assesses the quality of relationships and not follower behaviors, both constructs should not overlap. Thus, we predict a weak correlation between LMX and followership, which would speak to the discriminant validity of Kelley's
questionnaire. Thus, the correlations with LMX should not be greater than r = .20 (Cohen, 1988).

Hypothesis 4: AE will only be weakly (r \leq .20; *Cohen, 1988) related to LMX. Hypothesis 5: ICT will only be weakly (r* \leq .20) *related to LMX.*

3.2.3 Relationship to Criteria

We posit that followership behaviors will be related to important work-related criteria, such as work-related attitudes (job satisfaction and organizational commitment), extra-role performance (organizational citizenship behaviors [OCBs]), and emotional states (exhaustion). Job satisfaction is defined as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). Organizational commitment "(a) characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization" (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). We draw on cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) and predict that actively engaged followers justify the effort they spend for their work and are, thus, likely to have more positive job-related attitudes. A related argument is also made by Blanchard et al. (2009, p. 115): "Because attitudes are usually easier to change than behaviors, employees will change their attitudes to justify their behavior." As employees spend considerable effort when actively engaging in their jobs, we expect a positive relation of AE with job satisfaction and organizational commitment:

Hypothesis 6: AE will be positively related to (a) job satisfaction and (b) organizational commitment.

However, in accordance with Blanchard et al. (2009), we predict a negative relation of ICT with both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Although similar effort has to be expended for ICT as for AE, we expect that ICT exerts a negative influence on attitudinal variables that also prevails over possible positive effects of effort justification. This is because ICT increases followers' awareness of the problems and negative aspects of their job. Thus, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 7: ICT will be negatively related to (a) job satisfaction and (b) organizational commitment.

Organ (1988) defined OCBs as voluntary behaviors at work, which are beneficial for organizational functioning. OCBs express a certain degree of involvement in the organization, and a similar involvement also underlies both followership dimensions. According to Kelley (1992), effective followers, for instance, tend to carry out assignments that go beyond their job. They also personally identify critical activities instead of waiting for the leader's instructions. The findings of Gatti et al. (2014) also suggest a positive relation of followership with OCBs. Thus, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 8: AE and ICT will be positively related to OCBs.

Emotional exhaustion refers to "feelings of being overextended and exhausted by the emotional demands of one's work" (Demerouti et al., 2001, p. 499). According to conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll et al., 1992), employees use strategies that minimize any further resource loss to cope with emotional exhaustion (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998). Both AE and ICT require a high level of energy (e.g., when going beyond standard tasks or managing conflicts with the leader) and thereby consume personal resources. Thus, in accordance with Gatti et al. (2014), we expect negative relations of both followership dimensions with emotional exhaustion:

Hypothesis 9: AE and ICT will be negatively related to emotional exhaustion.

Finally, we also included the Big Five personality traits (McCrae & Costa, 2003) in our study, which describe relatively stable patterns of behavior, thoughts, and emotions. They are labeled as "extraversion" (relating to attributes like sociable, gregarious, assertive, and ambitious), "neuroticism" (unstable, insecure, nervous, and highly sensitive), "openness" (perceptive, imaginative, cultured, and curious), "agreeableness" (meaning courteous, helpful, trusting, and cooperative), and "conscientiousness" (dependable, hardworking, efficient, and organized; Barrick et al., 2005). Gatti et al. (2014) reported positive correlations of both followership dimensions with extraversion. In the current study, we will test whether AE and ICT will account for variance increments in the outcome variables (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, OCBs, and emotional exhaustion) over and above the broad personality traits to check whether the two followership dimensions show incremental validity.

3.3 Study 1

The aim of Study 1 was to test whether our German version of Kelley's (1992) questionnaire fits a two-factor solution equivalent to the previous validation studies (Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014; Hypothesis 1).

3.3.1 Method

3.3.1.1 Participants

We conducted an anonymous online survey via the German "SoSci Panel" (Leiner, 2016), an online respondent pool based on voluntary registration. We included only employees with a direct superior to ensure credible responses concerning followership behaviors in organizations. In addition, we tried to detect careless responses by following the procedures recommended by Meade and Craig (2012; for details, see Appendix A).

The final sample consisted of 451 employees (60.2% women, 39.2% men, and 0.6% respondents without a gender indication; Ribbat et al., 2020). The mean age of the participants was 42 years (SD = 11.06, Mdn = 42). Their highest education level was as follows: 21.6% of the respondents completed an apprenticeship, 26.0% a degree from a university of applied sciences, 37.4% a university degree, 7.6% a doctoral degree, 1.1% no professional degree, and 6.3% a degree not specified in the survey. Occupations of participants covered all domains (see Holland, 1996), that is, 33.5% had social professions, 20.5% conventional professions, 19.8% enterprising professions, 12.2% investigative

professions, 8.9% realistic professions, and 3.1% artistic professions. Participants' average tenure in their organizations was 11 years (SD = 10.38, Mdn = 7), and the average tenure with their leader was 5 years (SD = 4.98, Mdn = 3).

3.3.1.2 Instruments

Followership behaviors were measured with our translated German version of Kelley's (1992) questionnaire. We conducted three steps for the translation process as recommended by Bracken and Barona (1991). Details on the translation process and our translation can be found in Appendix B. Each item was answered on a 7-point rating scale. Possible responses ranged from 1 (*[almost] never*) to 7 (*[almost] always*).

3.3.1.3 Data Analysis

For the purpose of this study, we randomly split the sample into two subsamples. We used the first subsample (n = 226) to explore the factorial structure and compared the results to Kelley's theoretical categorization and the findings of the other two pertinent validation studies (Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014). Following Fabrigar et al. (1999), we considered the sample size as appropriate for the exploratory factor analysis (EFA), since we had a moderate level of communalities of the measured variables (with an average of .47) and expected at least three measured variables to represent each common factor.

Subsequently, we tested the adjusted final version of our questionnaire with a CFA independently in the second subsample (n = 225). For both factor analyses, we used Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2015) and the weighted least squares means and variance adjusted estimator (WLSMV). The goodness of fit was evaluated using the resulting chi-square values, the RMSEA, the CFI, and the weighted root mean square residual (WRMR). Following common recommendations (Cook et al., 2009; West et al., 2012), cutoff values for a good fit were defined as $p_{\chi}^2 < .05$, $\chi^2/df < 5$, CFI > .95, RMSEA < .06, and WRMR < 1.0. Furthermore, possible misspecifications were also detected based on

modification indices and standardized expected parameters of change, as described by Saris et al. (2009). A post hoc power analysis with semPower (Moshagen & Erdfelder, 2016) for the most complex CFA with a sample size of n = 225 to detect an RMSEA = .05 revealed a power $(1 - \beta)$ of .89. We use a reliability indicator based on factor models. For each followership dimension, we report the omega subscale (ω_s) as described by Rodriguez et al. (2016). We used Watkins' (2013) standalone program to compute ω_s .

3.3.2 Results

A detailed analysis of item and scale parameters can be found in Appendix C. A parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) with random normal data generation of 1,000 datasets yielded two factors. The first three raw data eigenvalues were 6.07, 1.84, and 1.00. The first three random data eigenvalues were 1.59, 1.46, and 1.36. This was in line with the optical test of the scree plot. Table 2 shows the factor loadings of the EFA with WLSMV estimator and promax rotation. The factors correlated with r = .50.

Four items loaded on the factor that Blanchard et al. (2009) and Gatti et al. (2014) termed "ICT" (Factor 2). The other factor contained a mix of items that we expected based on Kelley's (1992) theoretical considerations—to load on either AE or ICT. Blanchard et al. (2009) argued that these items describe both independent and proactive behaviors but consider the emerging factor to "most closely reflect what Kelley has proposed to be active, engaged followers" (Blanchard et al., 2009, p. 119). We agree with this assessment and accordingly term factor 1 "AE" and factor 2 "ICT." We excluded two items with comparatively weak loadings from subsequent analyses to obtain a model that is as robust as possible. This reduced the overall instrument from 16 to 14 items.

We tested this 14-item questionnaire with a two-factorial CFA in subsample 2. The detailed results are presented in Appendix D. All factor loadings were acceptable, and the model fit was $\chi^2(76) = 240.63$, p < .001, $\chi^2/df = 3.17$, RMSEA = .10 (.08–.11), CFI = .94, and WRMR = .96. While not all cutoff values for a good fit were reached, this fit can still

be described as reasonable (Hopwood & Donnellan, 2010). Additionally, the fit is comparable to the findings of Gatti et al. (2014). However, the misspecification test (Saris et al., 2009) revealed some difficulties with certain items that might point to local misspecification. Detailed information is presented in Appendix E. In order to avoid overspecification by data-driven adjustments, we checked potential misspecification again in Study 2 and examined whether the same misspecifications occurred.

Table 2

Results	of factor	analvsis.	subsample 1	
	<i>ej jacete</i> :		succentre 1	

	Item	Factor loading				
	-	1	2			
Factor	1: AE					
10.	Contribute high level (AE)	.88	16			
9.	Take initiative (AE)	.82	12			
15.	Understanding the needs and objectives (AE)	.74	18			
11.	Think up new ideas (ICT)	.71	.17			
6.	Actively develop (AE)	.67	.18			
8.	Highest quality work (AE)	.59	.19			
7.	Build success (AE)	.55	07			
12.	Solve tough problems (ICT)	.54	.26			
16.	Recognize one's strengths and weaknesses (ICT)	.54	.17			
5.	Personally identify (ICT)	.51	.33			
13.	Help coworkers (AE)	.47	.09			
14.	See opportunities and risks (ICT)	.45	.17			
Factor	2: ICT					
18.	Contrary (ICT)	18	.74			
19.	Ethical standards (ICT)	08	.72			
20.	Assert issues (ICT)	.08	.63			
17.	Question decisions (ICT)	.09	.63			

Note. n = 226. Kelley's (1992) categorization is presented in brackets.

Finally, a chi-squared difference test suggested that the two-factor solution fitted the data better than a potential one-factor solution, $\chi^2_{diff}(1) = 273.61$, p < .001. The factors correlated with .68 (p < .001) and showed good internal consistency. For the AE subscale factor, ω_s was .99 (95% CI ±.17), and for the ICT subscale factor, ω_s was .92 (95% CI ±.58).

3.4 Study 2

3.4.1 Method

The aim of Study 2 was to test the construct- and criterion-related validity of the translated instrument. In order to test the convergent and discriminant validity, we used two criteria. First, we inspected the magnitude of the relationships with other instruments. Since there was no other validated instrument available in German to measure followership behavior, we used measures that address followership behavior as directly as possible. We expected at least moderate correlations (i.e., r = .50; Cohen, 1988) of Kelley's followership behaviors with such measures. We interpret small correlations ($r \le .20$; Cohen, 1988) with theoretically unrelated constructs as evidence for divergent validity. Second, we expected correlations with theoretically related constructs to be considerably higher than with theoretically unrelated constructs (Campbell & Fiske, 1959).

3.4.1.1 Participants

Study 2 was again conducted via an anonymous online survey with the "SoSci Panel" (Leiner, 2016). We only included employees who had a direct superior and did not respond in a careless manner (Meade & Craig, 2012; for details, see Appendix A). The final sample contained 413 employees (59.8% women, 38.7% men, and 1.5% respondents without a gender indication; Ribbat et al., 2020). Participants' mean age was 42 years (SD = 11.49, Mdn = 40). Their highest education level was as follows: 20.1% of the respondents completed an apprenticeship, 22.8% a degree from a university of applied sciences, 44.3% a university degree, 6.8% a doctoral degree, 2.1% no professional degree,

and 4.8% a degree not specified in the survey. Occupations of participants covered all domains, that is, 33.4% had social professions, 21.1% conventional professions, 20.8% enterprising professions, 15.3% investigative professions, 6.8% realistic professions, and 2.7% artistic professions (see Holland, 1996). The average employment in the organization was 10 years (SD = 10.13, Mdn = 6.5), and the average tenure with their supervisor was 5 years (SD = 5.16, Mdn = 3).

3.4.1.2 Instruments

Followership behaviors were measured with the translated German version of Kelley's (1992) questionnaire comprising 14 items, as reported in Study 1. Possible responses ranged from 1 (*[almost] never*) to 7 (*[almost] always*). We used the questionnaire by Frese et al. (1997) to measure personal initiative at work with response options ranging from not correct at all (1) to applies completely (7). Self-responsibility was measured by the scale by Bierhoff et al. (2005) with response options ranging from very incorrect (1) to very correct (7). The four SITs "flattering," "rational influence," "exerting pressure," and "engaging superior authority" were measured with the questionnaire by Blickle and Gönner (1999). Response options ranged from (almost) never (1) to (almost) always (7). For LMX, we used the scale by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) in the German version (Schyns, 2002). The response options ranged from 1 to 7 (e.g., extremely ineffective [1] to extremely effective [7]). We applied a part of the "Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire" (Nübling et al., 2005) to measure job satisfaction with response options ranging from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (7). Organizational commitment was assessed with the scale by Mowday et al. (1979) in the German version (Maier & Woschée, 2002). Response options ranged from strongly disagree (1) to fully agree (7). We measured two OCBs (i.e., "helpfulness" and "initiative") with the scale by Staufenbiel and Hartz (2000). The range of possible responses was from not correct at all (1) to applies completely (7). The measure for emotional exhaustion was taken from the

"Maslach Burnout Inventory" (Maslach & Jackson, 1986) in the German version by Enzmann and Kleiber (1989). Participants were asked to indicate how often the following statements applied to them: Several times a year or rarer, once in a month, several times in a month, once a week, several times in a week, or daily. For the personality traits, we used the BFI-K instrument by Rammstedt and John (2005). Responses ranged from *very wrong* (1) to *very true* (7). Exemplary items for each instrument are provided in Appendix F.

3.4.1.3 Data Analysis

To assess the validity of the German version of Kelley's followership questionnaire, we inspected bivariate correlations with different constructs as delineated in the Hypotheses 2–9. Furthermore, we used hierarchical regression analysis to test whether AE and ICT accounted for variance increments of the criterion variables (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, OCBs, and emotional exhaustion) over and above the Big Five personality traits. A post hoc power analysis with GPower 3.1 (Faul et al., 2007) for a linear multiple regression model with a sample size of N = 413 and seven independent variables to detect a medium $H1 \rho^2 = .13$ (Cohen, 1988) revealed a power $(1 - \beta)$ of 1.00.

We first computed another CFA for the followership questionnaire based on the model we specified in Study 1. The model again had a reasonable fit (Hopwood & Donnellan, 2010): $\chi^2(76) = 349.42$, p < .001, $\chi^2/df = 4.60$, RMSEA = .09 (.08–.10), CFI = .93, and WRMR = 1.22. The misspecification detection (Saris et al., 2009) pointed to some problematic items. However, only one misspecification was identical to those reported in Study 1. That is, allowing residual correlations between the items "personally identify" ("Instead of waiting for or merely accepting what the leader tells you, do you personally identify which organizational activities are most critical for achieving the organization's priority goals?") and "actively develop" ("Do you actively develop a distinctive competence in those critical activities so that you become more valuable to the

leader and the organization?") significantly improved model fit across both studies. Although Landis et al. (2009) advised against improving model fit through specifying residual correlations (see, however, Cole et al., 2007), we felt that the common and specific aspect of proactively making oneself valuable to the organization in both items theoretically justified this residual correlation. Note that "actively develop" was presented right after "personally identify" and phrased to directly refer to the item content of "personally identify," which is consistent with the original version of the questionnaire. Thus, we allowed that error term correlation in the model, r = .44, p < .001, which improved the model fit: $\chi^2(75) = 302.06$, p < .001, $\chi^2/df = 4.03$, RMSEA = .09 (.08–.10), CFI = .94, and WRMR = 1.13. Further details are presented in Appendix E.

We also conducted a CFA for all other measured constructs we used in Study 2. In order to avoid cross loadings of the scales, we had to delete some items from different scales for further calculations. The scales for personal initiative, self-responsibility, the SIT "flattering," LMX, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, emotional exhaustion, extraversion, neuroticism, and openness were affected by these adjustments. We used the method of ant colony optimization (ACO; Olaru et al., 2019) to identify sets of items that fit the model and thus improved construct validity. ACO allows for testing model fit and reliability criteria simultaneously for different item sets by using an iterative process inspired by the foraging of ants (Olaru et al., 2019). Further details are provided in Appendix G.

For internal consistency, we report coefficient omega (ω ; McDonald, 1978) and ω_s for each dimension of multidimensional constructs (i.e., followership behaviors and OCBs). We used Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2015) to compute ω and Watkins' (2013) standalone program to compute ω_s .

3.4.2 Results

Table 3 summarizes descriptive statistics, coefficients ω or ω_s for internal consistency, and the intercorrelations of all latent models. The consistency estimates of the SIT "flattering" scale ($\omega = .69$) and the conscientiousness scale ($\omega = .66$) were slightly below the most commonly used minimum value of .70. All other scales showed at least good levels of internal consistency ($.70 \le \omega/\omega_s \le .97$). For the AE subscale factor, ω_s was .97 (95% CI ±.26), and for the ICT subscale factor, ω_s was .84 (95% CI ±.69). Furthermore, Table 3 additionally contains the intercorrelations of all latent models based on the initial versions of the external instruments (i.e., without ACO).

3.4.2.1 Results for Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Our findings revealed a significant and strong correlation of AE with personal initiative, r = .77, p < .001. The correlation of AE with the SIT "rational influence" was also significant, but slightly below moderate, r = .45, p < .001. Small correlations were found between AE and the SITs "exerting pressure", r = .19, p = .001, and "engaging superior authority", r = -.04, p = .55, and "flattering", r = .10, p = .07. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was only partly supported.

ICT was positively and moderately related to self-responsibility, r = .53, p < .001, and to the SIT "exerting pressure", r = .62, p < .001. Significant but smaller correlations were observed between ICT and the SITs "rational influence", r = .46, p < .001, and "engaging superior authority", r = .34, p < .001. However, we did not find a significant relationship of ICT with the SIT "flattering", r = -.07, p = .26. Hence, Hypothesis 3 was partially supported.

AE correlated slightly stronger with LMX than we expected (i.e., $r \le .20$), r = .28, p < .001. Still, we observed a weak correlation of AE with LMX. No significant correlation was found for ICT and LMX, r = -.08, p = .16. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was predominantly supported, and Hypothesis 5 was fully supported.

Table 3

Descriptive statistics and correlations for study variables

Variable	М	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1. AE	5.45	0.78	.97''	.64***	.10	.49***	.18**	04	.78***	.72***	.27***	.36***	.25***	.45***	.80***	12*	.34***	28***	.33***	04	.68***
2. ICT	4.85	0.96	.65***	.84''	08	.46***	.62***	.34***	.56***	.55***	08	01	12*	.25***	.58***	.03	.26***	24***	.28***	22***	.44***
3. SITs: Flattering	2.88	1.05	.10	07	.69'	.06	.12*	.19**	.05	10	.44***	.33***	.22***	.16**	.12*	09	.06	.15**	.01	.14*	03
4. SITs: Rational influence	5.80	0.92	.45***	.46***	.04	.78'	.16**	01	.48***	.58***	.18***	.25***	.09	.48***	.57***	20***	.22***	24***	.29***	07	.50***
5. SITs: Exerting pressure	2.83	1.15	.19**	.62***	.13*	.13*	.75'	.68***	.36***	.12*	30***	20***	22***	.05	.27***	.15**	.27***	16**	01	36***	.17**
6. SITs: Engaging superior Authority	2.06	1.21	04	.34***	.20**	03	.68***	.82'	.14*	.02	29***	19**	19**	.05	.14*	.12*	.10	09	01	15*	.05
7. Personal initiative	5.10	1.03	.77***	.56***	.07	.42***	.38***	.14*	.86'	.77***	.13*	.28***	.23***	.40***	.76***	14**	.46***	37***	.35***	11*	.76***
8. Self-responsibility	5.42	0.69	.72***	.53***	05	.54***	.09	.01	.76***	.74'	.13*	.31***	.22***	.63***	.75***	20***	.33***	41***	.48***	02	.76***
9. LMX	4.56	1.47	.28***	08	.41***	.23***	31***	29***	.13**	.17**	.91'	.83***	.58***	.08	.13*	41***	04	11*	05	.15**	.03
10. Job satisfaction	4.83	1.17	.39***	.02	.32***	.26***	14**	17**	.29***	.33***	.74***	.80'	.75***	.21***	.31***	59***	.09	33***	01	.26***	.20***
11. Organizational commitment	3.88	1.28	.22***	12*	.27***	.09	20***	17**	.20***	.20***	.59***	.70***	.89'	.19**	.26***	49***	.11*	24***	01	.27***	.09
12. OCBs: Helpfulness	5.50	0.80	.45***	.25***	.16**	.43***	.05	.05	.41***	.68***	.09	.25***	.18**	.92"	.76***	05	.34***	12	.40***	.33***	.48***
13. OCBs: Initiative	5.31	1.01	.80***	.58***	.13*	.52***	.27***	.14*	.77***	.76***	.14*	.36***	.25***	.76***	.96''	18**	.43***	35***	.40***	.09	.59***
14. Emotional exhaustion	2.42	1.10	12*	.05	08	18**	.19**	.13*	14*	19**	45***	62***	45***	05	17**	.86'	13**	.60***	.07	26***	17**
15. Extraversion	4.36	1.52	.23***	.19***	.06	.18**	.27***	.13*	.38***	.23***	04	.11*	.06	.27***	.34***	15**	.87'	36***	.32***	.24***	.32***
16. Neuroticism	3.65	1.42	25***	18**	.11*	19**	11*	08	33***	36***	17**	36***	22***	11	30***	.61***	27***	.77'	.00	21***	31***
17. Openness	5.37	1.13	.33***	.29***	.00	.23***	.02	.01	.38***	.48***	05	01	01	.39***	.41***	.02	.21***	04	.82'	.00	.35***
18. Agreeableness	4.49	1.16	04	22***	.13*	08	36***	15*	11	.03	.17**	.25***	.24***	.33***	.09	27***	23***	.03	.27***	.70'	05
19. Conscientiousness	5.36	0.91	.69***	.44***	03	.43***	.17**	.05	.76***	.73***	.05	.23***	.06	.48***	.59***	17**	25***	.34***	.26***	05	.66'

Notes. N = 413. Values along the diagonal represent internal consistency (' ω or " ω_s). Values above the diagonal represent the correlations for study variables in the initial form (i.e., without ACO).

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

3.4.2.2 Results for Criterion-Related Validity

Our findings revealed significant positive correlations of AE with job satisfaction, r = .39, p < .001, and with organizational commitment, r = .22, p < .001. Hence, Hypothesis 6 was supported. ICT was negatively but rather weakly related to organizational commitment, r = -.12, p = .04. Since we did not find the predicted negative correlation between ICT and job satisfaction, r = -.02, p = .78, Hypothesis 7 was only partly supported. AE correlated positively with both OCB dimensions: "helpfulness", r = .45, p < .001, and "initiative", r = .80, p < .001. ICT also correlated with "helpfulness", r = .25, p < .001, and "initiative", r = .58, p < .001. Hence, Hypothesis 8 was supported. AE correlated slightly negatively with emotional exhaustion, r = -.12, p = .03, while we did not observe the expected negative correlation of ICT with emotional exhaustion, r = .05, p = .38. Therefore, Hypothesis 9 was only partly supported.

3.4.2.3 Results for Incremental Validity

We also examined the incremental validity of AE and ICT in predicting job-related outcome variables above and beyond broad personality traits. The results of the hierarchical regression analyses are presented in Tables 4 and 5. Importantly, AE and ICT accounted for variance increments in all outcome variables. In fact, AE and ICT predicted incremental variance in job satisfaction with $\Delta R^2 = .09$, p < .001, indicating a small effect (Cohen, 1988) of $f^2 = 0.12$. Similarly, AE and ICT explained incremental variance in organizational commitment, $\Delta R^2 = .07$, p < .001, indicating a small effect of $f^2 = 0.08$. A moderate incremental contribution occurred for the OCB "initiative," $\Delta R^2 = .18$, p < .001, with a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988) of $f^2 = 0.33$. Small incremental contributions were observed for the prediction of OCB "helpfulness", $\Delta R^2 = .03$, p = .001, $f^2 = 0.04$, and for emotional exhaustion, $\Delta R^2 = .02$, p = .003, $f^2 = 0.03$.

Table 4

		J	lob Satisfaction	n		Organizational Commitment							
Variable	В	SE B	β	R^2	ΔR^2	В	SE B	β	\mathbb{R}^2	ΔR^2			
Step 1				.14	.14***				.06	.06***			
Extraversion	04	.04	05			03	.05	04					
Neuroticism	21	.04	25***			13	.05	14**					
Openness	05	.05	05			01	.06	01					
Agreeableness	.19	.05	.20***			.22	.06	.20***					
Conscientiousness	.17	.06	.14**			.02	.08	.02					
Step 2				.23	.09***				.13	.07***			
AE	.53	.08	.36***			.45	.10	.27***					
ICT	24	.06	20***			30	.08	23***					

Incremental validity of AE and ICT for job satisfaction and organizational commitment

Notes. N = 413.

** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001.

Table 5

	OCBs: Helpfulness						00	CBs: Initiati		Emotional Exhaustion					
Variable	В	SE B	β	\mathbb{R}^2	ΔR^2	В	SE B	β	\mathbb{R}^2	ΔR^2	В	SE B	β	\mathbb{R}^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.23	.23***				.27	.27***				.26	.26***
Extraversion	.04	.03	.07			.09	.03	.13**			01	.04	01		
Neuroticism	.00	.03	.00			11	.03	15**			.36	.04	.46***		
Openness	.14	.03	.19***			.19	.04	.21***			.06	.05	.06		
Agreeableness	.17	.03	.24***			00	.04	.00			14	.05	14**		
Conscientiousness	.23	.04	.26***			.34	.05	.31***			05	.06	04		
Step 2				.26	.03**				.45	.18***				.28	.02**
AE	.20	.06	.20**			.58	.06	.46***			10	.08	07		
ICT	.01	.04	.01			.11	.05	.10*			.20	.06	.18**		

Incremental validity of AE and ICT for OCBs and emotional exhaustion

Notes. N = 413.

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

3.5 Discussion

The aim of our two studies was to examine the psychometric properties of a German version of Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire. We found a two-factor structure in our data, equivalent to the original validation study by Blanchard et al. (2009) and the validation study by Gatti et al. (2014). The items did not unanimously load on the two factors that Kelley (1992) had predicted. However, this was also the case in the prior validation studies (Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014). Still, in accordance with Blanchard et al. (2009), the two identified factors can be interpreted as AE and ICT. A CFA of the resulting 14-item questionnaire showed an adequate model fit (Hopwood & Donnellan, 2010; Olaru et al., 2019). In addition, the fit was comparable to previous findings (Gatti et al., 2014) although the followership model could not reach all recommended cutoff values for a good model fit. However, Hopwood and Donnellan (2010) argued that previous studies might provide a more reasonable context for interpreting overall fit statistics than the rules of thumb widely used for model fit evaluation. Specifically, they concluded that the inherent complexity of personality measures often leads to poorer model fit statistics in a CFA (Hopwood & Donnellan, 2010). Thus, the presented fit of the followership model can be described as reasonable.

Furthermore, because relying on general cutoff values was repeatedly criticized (e.g., Greiff & Heene, 2017; Ropovik, 2015), we used a combination of confirmatory and exploratory analyses to reduce the risk of misspecification (Ropovik, 2015). In addition, we tried to detect local misspecification based on modification indices (Saris et al., 2009). While the misspecification method pointed to some potentially problematic items in the followership model, we could only find one consistent misspecification across Study 1 and Study 2. Consequently, we allowed residual correlations between the two items "personally identify" and "actively develop" as this was a plausible adjustment. Since the substantial residual correlation was replicated across two studies, mere specifics of a sample can be ruled out. We can only speculate about the commonality of the two items "personally identify" ("Instead of waiting for or merely accepting what the leader tells you, do you personally identify which organizational activities are most critical for achieving the organization's priority goals?") and "actively develop" ("Do you actively develop a distinctive competence in those critical activities so that you become more valuable to the leader and the organization?") beyond the active engagement factor. The direct reference made in one item to the other may be one reason. Future research may examine whether the residual correlation also emerges if the two items are not presented next to each other and the direct reference ("those critical activities") is replaced. From a followership perspective, another plausible commonality of the two concerned items may be that they reflect the efforts to achieve overarching organizational goals, which is also in line with Kelley's (1992) definition of followership, while the other followership items more specifically refer to the leader or group level. To substantiate this conjecture, further research is needed to test the effects of followership behaviors with different foci. The decision to keep both items or exclude one item does, however, not seem to be very important: When we dropped one of the two items ("actively develop"), thus accounting for the potential redundancy in these items, the correlations with other variables remained unchanged (see Table 3 and Appendix H).

Furthermore, we tested the convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity. Some correlations obtained with instruments included for establishing convergent and discriminant validity seem noteworthy. We found several correlations supporting the convergent validity of the two dimensions. For instance, AE strongly correlated with personal initiative at work. ICT was moderately related to self-responsibility. However, the positive correlation of AE with self-responsibility was even higher. Note that as a result of our factor analyses, the AE dimension became broader in scope. In the current version, AE includes, for instance, thinking up new ideas and solving tough problems. These behaviors should indeed relate to self-responsibility. We also observed that not all SITs were unanimously related to AE and ICT. It makes sense, however, that the SITs "exerting pressure" and "engaging superior authority" were more strongly related to ICT, which comprises followership behavior that may cause conflicts with a supervisor. As expected, we found only small correlations of LMX with AE and ICT, indicating discriminant validity. Importantly, correlations of the followership dimensions with variables that we considered as convergent indicators were considerably higher than those obtained with LMX.

In testing criterion-related validity, we found comparable results to previous findings regarding job satisfaction, organizational commitment, OCBs, emotional exhaustion, LMX, and extraversion (Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014). We also extended the nomological network by exploring relations of followership behaviors with these important organizational constructs while controlling for the influence of personality traits. AE and ICT both accounted for variance increments in all outcome variables above and beyond broad personality traits. Hence, our findings reveal that an active approach to followership is associated with desired organizational outcomes. This is in line with the argument of Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) that followership is essential for better understanding leadership because it contributes to the understanding of how more or less effective followership behavior contributes to the leadership process.

However, we also observed correlations indicating that ICT is not always positively associated with desired leadership outcomes. In accordance with our hypotheses, ICT was negatively related to organizational commitment and did not correlate with job satisfaction. These results do not correspond with Kelley's (1992) assumption that active and critical followers are the most effective. This assumption may thus not apply as broadly as expected by Kelley. For instance, there might be leaders who do not want followers to act too independently. Thus, the effectiveness of followership might depend on the fit of implicit role expectations between followers and their leaders (Carsten et al., 2010, 2018). Hence, more empirical work in the field of followership is needed to better understand the impact, interaction, and potential boundary conditions of active and critical followership behaviors within organizations.

Our validation study opens further concrete avenues for future research. The German instrument can be used to assess followership behaviors within German organizations and to compare followership behaviors in Germany with other countries. Such research is called for because of an increasing number of global work teams and since cultural differences between countries might affect the relationships between followership, leadership, and organizational outcomes (e.g., via varying power distance or institutional collectivism; e.g., Haire et al., 1966; House et al., 2004). Another particularly promising and innovative direction for future research could be to complement effective leadership training with appropriate followership development programs (Bufalino, 2018).

3.6 Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. Since we adapted a questionnaire to measure followership behaviors, we only collected self-report data. The relatively high mean values for the followership dimensions might indicate certain risks of social desirability. To address related problems, future research could match the subjective evaluations of followers with their leaders' perceptions (Gatti et al., 2014). Furthermore, our analysis was based on cross-sectional data. Future research should investigate the reported relations especially for criterion-related validity in longitudinal studies to get indications for the causality underlying them.

We found evidence for the factorial structure, internal consistency, convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity for our German translation of Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire. With this, we provide a basis for further followership research in German-speaking countries. However, we recommend future research to pay attention to potential local misspecifications of the followership model. Furthermore, we point to the broad interpretation of what we used as convergent indicators, since no other followership questionnaire in German was available. In addition, we had to adjust most of the instruments we used in this study to achieve adequate model fit, which reduces their comparability to other studies.

3.7 Conclusion

The German version of Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire showed the intended factorial structure and was related to meaningful organizational variables. We hope that the availability of this followership questionnaire can facilitate future research, both on followership and on leadership. The final German questionnaire is provided in Appendix B.

4 Study 2 — Followership Styles Scrutinized: Temporal Consistency and Relationships with Job Attitudes and Self-efficacy

Authors: Mirko Ribbat, Christoph Nohe, Joachim Hüffmeier

4.1 Introduction

The tradition of a classic leader-centric view (i.e., the focus on the leader's role and characteristics) is still dominant in the field of leadership research and practice (Avolio et al., 2009; Banks et al., 2018; Dinh et al., 2014). However, the specific roles and contributions of followers in the leadership process (i.e., followership) have gained more attention in recent years (see, for instance, Khan et al., 2019; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). In their integrative literature review and "Formal Theory of Followership" (FTF), Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) highlighted several ways to study how followers construe and enact their follower role, and how this may affect leaders and followership outcomes (i.e., the rolebased approach to followership; see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). In addition, they introduced the constructionist perspective on followership, which centers on how individuals mutually interact to (co-)construct leadership and followership identities. Thus, according to the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), followership either describes the role enactment from a predefined follower rank or position, or reflects an individual's actual act of following in a social interaction process. While the co-construction approach to followership is a rather novel approach within the field of followership research, the role-based approach has been developed over several decades (see, for instance, Chaleff, 1995; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; Kelley, 1988; Kelley, 1992).

Although Kelley (1988) provided one of the first (role-based) theories on the positive impact that followers can have in the leadership process, some of his assumptions are still awaiting empirical testing. Specifically, Kelley (1992) conceptualized different followership styles as rather stable behavior patterns based on the interaction of the followers' active engagement (AE) in the leadership process and their independent, critical thinking (ICT) toward their leader. The notion of stable followership behaviors was also echoed by subsequent approaches to followership styles, such as Kelley (2008), Khan et al. (2019), or Uhl-Bien et al. (2014). However, prior studies on Kelley's proposed followership behaviors² (Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014; Gatti et al., 2017; Ribbat et al., 2021) used cross-sectional designs and thus could not test his assumption of stable followership patterns. Indeed, there are various prominent approaches that consider behaviors at work as dynamic and variable (see, for instance, Beal et al., 2005; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Therefore, followership behavior could also depend on situational factors such as followers' mood or the current environment in which they work (Benson et al., 2016; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996).

Furthermore, followership approaches stress the role of followers by considering followership as an important independent variable in leadership research instead of considering it as the dependent variable (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). Thus, according to followership theory (Kelley, 1988; Kelley, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), followership behavior should be a major predictor for followership outcomes (e.g., individual follower outcomes such as job satisfaction or organizational commitment). On the individual follower level, prior research in fact demonstrated that AE and ICT correlate with job attitudes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014; Ribbat et al., 2021). In contrast to followership approaches (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018), the literature on job attitudes and job performance (e.g., Riketta, 2008), however, suggests that job attitudes precede follower behavior. Since prior research (Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014; Ribbat et al., 2021) cannot provide insights into the direction of relationships due to their cross-sectional designs, the direction of the relationship between followership and job attitudes is still unclear.

² In the following, "followership behavior(s)" refer to Kelley's (1992) definition and conception.

In the current research, we conducted two studies to test the temporal consistency of Kelley's (1992) followership behaviors in a longitudinal design, along with their relations to critical job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) and self-efficacy for the first time. Specifically, we test both the construct stability of followership behaviors and the cross-lagged relationships between followership, job attitudes, and self-efficacy in two different samples. In Study 2, we additionally test two potential new moderator variables that were not part of Study 1 (i.e., leader humility and perceived organizational support [POS]).

Thus, our studies extend current research in several ways. First, we explore whether followership behavior can be characterized as rather stable or trait-like behavior patterns as proposed by Kelley (1992). This is important because Kelley's (1992) conception of styles suggests that followership should be conceptualized as rather trait-like behavioral tendencies that are related to rather stable personal characteristics and/or general circumstances. A state-like nature of followership behavior, however, would necessarily shift the focus of future research from general and typical factors to more specific, situational, and contingent factors as followership would then rather be spontaneous, dynamic, or variable. Second, we examine whether followership behaviors are antecedents of job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) as conceptualized by Kelley (1992) and/or vice versa in multistate models (Geiser, 2020; Prenoveau, 2016). These relationships have been investigated only in cross-sectional studies and, therefore, prior research could not yet provide a rigorous test of the direction of these relationships (see Byun et al., 2018; Ribbat et al., 2021). Third, we explore the link of AE and ICT with self-efficacy, an important variable in the organizational context that has, however, not been studied thus far. According to Kelley (1992), p. 143), active and critical followers are goal-oriented, success-oriented, and effective, which culminates in a "can do aura". Therefore, active and critical followership should be related to the followers' perception of

self-efficacy. Finally, we consider leader humility and POS as moderators. Hence, we also explore two potential new conditions under which the relationships of followership with job attitudes might be fostered. In this way, we contribute to a better understanding of the followership construct (as conceptualized by Kelley, 1992) and potential followership outcomes.

4.2 Followership

Followership behavior is defined as "behaviors of individuals acting in relation to a leader(s)" (Carsten et al., 2010, p. 545). In our study, we refer to the followership concept by Kelley (1992) that describes followership styles based on the interaction of the followers' active engagement (AE) in the leadership process and their independent, critical thinking (ICT) towards their leader. According to Kelley (1992), the best followers are those who participate actively in the leadership process and take initiative. At the same time, they independently think for themselves and provide constructive criticism for their leader and group. By contrast, the worst followers do not independently think for themselves, simply take directions, and do not challenge their leader and group. Moreover, they are passive, lazy, and require constant supervision. Kelley (1992) proposes that the different combinations of AE and ICT result in five styles of followership behavior, which he describes as "passive" (i.e., low in both dimensions), "conformist" (i.e., high in AE, but low in ICT), "alienated" (i.e., low in AE, but high in ICT), "exemplary" (i.e., high in both dimensions), and "pragmatist" (i.e., with medium levels in both dimensions). The exemplary followership style is considered as most effective and most valuable to the organization (Kelley, 1988; Kelley, 1992).

In our current study, we will examine whether followership behavior can be characterized as rather stable behavior patterns as proposed by Kelley (1992). To do so, we apply a latent state-trait approach (Geiser, 2020; Steyer et al., 2015). This approach can provide answers to the question of whether measurement instruments assess more trait-like or more state-like attributes. Specifically, a latent state-trait approach quantifies to which degree observed and/or underlying latent state (τ) variables reflect trait effects that indicate consistency (i.e., coefficient Con τ ; see Geiser, 2020) or situation effects/person by situation interaction effects that indicate occasion specificity (i.e., coefficient Osp τ ; see Geiser, 2020). Measures can be considered as trait-like, when more than 50% of their true state variance is due to trait effects (Geiser, 2020; Steyer et al., 1999). In accordance with Kelley's (1992) conceptualization of followership styles as rather stable (i.e., trait-like) behavior patterns we predict:

Hypothesis 1: (a) AE and (b) ICT will have a higher proportion of state variance at each time point that is due to trait effects (i.e., $Con[\tau_{t1,t2}] > .50$) *than state residual variance (i.e.,* $Osp[\tau_{t1,t2}] < .50$).³

4.3 Followership and Job Attitudes

Again, in accordance with Kelley's conceptualization, we posit that followership behavior will be related to important job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment). Our Hypotheses are visualized in Figures 2 and 3. Job satisfaction is defined as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). Organizational commitment "(a) characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization" (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67).

Empirical evidence suggests a positive relationship of AE with job satisfaction (e.g., Blanchard et al., 2009; Ribbat et al., 2021). With regard to ICT, several studies found no significant relationship of ICT with job satisfaction (Gatti et al., 2014; Gatti et al., 2017; Ribbat et al., 2021). Blanchard et al. (2009) even reported that ICT was negatively associated with job satisfaction. Their results further suggest that the interaction of AE and ICT increases intrinsic job satisfaction (i.e., satisfaction with job aspects that are task-

³ This study was preregistered on the Open Science Framework.

related such as responsibility) but decreases extrinsic job satisfaction (i.e., satisfaction with job aspects that are unrelated to the task such as the supervisor; Blanchard et al., 2009). Specifically, followers with high AE and high ICT had the highest levels of intrinsic job satisfaction. The more followers engaged in ICT, the lower was their extrinsic job satisfaction, while this effect was weaker when followers were also actively engaged (Blanchard et al., 2009). The findings of Favara (2009) and Saraih et al. (2018) also showed a positive relation of an exemplary followership style (i.e., high scores both on AE and ICT) with job satisfaction. Furthermore, two studies (Blanchard et al., 2009; Ribbat et al., 2021) showed that AE was positively associated with organizational commitment, whereas ICT was negatively related to organizational commitment.

To derive our first set of hypotheses we apply Cognitive Dissonance Theory (Festinger, 1957; Harmon-Jones & Mills, 2019). According to Cognitive Dissonance Theory, employees tend to harmonize conflicting cognitions (e.g., attitudes and behaviors). We follow the effort justification tenet of Cognitive Dissonance Theory (Aronson & Mills, 1959; Harmon-Jones et al., 2018), which refers to the strategy of adding consonant cognitions to dissolve experienced dissonance when undertaking demanding or exhausting activities and achieving outcomes that may not be satisfying. Thus, we expect followers to value their job and their organization more to justify the considerable effort they spend on engaging actively in the leadership process (see also Blanchard et al., 2009; Ribbat et al., 2021). Hence, their earlier active engagement (at t1) is expected to increase their later job attitudes (at t2). This reasoning is in line with the dominant view that AE antecedes followers' job attitudes (Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014; Ribbat et al., 2021). Thus, we predict:

Hypothesis 2a: AE at t1 will be positively related to job satisfaction at t2. Hypothesis 2b: AE at t1 will be positively related to organizational commitment at t2.

Figure 2



Hypotheses for the relationships of AE and ICT with job attitudes and self-efficacy

Figure 3

Hypotheses for interaction effects



However, we expect that ICT at t1 exerts a negative influence on attitudinal variables at t2, because it increases the followers' awareness of the problems and negative aspects of their job. Hence, rather than valuing their job and organization more due to the effort that has also to be expended on independent, critical thinking, followers with high levels of ICT should become less satisfied and committed when faced with the problems and negative aspects of their job (see also Blanchard et al., 2009; Ribbat et al., 2021). Therefore, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 3a: ICT at t1 will be negatively related to job satisfaction at t2. Hypothesis 3b: ICT at t1 will be negatively related to organizational commitment at t2.

Besides effort justification, another strategy to avoid cognitive dissonance according to Cognitive Dissonance Theory (Festinger, 1957; Harmon-Jones & Mills, 2019) would be to bring behaviors in line with one's attitudes. That is, attitudes can guide and facilitate behavior. This notion suggests that job attitudes can cause later job behaviors (Hinojosa et al., 2017; Riketta, 2008). Therefore, we expect satisfied and committed followers to actively engage in the leadership process. We state:

Hypothesis 4a: Job satisfaction at t1 will be positively related to AE at t2. Hypothesis 4b: Organizational commitment at t1 will be positively related to AE at t2.

However, we do not expect satisfied and committed followers to question the leader and the organization frequently. Since satisfaction and commitment are pleasurable and positive emotional states (Locke, 1976; Meyer & Allen, 1991), there should be no incentive for the followers to create conflicting cognitions and risk psychological discomfort (Festinger, 1957; Harmon-Jones & Mills, 2019). Thus, satisfied and committed followers might avoid becoming aware of negative aspects of their job through ICT in order to prevent cognitive dissonance. Hence, we predict that job attitudes at t1 will be negatively related to ICT at t2.

Hypothesis 5a: Job satisfaction at t1 will be negatively related to ICT at t2. Hypothesis 5b: Organizational commitment at t1 will be negatively related to ICT at t2.

Additionally, we argue that the effort justification mechanism (cf. Hypothesis 2) is stronger than the "attitudes as guidelines" mechanism (cf. Hypotheses 4 and 5), because followership styles, which are conceptualized as relatively stable or trait-like behavior patterns (Kelley, 1992; see also our Hypothesis 1), should be more difficult to change than job attitudes. Therefore, we expect stronger relations of AE and ICT at t1 with the attitudinal variables at t2 due to effort justification than the opposite relations between attitudes (at t1) and AE and ICT (at t2). Thus, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 6: The relationships of AE at t1 with (a) job satisfaction at t2 and (b) organizational commitment at t2 is stronger as compared to the relationships of (a) job satisfaction at t1 and (b) organizational commitment at t1 with AE at t2. Hypothesis 7: The relationships of ICT at t1 with (a) job satisfaction at t2 and (b) organizational commitment at t2 is stronger as compared to the relationships of (a) job satisfaction at t1 and (b) organizational commitment at t1 with ICT at t2.

Since Kelley's (1992) typology of followership styles refers to the interaction of both followership dimensions (i.e., AE and ICT), we also investigate this interaction. Continuing the argumentation above, the less followers engage actively in the leadership process, the more should the negative influence of ICT on job attitudes prevail over effort justification. However, independent, critical followers might also use active engagement to change undesired working conditions and, thus, they should become more satisfied and committed. Therefore, following the logic of both Cognitive Dissonance Theory (Festinger, 1957) and Kelley's (1992) conceptualization, we predict: Hypothesis 8: ICT at t1 will be less negatively related to (a) job satisfaction at t2 and (b) organizational commitment at t2 when AE at t1 is high as compared to when AE at t1 is low.

4.4 Followership and Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is defined as "people's judgements of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances" (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). According to Kelley (1992), active and critical followers are goaloriented, success-oriented, and effective. He describes effective followers as those who determine early and accurately the criteria for success in the leadership environment, who track a record of successes in tasks that are important to the leader, and who "seize smaller victories that accumulate into a 'can do' aura" (Kelley, 1992, p.143). Therefore, active and critical followership should raise the followers' awareness for their own capabilities to attain personal and leadership goals. Consequently, active and critical followership should be related to the followers' perception of self-efficacy. Prior meta-analyses (Sadri & Robertson, 1993; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998) demonstrated that self-efficacy is positively related to work-related behaviors (e.g., changes in career tracks or intentions to show assertiveness) and job performance. However, the relation of this important individuallevel construct with followership behavior has not been tested so far. Therefore, we will investigate this relationship in our study.

According to Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1997), self-efficacy emerges from four sources: (1) physiological and affective states, (2) verbal persuasion, (3) vicarious experience, and (4) mastery experience. Mastery experience is considered to have the strongest impact on the development of self-efficacy, because it provides authentic evidence for one's capability to succeed, and, thus, builds a robust belief in one's personal efficacy (Bandura, 1997). When followers simply take directions, there is no evidence for the followers' own capability to succeed, because success fully depends on the leader's decisions. Active and critical followership, however, allow for evaluating the followers' own contributions to leadership success (e.g., followers' high individual or collective job performance) and, thus, raises the awareness for mastery experiences. Therefore, we expect that the followers' self-efficacy substantially results from ascribing (at least parts of) the leadership success to own efforts when carrying out an active and independent follower role. Hence, we expect that both AE at t1 and ICT at t1 are positively associated with self-efficacy at t2, which is also in line with the dominant view of followership research (Kelley, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) that followership should be a major predictor for followership outcomes:

Hypothesis 9a: AE at t1 will be positively related to self-efficacy at t2.Hypothesis 9b: ICT at t1 will be positively related to self-efficacy at t2.

Paralleling our above hypotheses on job attitudes, the relationship of ICT (at t1) with self-efficacy (at t2) might depend on the level of AE. While it may be obvious to ascribe leadership success to own efforts (i.e., to allow for mastery experience; see Bandura, 1997) when active engagement is high, the contribution of ICT to leadership success might not always be apparent. This should, for instance, be the case when a follower expresses concerns about the leader's direction and consequently does not (strongly) contribute to goal attainment. According to Kelley (1992), followers may become frustrated and "alienated", when their concerns are ignored repeatedly, which keeps them away from their goal achievements and day-to-day job satisfaction (see Kelley, 1992). When active engagement is high, however, ICT could be considered as an additional contribution to leadership success and therefore raise even more awareness for mastery experiences than the active engagement alone. Thus, we predict:

Hypothesis 10: ICT at t1 will be more positively related to self-efficacy at t2 when AE at t1 is high than when AE at t1 is low.

Furthermore, according to Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1997), self-efficacy is also considered to be a predictor for one's choices of activities, effort expenditure, persistence, thought patterns, and emotional reactions when confronted with obstacles (Lent et al., 1994). Followers with high self-efficacy should therefore be more likely to actively engage in the leadership process and rather be willing to act independently and critically. Thus, we predict:

Hypothesis 11a: Self-efficacy at t1 will be positively associated with AE at t2. Hypothesis 11b: Self-efficacy at t1 will be positively associated with ICT at t2.

4.5 Study 1

4.5.1 Materials and Methods

This study was preregistered at the Open Science Framework

(https://osf.io/tf493/?view_only=03c75588fa514565be62adbdc58b24dc). Following Simmons et al. (2012), we report and explain in detail (a) how we determined our sample size, (b) all exclusions, and (c) all independent and dependent variables (see also Simmons et al., 2012).

4.5.1.1 Sample

The variables that we investigated in this study were part of a more comprehensive data set, which had been collected for the German Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health between 2017 and 2018 (https://www.baua.de/EN/Tasks/Research/Research-projects/f2372.html) in German language. Employees and their supervisors from eleven German service organizations were surveyed twice with an online questionnaire. Participants gave their consent for participation within the questionnaire by checking the associated box.⁴ In this study, we only used data from the employees' surveys. The time

⁴ Our research is in line with the ethical principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and the Psychologists Code of Conduct of the American Psychological Association. Please note that correlational studies are exempt from institutional review in Germany (see also Sonnentag et al., 2022). As prescribed by the German Medicines Laws (AMG, MPDG) and the associated EU regulations (CTR 536/2014, MDR 2017/745), institutional ethical approval is mandatory if research involves drug or medical device testing, or if physicians participate. Our studies do not meet any of those criteria. However, we obtained retrospective

lag between the two measurement waves (i.e., t1 and t2) was between nine and 12 months. Persons responsible for human resources in the participating organizations invited various teams to complete the survey via e-mail. Therefore, we have no information about the exact number of employees that were invited to the survey. The first measurement wave was answered by 551 employee responses. For the second wave, employees who were originally invited had again the opportunity to participate, regardless of whether they had participated in the first wave. The second measurement wave was answered by 349 employees in total. For 187 employees (or 34% of the original population), we could match the questionnaires of both time points.⁵

Following our preregistration, some participants were excluded from the data set because of responding in a careless manner. Following the procedures recommended by Meade & Craig (2012), three outlier cases were identified by computing the Mahalanobis Distance over all items, which reduced the overall sample size to 184 employees. Moreover, for five persons, the followership values were recoded as missing values either for t1 or t2 due to zero-within-variance in responses, resulting in a sample of 179 participants. The respondents were mainly employed within the public service sector (76%). Another 17% worked within the finance service sector (banking or insurance). A small proportion (7%) was employed in other service organizations (i.e., health services or information technology services). The mean age was 43.5 years and 67% of the respondents were female, 33% were male. The level of education was distributed as

ethical approval of the University of Münster for Study 2 (approval number 2022-65-ChN). For Study 1, the data had been collected by the German Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health in a very similar way as Study 2.

⁵ One reason for the relatively high drop-out could be that we had to rely on third persons (i.e., organizational multipliers) to recruit the respondents within the organizations. Furthermore, we did not pay participants for each response. Another reason could be that the matching process was realized via a self-chosen code. The need for retaining the self-chosen code over nine to 12 months might have resulted in mistakes in some cases. Hence, there might be more respondents that completed both questionnaires, which, however, could not be matched via the personal code. However, the resulting sample of participants for which the questionnaire could be matched for both time points is comparable to the original sample at time point one in terms of their mean age, gender distribution, level of education, and professional sector distribution. Furthermore, the drop-out rate is comparable to studies with a similar approach to data collection (see, for instance, Rayton & Yalabik, 2014; Tims et al., 2015).

follows: 43% had a completed apprenticeship, 40% had a university of applied science degree, and 17% had a university degree.

4.5.1.2 Measures

Both dimensions of followership behavior (i.e., AE and ICT) were measured using the German version of Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire by Ribbat et al. (2021); with 10 items for AE and four items for ICT. An exemplary item for AE was "Do you understand the leader's needs, goals, and constraints, and work hard to help meet them?". The ICT subscale, for instance, included the item "Do you assert your views on important issues, even though it might mean conflict with your group or reprisals from the leader?". Possible responses ranged from 1 (*[almost] never*) to 7 (*[almost] always*).

Job satisfaction was measured with six items of the "Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire" (Nübling et al., 2005). The respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with their colleagues, leadership, challenges of work, use of abilities, career perspective, and job satisfaction overall. The response options ranged from *very dissatisfied* (1) to *very satisfied* (7).

Organizational commitment was measured with three items of the scale from Mowday et al. (1979) in the German Version by Maier & Woschée (2002). A sample item was "I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for". Response options ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *fully agree* (7). Finally, we measured self-efficacy using the scale by Rigotti et al. (2008) with six items. A sample item was "I feel up to most of the job demands". Response options ranged from *not correct at all* (1) to *applies completely* (7).

4.5.1.3 Data Analysis Strategy

We applied a latent state-trait approach (Geiser, 2020; Steyer et al., 2015). This approach allows for differentiating trait effects from situation/person situation interaction effects (Steyer et al., 1999; Steyer et al., 2015). Specifically, we applied single-trait multi-

state models with indicator-specific residual factors (STMS-IS; see Geiser, 2020) for both followership dimensions (i.e., AE and ICT). The single-trait multi-state model (STMS) refers to the test of a single trait (i.e., AE or ICT) in multiple situations (i.e., t1 and t2). The indicator-specific residual factors account for indicator specific effects of latent variables (Eid et al., 1999; Geiser, 2020). This is important, because the simple STMS model would assume perfect homogeneity of the indicators for the latent variable that are measured at the same time point (Geiser, 2020). However, this was not a realistic assumption, as both AE and ICT measures were not perfectly consistent (see Table 6). Thus, the STMS-IS model was more appropriate to test the consistency of the followership measures, as it reflects potential method effects of indicator heterogeneity. The model fit was evaluated using the resulting chi-square values, the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). The following cut-off values were considered to indicate a good model fit (West et al., 2012): $\chi^2/df < 5$, RMSEA < .06, CFI > .95, and SRMR < .08.

In order to test the hypotheses on the interrelations of followership with the other study variables, we applied latent autoregressive/cross-lagged states models (LACS; see Geiser, 2020). Latent states cross-lagged models are longitudinal models that allow for testing relationships of latent state variables over multiple states (i.e., t1 and t2) in both directions in the same model, while correcting for random measurement error. By controlling for the autoregressive effects of the variables (i.e., the autoprediction of the dependent variables), LACS models additionally take into account that in social science previous states are usually strong predictors for future states of the same variable (Adachi & Willoughby, 2015; Geiser, 2020). We also considered potential method effects of indicator heterogeneity and applied models with indicator-specific residual factors (Eid et al., 1999; Geiser, 2020). For the models that tested the interaction effects of AE and ICT, we also controlled for the autoregressive effects of job attitudes and self-efficacy, and
applied indicator-specific residual factors. We used one-tailed tests of significance for the regression coefficients, since we had directed hypotheses (Cho & Abe, 2013; Jones, 1952; Lakens, 2016).

As our measures of internal consistency, we used a reliability indicator based on factor models and report coefficient omega (ω ; McDonald, 1978). We report the omega subscale (ω_s) for multidimensional constructs (i.e., for each followership dimension) as described by Rodriguez et al. (2016). We used Watkins (2013) standalone program to compute the omega subscale (ω_s). Every other analysis was computed with MPlus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2015).

4.5.2 Pre-Analyses

4.5.2.1 Construct Validity

In our study, we analyzed four latent variables including five latent factors at two measurement times: followership behavior with its two dimensions AE and ICT, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and self-efficacy. In order to ensure the distinctiveness of our study variables, we compared our five-factor measurement model to an alternative four-factor model that specified both job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) as one common factor. Chi square difference tests revealed that our measurement model fitted the data better than the alternative model both at t1, $\chi^2_{diff}(3) = 96.43$, p < .001, and at t2, $\chi^2_{diff}(3) = 111.98$, p < .001. Hence, our analyses indicate the distinctiveness of our study variables.

Note, however, that we allowed the residual correlation between the two items "Instead of waiting for or merely accepting what the leader tells you, do you personally identify which organizational activities are most critical for achieving the organization's priority goals?" and "Do you actively develop a distinctive competence in those critical activities so that you become more valuable to the leader and the organization?" in the followership model (r = .71, p < .001 for t1; r = .52, p < .001 for t2). In their validation

study for the German version of Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire, Ribbat et al. (2021) argued for this model specification as the latter item was formulated with a direct reference to the former. In addition, the two concerned items reflect the efforts to achieve overarching organizational goals and thus share a plausible commonality (Ribbat et al., 2021). In our study, allowing the respective error term correlation led to better model fit both at t1, $\chi^2_{diff}(1) = 119.43$, p < .001, and at t2, $\chi^2_{diff}(1) = 46.47$, p < .001.

4.5.2.2 Measurement Equivalence Across Time

Before testing the hypotheses, we tested for measurement equivalence across time to follow a common standard for our analyses: "ME is a prerequisite for meaningful across-time comparisons [...] Without measurement equivalence, differences in latent state factor means or variances across occasions may be due to changes in measurement (observed variable) properties rather than true changes in latent variables" (Geiser, 2020, pp. 122-123). Following Geiser (2020), we consecutively tested measurement equivalence models that differ by the level of measurement equivalence (i.e., various parameter equality constraints) for every latent variable. First, we tested for configural invariance that specified the same number of factors and the same factor loading pattern across time. Second, we also constrained the factor loadings to remain the same for a given observed variable in addition to configural invariance (weak invariance). Subsequently, we tested for strong invariance (strong measurement equivalence), which additionally set the intercepts to remain the same across time for a given observed variable. Finally, the strict invariance model (strict measurement equivalence) additionally determined the measurement error variance to remain the same across time for a given variable. Researchers typically aim for at least strong measurement equivalence, because it allows for meaningful comparisons of latent variable means and variances across time (Meredith, 1993; Widaman & Grimm, 2014).

The fit of the various measurement equivalence models is presented in Appendix I. In our model comparisons, strong measurement equivalence was preferred for AE and strict measurement equivalence was preferred for ICT. Thus, for AE and ICT at least strong measurement equivalence could be assumed. This was also the case for the other latent variables: Strong measurement equivalence was preferred for organizational commitment and self-efficacy. For job satisfaction, the strict model was the best fitting model. Hence, we used these models in further analyses.

4.5.3 Results

Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics, the intercorrelations of the latent variables and the reliabilities of the measures. For ICT at t2, $\omega_s = .69$ was slightly below the commonly used minimum value (Dunn et al., 2014; Kline, 1998). However, we addressed this problem by specifying latent state-trait models with indicator-specific residuals (Eid et al., 1999; Geiser, 2020; see also above).

5.5.3.1 Temporal Consistency of Followership Behavior

To test Hypothesis 1, we used a STMS-IS model, which fitted the data well, $\chi^2(df) = 207.53(141), p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.47$, RMSEA = .05, CFI = .96, SRMR = .06. The results revealed that AE was rather stable and trait-like over time as indicated by consistencies exceeding the commonly applied 50% threshold for both AE at time 1 (Con[$\tau_{AE,t1}$] = .78, p < .001,) and AE at time 2 (Con[$\tau_{AE,t2}$] = .74, p < .001) as compared to the coefficients that indicate occasion specificity (Osp[$\tau_{AE,t1}$] = .22, p = .001, Osp[$\tau_{AE,t2}$] = .26, p < .001). Hence, our results suggest that AE was consistent across time and rather trait-like, which supported Hypothesis 1a.

Table 6

Model	Μ	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Followership: AE (t1)	5.18	0.87	.96''									
2. Followership: ICT (t1)	4.62	1.00	.41***	.75"								
3. Job satisfaction (t1)	5.03	1.14	.20*	11	.86'							
4. Organizational commitment (t1)	5.34	1.18	.27**	05	.56***	.78'						
5. Self-efficacy (t1)	5.27	0.95	.58***	.31***	.20*	.31***	.87'					
6. Followership: AE (t2)	5.16	0.88	.80***	.24*	.33***	.32***	.52***	.98"				
7. Followership: ICT (t2)	4.79	0.91	.32**	.86***	.08	.16	.36***	.41***	.69"			
8. Job satisfaction (t2)	5.96	1.12	.05	.01	.72***	.41***	.12	.17*	.04	.88'		
9. Organizational commitment (t2)	5.20	1.25	.27**	.03	.45***	.96***	.34***	.32***	.26*	.39***	.75'	
10. Self-efficacy (t2)	5.27	0.89	.45***	.18	.16*	.31***	.81***	.58***	.34***	.16	.31***	.86'

Descriptives, intercorrelations between latent variables, and internal consistencies of Study 1

Note. N = 184. AE = Active engagement; ICT = Independent, critical thinking; Values along the diagonal represent internal consistency (' ω or " ω_s).

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

The results of the STMS-IS model for ICT revealed $\text{Con}[\tau_{\text{ICT},t1}] = .59, p < .001$, $\text{Con}[\tau_{\text{ICT},t2}] = .82, p < .001, \text{Osp}[\tau_{\text{ICT},t1}] = .41, p < .001, \text{ and } \text{Osp}[\tau_{\text{ICT},t2}] = .18, p < .001$. The model fit was good: $\chi^2(\text{df}) = 35.89(24), p = .06, \chi^2/df = 1.50$, RMSEA = .05, CFI = .96, SRMR = .08. Thus, ICT, was consistent across time and rather trait like. Hence, Hypothesis 1b was also supported.

5.5.3.2 Followership and Job Attitudes

The first cross-lagged model explored the relationship of AE with job satisfaction. Both autoregressive paths were significant (for AE: $\beta = .75$, p < .001; for job satisfaction: $\beta = .71$, p < .001). The relationship of AE (at t1) with job satisfaction (at t2) was not significant, $\beta = .08$, p = .12, thereby not supporting Hypothesis 2. However, job satisfaction (at t1) was positively related to AE (at t2), $\beta = .13$, p = .02, thereby supporting Hypothesis 4a. The model explained 60% of the variance in AE and 49% of the variance in job satisfaction and the model fit was good: $\chi^2(df) = 524.84(371)$, p < .001, $\chi^2/df = 1.42$, RMSEA = .05, CFI = .95, SRMR = .06.

The second cross-lagged model included AE and organizational commitment. Both autoregressive paths were significant (for AE: $\beta = .74$, p < .001; for organizational commitment: $\beta = .87$, p < .001). The relationship of AE (at t1) with organizational commitment (at t2) was not significant, $\beta = .02$, p = .39, which does not support Hypothesis 2. However, organizational commitment (at t1) was positively related to AE (at t2), $\beta = .11$, p = .049, thereby supporting Hypothesis 4b.⁶ The model explained 59% of the variance in AE and 75% of the variance in organizational commitment and the model fit was good: $\chi^2(df) = 325.76(236)$, p < .001, $\chi^2/df = 1.38$, RMSEA = .05, CFI = .96, SRMR = .05.

⁶ Please note that this relationship was no longer significant when we additionally controlled for age and gender. Controlling for age and gender did not, however, significantly affect any other tested relationship.

The relationship of ICT with job satisfaction was explored in the third cross-lagged model. While we had predicted this relationship to be negative, our results rather pointed in a positive direction. Thus, we applied a two-tailed test for this model. We, therefore, could neither find a significant relation of job satisfaction (at t1) to ICT (at t2), $\beta = .16$, p = .08, nor between ICT (at t1) and job satisfaction (at t2), $\beta = .09$, p = .21. These results do not support Hypotheses 3a and 5a. Both autoregressive paths were significant (for ICT: $\beta = .74$, p < .001; for job satisfaction: $\beta = .71$, p < .001). The model explained 53% of the variance in ICT and 50% of the variance in job satisfaction and the model fit was again good: $\chi^2(df) = 201.37(146)$, p = .002, $\chi^2/df = 1.38$, RMSEA = .05, CFI = .97, SRMR = .06.

The fourth cross-lagged model explored the relationship of ICT with organizational commitment. Again, we applied a two-tailed test for the model, because our results pointed in another direction than we had expected. Both autoregressive paths were significant (for ICT: $\beta = .72$, p < .001; for organizational commitment: $\beta = .86$, p < .001). No significant relationship of ICT (at t1) with organizational commitment (at t2) could be found, $\beta = .06$, p = .41. Organizational commitment (at t1) was also not related to ICT (at t2), $\beta = .17$, p = .07. These results do not support Hypotheses 3b and 5b. The model explained 55% of the variance in ICT and 75% of the variance in organizational commitment and the model fit was good: $\chi^2(df) = 80.71(65)$, p = .09, $\chi^2/df = 1.24$, RMSEA = .04, CFI = .98, SRMR = .06.

In Hypotheses 6 and 7, we proposed the relationships of AE (at t1) and ICT (at t1) with job attitudes (at 2) to be stronger than those of job attitudes (at t1) with AE (at t2) and ICT (at t2). Both hypotheses were not supported by our results, because we found no significant relationship of AE or ICT (at t1) with any job attitude (at t2). The relationship of AE (at t1) with job satisfaction (at t2) was not significant, $\beta = -.08$, p = .12. The relationship of AE (at t1) with organizational commitment (at t2) was not significant, $\beta = .02$, p = .39. The relationship between ICT (at t1) and job satisfaction (at t2) was also

not significant, $\beta = .09$, p = .21. Finally, no significant relationship of ICT (at t1) with organizational commitment (at t2) could be found, $\beta = .06$, p = .41.

Furthermore, in Hypothesis 8 we posited ICT (at t1) to be less negatively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (at t2) when AE (at t1) was high, as compared to when AE (at t1) was low. In our analysis, the interaction of AE (at t1) and ICT (at t1) was not a significant predictor for job satisfaction (at t2), $\beta = -.10$, p = .14. However, the interaction (at t1) predicted organizational commitment (at t2), $\beta = .14$, p = .04, while controlling for the autoregressive effect of organizational commitment (at t1), $\beta = .86$, p < .001. The interaction effect is plotted in Figure 4. Overall, the model explained 78% of the variance. Since the interaction of AE and ICT (at t1) was associated with a higher score in organizational commitment, Hypothesis 8b was supported.

Figure 4

Interaction Effect of AE (t1) and ICT (t1) on organizational commitment (t2)



Note. AE = Active Engagement; ICT = Independent, Critical Thinking

5.5.3.3 Followership and Self-Efficacy

We explored the relationship of AE and ICT with self-efficacy in different crosslagged models. In addition, we tested whether the interaction of AE (at t1) and ICT (at t1) could predict self-efficacy (at t2). We could not find a significant relationship of AE (at t1) with self-efficacy (at t2), $\beta = -.02$, p = .37, nor did ICT (at t1) predict self-efficacy (at t2), $\beta = -.09$, p = .11. Hence, Hypothesis 9 was not supported. The interaction of AE (at t1) and ICT (at t1) did also not predict self-efficacy (at t2), $\beta = .01$, p = .47. Thus, Hypothesis 10 was not supported. Finally, we found no evidence for Hypothesis 11, as no significant relationship of self-efficacy (at t1) and AE (at t2) was detected, $\beta = .07$, p = .15, and as self-efficacy (at t1) did also not predict ICT (at t2), $\beta = .08$, p = .19.

5.5.4 Brief Discussion

Overall, we found evidence for some, but not for all of our hypotheses. The results of Study 1 support Kelley's (1992) assumption that followership behaviors are rather stable behavior patterns. Since we found no evidence for the relationships of AE or ICT (at t1) and later job attitudes or self-efficacy (at t2), our results of Study 1 challenge the original idea of followership theory, that followership behaviors are significant predictors for important organizational variables (see, for instance, Kelley, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). However, the interaction of AE and ICT (at t1) was positively related to organizational commitment (at t2), which corresponds to Kelley's (1992) assumption that exemplary followership leads to desired organizational variables. One reason for the absence of the expected effects could be the length of the time lag between the two measurement waves (nine to 12 months). That is, some effects might have simply vanished over time and, thus, might not have been possible to detect. This would be the case, for instance, if the respondents' leader changed between the two measurement waves, if the proposed effects unfolded too quickly, or if the effects did not last long enough to be detected (for a related analysis of time-lags in leadership research, see Fischer et al., 2017). Another reason could be that we did not include conditions under which the relationships of followership with job attitudes might be fostered in our first study. Kelley (1988) argued that active and critical followers are the most effective and, thus, active and critical behaviors should be positively related to followership outcomes. However, he also admitted that an exemplary followership style might not always be the preferred style of a certain leader or organization. Therefore, exemplary followership might not always be acknowledged or rewarded. The missing acknowledgement of the followers' efforts of engaging actively and critically in the leadership process could explain why followership behavior does not necessarily increase the follower's job satisfaction.

Since our results have considerable implications both scientifically and practically, we conducted a second study to once again test our hypotheses and check whether the results of Study 1 are robust with a bigger sample size and, thus, more statistical power. In addition, we include potential moderator variables to test whether leader-related or organizational variables that may facilitate or even reward exemplary followership can foster the relationship of followership with job attitudes.

4.6 Study 2

Compared to Study 1, we made the following changes in Study 2: In addition to the variables that were considered in Study 1, we also tested two moderator variables that were not part of Study 2 (i.e., leader humility and perceived organizational support, see below). Thus, Study 2 went beyond a mere replication of Study 1 and examined two potential new conditions under which the relationships of followership with job attitudes may be fostered. Finally, we used a shorter time-lag than in Study 1 and assessed whether the followers' direct leader (i.e., the person they referred to when responding to the followership questionnaire) had changed between t1 and t2 to rule out potential shortcomings of our initial study design.

4.6.1 Followership, Leader Humility, and Perceived Organizational Support

We argue that leader humility is likely to moderate the proposed relationships between followership and job attitudes. Leader humility comprises leaders' willingness to view oneself accurately, teachability, and the appreciation of the followers' strengths and contributions (Chiu et al., 2016; Owens et al., 2013). Specifically, Kelley (1992) suggests that both actively engaged and independent, critical followers are most valuable for leaders and for organizations. However, he admits that not every leader or organization might actually appreciate active and/or critical followership (Kelley, 1988). Thus, positive relationships of followership behavior with job satisfaction and organizational commitment are likely to depend on leaders' teachability and leaders' appreciation for "exemplary followership" as a valuable resource. That is, followership can only unfold its positive effect on followers' job attitudes when leaders are willing to learn from followers and appreciate their contributions. Therefore, we expect that high leader's humility facilitates the relationship between followership (at t1) and job attitudes (at t2). Thus, we predict:

Hypothesis 12: AE at t1 will be more positively related to (a) job satisfaction at t2 and (b) organizational commitment at t2 when the leader's humility at t1 is high, as compared to when leader humility at t1 is low.

Hypothesis 13: ICT at t1 will be less negatively related to (a) job satisfaction at t2 and (b) organizational commitment at t2 when the leader's humility at t1 is high, as compared to when leader humility at t1 is low.

In addition to leader humility, we expect that perceived organizational support (POS) moderates the relationship of followership behaviors and job attitudes as another form of appreciation for "exemplary followership" as a valuable resource. This is generally consistent with notions from Organizational Support Theory according to which "employees develop global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being" (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002, p. 698). Organizational Support Theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986) assumes that the caring, approval, and respect connoted by POS strengthen the employees' beliefs that the organization recognizes and rewards increased performance (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Meta-analytic results by Kurtessis et al. (2017) suggest that POS is an important link between favorable treatment by the organization and employees' positive orientation toward the organization, psychological well-being, and performance. For example, they report positive relationships of POS with employees' performance-reward expectancy, commitment, and job satisfaction (Kurtessis et al., 2017). In line with the general predictions of Organizational Support Theory and these meta-analytical results, the interaction of the efforts of carrying out an active and independent follower role and its acknowledgement through POS (at t1) should also be positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (at t2). Thus, we predict:

Hypothesis 14: AE at t1 will be more positively related to (a) job satisfaction at t2 and (b) organizational commitment at t2 when POS at t1 is high, as compared to when POS at t1 is low.

Hypothesis 15: ICT at t1 will be less negatively related to (a) job satisfaction at t2 and (b) organizational commitment at t2 when POS at t1 is high, as compared to when POS at t1 is low.

In addition, we will also investigate as a research question whether the simultaneous occurrence of leader humility and POS (at t1) will strengthen the relationships between followership behaviors (at t1) and job attitudes (at t2), since the acknowledgement of "exemplary followership" might be even more present for the follower, when both the leader and the organization accordingly consider active and critical followership a valuable resource.

4.6.2 Materials and Methods

We again conducted a two-wave survey. In contrast to the time lag between the two measurement waves in Study 1 (i.e., nine to 12 months), we realized a time lag of four months for Study 2. With a shorter time lag, we intended to rule out possible shortcomings of Study 1: Some effects might have simply disappeared over time and thus could not be detected. This would be the case, for instance, if the respondents' leader changed between the two surveys, if the proposed effects unfolded too quickly, or if the effects did not last long enough to be detected (for a related analysis of time-lags in leadership research, see Fischer et al., 2017). Since there were no other longitudinal studies that studied followership behaviors when we planned our study, we drew from the meta-analysis on relationships between performance and job attitudes by Riketta (2008) to obtain information about suitable time lags. On that basis, we considered four months to be a reasonable time lag to detect effects on attitudinal variables in the context of work. This was also in line with the general recommendation of pertinent literature to use, in case of doubt, a rather shorter time-lag (e.g., Dwyer, 1983; Griep et al., 2021; Voelkle et al., 2012). This study was preregistered at the Open Science Framework

(https://osf.io/9q48p/?view_only=b02c98f57f7841129cf6daf42405b410).

4.6.2.1 Sample

We conducted an anonymous online survey via the German "WiSoPanel", an online-access-panel based on voluntary registration (Göritz, 2014). All eligible users were invited to participate in 2021 and 2022. We included only employees with a direct superior to ensure credible responses concerning followership behaviors in organizations. Participants gave their consent for participation within the questionnaire by checking the associated box.⁷ At t1, 777 respondents completed the questionnaire. However, two cases

⁷ Our research is in line with the ethical principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and the Psychologists Code of Conduct of the American Psychological Association. We obtained ethical approval of the University of Münster for Study 2 (approval number 2022-65-ChN).

were excluded because of the respondents' statement not to use the data. Thus, 775 respondents of t1 were invited to participate again at t2. At t2, 628 respondents completed the questionnaire (response rate 81%), while three cases were excluded due to the respondents' statement not to use the data. Following our preregistration, we additionally tried to detect careless responses by following the procedures recommended by Meade & Craig (2012). We tested for zero-within-variance in responses and defined the values in question as missing values. For t1 data, 70 cases were affected regarding leader humility, 28 cases were affected regarding followership, 46 cases were affected regarding job satisfaction and self-efficacy, and 41 cases were affected regarding POS and organizational commitment. For t2 data, 69 cases were affected regarding leader humility, 25 cases were affected regarding followership, 33 cases were affected regarding job satisfaction and selfefficacy, and 39 cases were affected regarding POS and organizational selfefficacy, and 39 cases were affected regarding POS and organizational commitment. Furthermore, we computed Mahalanobis Distance overall items and excluded 55 cases that were detected as outliers.

The final sample consisted of 570 employees. The mean age was 49.1 years and 55% of the respondents were female, 45% were male. The level of education was distributed as follows: 1% had no professional qualification, 42% had a completed apprenticeship, 22% had a university of applied science degree, and 35% had a university degree, and 1% had another degree that was not specified in the questionnaire. Nearly a third (34%) of the respondents worked in the public service sector, 5% worked in the finance service sector (banking or insurance), and 61% worked in another sector (i.e., for instance, other professional services or industry sector). Hence, in Study 2, we tested our hypotheses in a more heterogeneous sample than in Study 1.⁸

⁸ Note that we preregistered our data collection with the intention to generate a sample that was comparable to the sample of Study 1. Since the panel was not successful in providing the desired highly comparable distribution for the sectors, we had to use the resulting, more heterogeneous sample for Study 2.

4.6.2.2 Measures

We used the exact same measures that were used in Study 1 for followership, job attitudes and self-efficacy. Additionally, we measured leader humility with the "Expressed Humility Scale" of Owens et al. (2013) as adapted for the leadership context by Chiu et al. (2016). A sample item was "My supervisor shows appreciation for the unique contributions of others" (nine items in total). Response options ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *fully agree* (7). Following Bracken & Barona (1991), this scale was translated into German and back-translated into the original language (English) by another organizational psychology expert without prior knowledge of the questionnaire. Finally, this back-translation was compared to the original version by a native speaker. POS was measured by Eisenberger et al. (2001) in the German translation by Klasmeier & Rowold (2020). A sample item was "The organization values my contributions to its well-being" (six items in total). Response options ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *fully agree* (7). All questions were in German language.

4.6.2.3 Data Analysis Strategy

We applied the same statistical analyses that we used in our initial study. In order to investigate the construct stability of followership behavior, a latent state-trait analysis (Geiser, 2020; Steyer et al., 1999) was conducted. Furthermore, we again applied LACS models (see Geiser, 2020) to test the hypotheses on the interrelations of followership with the other study variables. For the models that tested the interaction effects of AE and ICT, we again controlled for the autoregressive effects of job attitudes and self-efficacy.

4.6.3 Pre-Analyses

4.6.3.1 Construct Validity

In order to ensure the distinctiveness of our study variables, we applied Chi square difference tests to test whether our measurement model fitted the data better than two alternative models both at t1 and t2. In the first alternative model, we specified both job

attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) as one common factor. Our model fitted the data better than the alternative model both at t1, $\chi^2_{diff}(5) = 347.902$, p < .001, and t2, $\chi^2_{diff}(5) = 290.357$, p < .001. In the other alternative model, we specified both organization-related variables (i.e., organizational commitment and POS) as one common factor. Again our model fitted the data better at t1, $\chi^2_{diff}(5) = 186.424$, p < .001, and t2, $\chi^2_{diff}(5) = 165.31$, p < .001. Hence, our analyses indicate the distinctiveness of our study variables.

4.6.3.2 Measurement Equivalence Across Time

Before testing the hypotheses, we again tested for measurement equivalence across time. According to the tests of measurement equivalence, the strict model was preferred for AE, ICT, job satisfaction, organizational commitment. The strong model was preferred for self-efficacy. Hence, all constructs that were used for longitudinal analysis showed at least strong measurement equivalence (see Appendix I for more details).

4.6.4 Results

Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics, the intercorrelations of the latent variables and the reliabilities of the measures of Study 2.

4.6.4.1 Temporal Consistency of Followership Behavior

The results of Study 2 again revealed that AE was rather stable and trait-like over time as indicated by consistencies exceeding the commonly applied 50% threshold for both AE at time 1 (Con[$\tau_{AE,t1}$] = .73, p < .001,) and AE at time 2 (Con[$\tau_{AE,t2}$] = .80, p < .001) as compared to the coefficients that indicate occasion specificity (Osp[$\tau_{AE,t1}$] = .27, p < .001; Osp[$\tau_{AE,t2}$] = .20, p < .001). The model fitted the data well, χ^2 (df) = 277.90(151), p < .001, $\chi^2/df = 1.84$, RMSEA = .04, CFI = .98, SRMR = .04. Hence, our results suggest that AE was consistent across time and rather trait-like, which supported Hypothesis 1a.

Table 7

Model	М	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Followership: AE (t1)	5.10	1.07	.99''													
2. Followership: ICT (t1)	4.61	1.08	.54***	.84"												
3. Job satisfaction (t1)	5.02	1.21	.54***	.22***	.91'											
4. Organizational commitment (t1)	4.79	1.45	.46***	.08	.73***	.80'										
5. Self-efficacy (t1)	5.31	1.11	.71***	.57***	.61***	.38***	.93'									
6. Perceived organizational support (t1)	4.34	1.37	.45***	.16**	.70***	.84***	.44***	.95'								
7. Leader humility (t1)	4.70	1.42	.49***	.19***	.66***	.59***	.38***	.60***	.91'							
8. Followership: AE (t2)	5.08	1.01	.80***	.30***	.41***	.41***	.58***	.40***	.38***	.99''						
9. Followership: ICT (t2)	4.68	1.05	.50***	.69***	.17**	.13*	.44***	.18***	.12*	.61***	.85 ''					
10. Job satisfaction (t2)	5.09	1.16	.47***	.15**	.77***	.64***	.53***	.58***	.55***	.54***	.31***	.90'				
11. Organizational commitment (t2)	4.73	1.42	.42***	.04	.63***	.92***	.34***	.72***	.56***	.49***	.23***	.77***	.79'			
12. Self-efficacy (t2)	5.34	1.12	.56***	.35***	.45***	.32***	.81***	.33***	.27***	.69***	.54***	.60***	.40***	.93'		
13. Perceived organizational support (t2)	4.31	1.34	.37***	.15**	.58***	.72***	.35***	.79***	.56***	.45***	.26***	.72***	.85***	.38***	.95'	
14. Leader humility (t2)	4.65	1.41	.43***	.09	.53***	.54***	.32***	.51***	.75***	.48***	.23***	.68***	.63***	.31***	.63***	.92'

Descriptives, intercorrelations between latent variables, and internal consistencies of Study 2

Note. N = 570. AE = Active engagement; ICT = Independent, critical thinking; Values along the diagonal represent internal consistency (' ω or " ω_s).

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

The results of the model for ICT revealed $Con[\tau_{ICT,t1}] = .58, p < .001,$

Con $[\tau_{ICT,t2}] = .63, p < .001$, Osp $[\tau_{ICT,t1}] = .42, p < .001$, and Osp $[\tau_{ICT,t2}] = .37, p < .001$. The model fit was good: $\chi^2(df) = 36.25(24), p = .05, \chi^2/df = 1.51$, RMSEA = .03, CFI = .99, SRMR = .04. Therefore, ICT was consistent across time and rather trait like. Hence, Hypothesis 1b was also supported.

4.6.4.2 Followership and Job Attitudes

In the first cross-lagged model, the relationship of AE with job satisfaction was explored. Both autoregressive paths were significant (for AE: $\beta = .80$, p < .001; for job satisfaction: $\beta = .67$, p < .001). The relationship of job satisfaction (at 1) with AE (at t2) was not significant, $\beta = .03$, p = .26, thereby not supporting Hypothesis 4a in Study 2. However, AE (at 11) was positively related to job satisfaction (at t2), $\beta = .09$, p = .02, thereby supporting Hypothesis 2 in Study 2. The model explained 59% of the variance in AE and 52% of the variance in job satisfaction and the model fit was good: $\chi^2(df) = 634.05(381)$, p < .001, $\chi^2/df = 1.66$, RMSEA = .03, CFI = .98, SRMR = .04. We received similar results when controlled for a potential change of the reference leader since t1 in addition to the autoregressive paths. Results were then $\beta = .08$, p = .04, for the relationship between AE (at t1) and job satisfaction (at t2), and $\beta = -.03$, p = .26, for the opposite path.

The relationship of AE and organizational commitment was explored in the second cross-lagged model. Both autoregressive paths were significant (for AE: $\beta = .75$, p < .001; for organizational commitment: $\beta = .86$, p < .001). The relationship of AE (at t1) with organizational commitment (at t2) was not significant, $\beta = -.05$, p = .12, thereby not supporting Hypothesis 2b. Organizational commitment (at t1) was positively related to AE (at t2), $\beta = .08$, p = .02, thereby supporting Hypothesis 4b. The model explained 60% of the variance in AE and 72% of the variance in organizational commitment and the model fit was good: $\chi^2(df) = 432.59(249)$, p < .001, $\chi^2/df = 1.74$, RMSEA = .04, CFI = .98,

SRMR = .04. We again received similar results when we additionally controlled for a potential leader change (for the relationship between AE (at t1) and organizational commitment (at t2): β = -.04, p = .13; for the opposite path: β = .08, p = .02).

The third cross-lagged model explored the relationship of ICT with job satisfaction. Both autoregressive paths were significant (for ICT: $\beta = .61$, p < .001; for job satisfaction: $\beta = .72$, p < .001). We could neither find a significant relation of job satisfaction (at t1) to ICT (at t2), $\beta = .03$, p = .23, nor between ICT (at t1) and job satisfaction (at t2), $\beta = .01$, p = .43. Hence, these results do not support Hypotheses 3a and 5a. The model explained 38% of the variance in ICT and 52% of the variance in job satisfaction and the model fit was again good: $\chi^2(df) = 196.28(146)$, p = .004, $\chi^2/df = 1.34$, RMSEA = .03, CFI = .99, SRMR = .03.

The fourth cross-lagged model included ICT and organizational commitment. Both autoregressive paths were significant (for ICT: $\beta = .62$, p < .001; for organizational commitment: $\beta = .84$, p < .001). No significant relationship of ICT (at t1) with organizational commitment (at t2) could be found, $\beta = -.03$, p = .18. Organizational commitment (at t1) was also not related to ICT (at t2), $\beta = .02$, p = .34. These results do not support Hypotheses 3b and 5b. The model explained 39% of the variance in ICT and 72% of the variance in organizational commitment and the model fit was good: $\gamma^2(df) = 134.32(68)$, p < .001, $\gamma^2/df = 1.98$, RMSEA = .04, CFI = .98, SRMR = .04.

In Hypotheses 6 and 7, we proposed the relationships of AE (at t1) and ICT (at t1) with job attitudes (at 2) to be stronger than those of job attitudes (at t1) with AE (at t2) and ICT (at t2).⁹ While we found a significant relationship for AE (at t1) and job satisfaction (at t2) but not for the opposite path, the results of Study 2 support Hypothesis 6a. However, we could not find significant relationships between AE (at t1) and organizational

⁹ Note that we did not preregister Hypotheses 6 and 7 for Study 2, because our results of Study 1 pointed in the opposite direction than we had expected. However, we obtained different results in Study 2. Hence, we tested all of our hypotheses again in Study 2.

commitment (at t2) or of ICT (at t1) with any job attitude. Therefore, Hypothesis 6b and Hypothesis 7 were not supported. Furthermore, in Hypothesis 8 we posited ICT (at t1) to be less negatively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (at t2) when AE (at t1) was high, as compared to when AE (at t1) was low. In Study 2, the interaction of AE (at t1) and ICT (at t1) was not a significant predictor for organizational commitment (at t2), $\beta = .01$, p = .37. In addition, the interaction (at t1) did not predict job satisfaction (at t2), $\beta = .01$, p = .36. Thus, Hypothesis 8 was not supported.

4.6.4.3 Followership and Self-Efficacy

We also explored the relationship of AE and ICT with self-efficacy in different cross-lagged models. The first cross-lagged model included AE and self-efficacy. We could not find a significant relationship of AE (at t1) with self-efficacy (at t2), $\beta = -.07$, p = .09, nor did self-efficacy (at t2) predict AE (at t1), $\beta = -.03$, p = .55. Note, however, that we applied a two-tailed test for significance in this model, since the regression coefficient pointed in a different direction than we had expected. Hence, Hypotheses 9a and 11a were not supported. The autoregressive paths were significant (for AE: $\beta = .78$, p < .001; for self-efficacy: $\beta = .83$, p < .001). The model explained 61% of the variance in AE and 64% of the variance in self-efficacy with a good model fit: $\chi^2(df) = 628.73(375)$, p < .001, $\chi^2/df = 1.68$, RMSEA = .04, CFI = .98, SRMR = .04.

The relationship of ICT and self-efficacy was explored in another cross-lagged model. The autoregressive paths were again significant (for ICT: $\beta = .59$, p < .001; for self-efficacy: $\beta = .85$, p < .001). We could not find a significant relationship between self-efficacy (at t1) with ICT (at t2), $\beta = .05$, p = .34, which does not support Hypothesis 11b. However, ICT (at t1) was negatively related to self-efficacy (at t2), $\beta = .12$, p = .004. We again applied a two-tailed test for this model, since we had predicted this relationship to be positive. Hence, Hypothesis 9a was also not supported. The model explained 39% of the variance in ICT and 63% of the variance in self-efficacy with a good model fit: $\chi^2(df) = 211.12(140), p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.51, RMSEA = .03, CFI = .99, SRMR = .03. We$ received similar results when we additionally controlled for a potential leader change (for the relationship between ICT (at t1) and self-efficacy (at t2): $\beta = -.12, p = .004$; for the opposite path, $\beta = .05, p = .34$).

In addition, we tested whether the interaction of AE (at t1) and ICT (at t1) could predict self-efficacy (at t2). The interaction of AE (at t1) and ICT (at t1) did not predict self-efficacy (at t2), $\beta = .05$, p = .12. Thus, Hypothesis 10 was not supported.

4.6.4.4 Followership, Leader Humility and POS

In Study 2, we tested whether leader humility or POS could be mechanisms that foster the relationships of AE or ICT with job attitudes. The interaction of AE and leader humility (at t1) did not predict job satisfaction (at t2), $\beta = .00$, p = .46, and it did not predict organizational commitment (at t2), $\beta = -.02$, p = .31. Hence Hypothesis 12 was not supported. The interaction of ICT and leader humility (at t1) did neither predict job satisfaction (at t2), $\beta = .01$, p = .43, nor organizational commitment (at t2), $\beta = .03$, p = .22. Thus, Hypothesis 13 was not supported. Furthermore, we could neither find a significant relationship of the interaction of AE and POS (at t1) with job satisfaction (at t2), $\beta = .05$, p = .08, nor with organizational commitment (at t2), $\beta = .03$, p = .17. The interaction of ICT and POS (at t1) could neither predict job satisfaction (at t2), $\beta = -.03$, p = .20, nor organizational commitment (at t2), $\beta = -.02$, p = .24. Therefore, Hypotheses 14 and 15 were not supported. Finally, a three-way interaction of AE, leader humility and POS (at t1) could not predict job satisfaction (at t2), $\beta = -.01$, p = .43, nor organizational commitment (at t2), $\beta = .03$, p = .08. A three-way interaction of ICT, leader humility and POS did neither predict job satisfaction (at t2), $\beta = .04$, p = .07, nor organizational commitment (at t2), $\beta = .01$, p = .35.¹⁰

¹⁰ Note that Mplus did not provide standardized coefficients for the three-way interaction models. Thus, for these models, we report unstandardized coefficients.

4.7 Discussion

The results of both of our studies support Kelley's (1992) assumption that followership behaviors are rather stable behavior patterns. We found significant relations of job attitudes with active, engaged followership behavior in the cross-lagged models, above and beyond the autoregressive effects in both studies. We also found significant relations of AE (at t1) with job satisfaction (at t2) and of ICT (at t1) with self-efficacy (at t2) in Study 2. The interaction of AE and ICT (at t1), however, predicted organizational commitment (at t2) only in Study 1.

Although the regression coefficients $(.08 \le \beta \ge .14)$ can be described as rather small (Cohen, 1988), the identified effects indicate important findings for three reasons. First, cross-lagged effects are generally hard to find. That is, autoregressive effects are often strong and therefore explain much of the variance by themselves (Adachi & Willoughby, 2015; Geiser, 2020). Hence, there is often little variance left to be explained by the cross-lagged effects. Second, since our results demonstrate that followership styles are rather stable behavior patterns, predicting change in followership behavior is even more noteworthy. Third, the reported effect sizes are indeed in a typical range as compared to similar studies with cross-lagged models (see, for instance, Riketta, 2008; Sonnentag et al., 2010). However, across both studies, we found mixed results regarding our hypotheses. We will elaborate on these findings below.

4.7.1 Theoretical Implications

Our studies contribute to a better understanding of followership (Kelley, 1992) and its outcomes (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). To go beyond prior research, we tested Kelley's (1992) followership behaviors longitudinally, and explored their relationships to critical job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) and self-efficacy as potential predictors and consequences. Our findings support Kelley's (1992) assumption that followership styles (i.e., AE and ICT) are rather stable behavior patterns. This is an important finding, because a more state-like nature of followership behavior would necessarily shift the focus of future research from general and stable factors to more specific, situational, and contingent factors as followership would then rather be spontaneous, dynamic, or variable. For instance, the common perspective on leadership styles (see Anderson & Sun, 2017; Bass & Avolio, 1995) as consistent behavior patterns of leaders has been challenged most recently. An increasing number of authors argue for considering leader behaviors as more dynamic (see, for instance, Kelemen et al., 2020; McClean et al., 2019). In contrast, our findings suggest that an opposite perspective is adequate for Kelley's (1992) followership styles. However, several studies could show how leader and follower identities (that did not necessarily correspond to their formal ranks as "leaders" and "subordinates") were (co-)constructed in different leadership situations (e.g., Blom & Alvesson, 2014; Larsson & Nielsen, 2021; Van De Mieroop, 2020). Adopting the co-construction approach to followership (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), Larsson & Nielsen (2021), for instance, found that leader and follower roles remained abstract in the workplace interactions that they analyzed. Participants rather focused on negotiated, task-oriented, expert or non-expert identities (Larsson & Nielsen, 2021). Hence, a more dynamic or situational perspective on followership can be helpful in those contexts, in which leaders and followers are not determined by their position. Our findings, however, suggest that subordinates tend to enact their follower role rather consistently within a continuum between active and passive, independent and uncritical (see Kelley, 1992), when they interact with their superior leader.

It is noteworthy and plausible, however, that ICT is less stable or trait-like than AE, a finding that we consistently observed across our studies. Speaking up in front of the leader can be a risky behavior for followers, particularly when it is done in challenging rather than supportive ways (Burris, 2012). Thus, followers probably consider their concerns carefully before they actually express them to the leader (Bashur & Oc, 2015; Detert et al., 2013). Consequently, they might hold back their contrary view, when they feel that their concern is less important, but they rather have the courage to speak up in situations where they perceive urgency. Therefore, it is plausible that potentially risky critical followership is more dependent on the evaluation of the urgency and appropriateness of a specific situation than the willingness to support the leader through active engagement. Still, even if followership behaviors cannot be seen as fully invariable personality traits, both AE and ICT are more trait-like than state-like according to our findings.

With regard to the relationships of AE and ICT with critical job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) and self-efficacy, we obtained mixed results. In Study 1, we did not find significant relationships of AE or ICT (at t1) with job attitudes (at t2) that we had predicted. Furthermore, we did not detect any significant relation of followership with self-efficacy. In contrast, job satisfaction and organizational commitment (at t1) were positively related to AE (at t2). In Study 2, we obtained similar results with three exceptions. First, in Study 2, we did not find a relationship of job satisfaction (at t1) with AE (at t2), but AE (at t1) predicted later job satisfaction (at t2). Second, ICT (at t1) was negatively related to self-efficacy (at t2) in Study 2, although we had predicted a positive relation. This relationship was not significant in Study 1. Third, our results of Study 1 suggest that high levels of both AE and ICT (i.e., an exemplary followership style, see Kelley, 1992) lead to higher organizational commitment, thereby supporting Kelley's (1992) assumption that high levels of both AE and ICT imply desirable organizational behaviors. However, we could not detect this interaction effect in Study 2. One reason for the relatively low bivariate associations across time and for the missing interaction effects in our studies could be that our analysis was restricted by low variance in followership styles. Most participants in both studies adopted either the pragmatist or the exemplary followership style (see Appendix J for more details).

Furthermore, the high mean values of both followership dimensions in both studies (see Tables 6 and 7) might indicate a certain risk of social desirability of the questions, which has also been discussed in previous studies (see, for instance, Gatti et al., 2014; Ribbat et al., 2021).

While some of our results indicate that followership behaviors can predict later job attitudes or self-efficacy, most of our results either point in the opposite direction or indicate no significant relationships at all. Those results challenge the original idea of followership theory (Kelley, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) that followership behaviors are significant predictors for organizational variables. However, our studies do provide at least a few hints for the potential of followership behaviors as predictors for job attitudes and self-efficacy. In sum, our findings raise important questions for future followership research.

First, the mixed findings across our two studies suggest that future research needs to elaborate on time lags in longitudinal research. An increasing number of authors calls for the appropriate inclusion of time aspects both in research designs and in theory, which has been neglected in leadership and organizational research for a long time (see Fischer et al., 2017; Griep & Zacher, 2021; Griep et al., 2021; Shamir, 2011). In Study 1, we used data from a preexisting, more comprehensive data set that had a time lag of nine to 12 months. Since there are some comparable studies that used shorter time lags to detect interrelations of job attitudes and behaviors (for an overview, see, for instance, Riketta, 2008), we used a shorter time lag (i.e., four months) in Study 2. We indeed found two relationships of followership behaviors (at t1) with later job satisfaction and self-efficacy (at t2) that we did not detect in Study 1. These findings suggest that followership behaviors might affect job attitudes or self-efficacy in the short-term rather than in the long-term. Hence, our findings correspond to the analysis of leadership research by Fischer et al. (2017) in view of two points: Fischer et al. (2017) concluded that effects at the team- or

individual level unfold rather quickly, while they do not last very long. Furthermore, they stated that effects on behaviors typically take longer to unfold and persist longer than do effects on cognitions or emotions (Fischer et al., 2017). Still, we need more information on the role that time plays both in followership and leadership research to develop theory further and to better understand the nature of the studied effects (Castillo & Trinh, 2018; Griep et al., 2021). We, therefore, highly recommend future research to consider different time lags in order to learn in which time frames the effects of followership behaviors occur and when they potentially decline. In our two studies, we could demonstrate that followership behaviors are relatively stable, thereby supporting Kelley's (1992) conceptions of rather consistent followership styles. Hence, our findings can guide future followership research, since "the temporal stability of variables and the stability of effects on these variables are criteria for deciding on repeated-measures designs" (Fischer et al., 2017, p. 1740).

Second, we encourage future research to explore potential mechanisms that might appear to be the missing links for the relationships we could not detect in our studies. Benson et al. (2016), for instance, suggest that the situational context affects how leaders see followership behaviors. That is, attempts to influence a leader's decisions in front of others might not be appreciated by the leader. However, while this might be obvious for independent and critical behavior, we would still expect the leader to acknowledge the follower's support through active engagement. Hoption (2016), for instance, demonstrated that the followers' provision of help to leaders corresponds to greater leader relationship satisfaction. Thus, it is somewhat surprising that we could find a positive relation of AE (at t1) with job satisfaction (at t2) only in Study 2, and no positive relation of AE (at t1) with organizational commitment (at t2) in both of our studies. Future research should, therefore, explore potential moderator and mediator variables that might uncover the most detrimental and beneficial conditions for positive followership outcomes.

We suggest that the leaders' preferences and reactions to certain followership styles should be a good starting point to detect the missing links between active and critical followership and followership outcomes. We firstly tested leader humility, which was not confirmed as a moderator in our study despite our prediction. However, Shen & Abe (2022), for instance, found an indirect effect of followership behaviors on job performance through perceived supervisor support. Moreover, we expected POS to strengthen the employees' beliefs that the organization recognizes and rewards increased performance (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) and thereby foster the relationships between active and critical followership with job attitudes. The corresponding hypotheses, however, were not supported by our data. We could neither find a three-way interaction of followership behavior, leader humility and POS. One reason for this could be that leader humility, and POS were highly correlated (r = .60; see Table 7). Future research could further explore which organizational environments affect followership behaviors and its potential outcomes. Blair & Bligh (2018), for instance, argue that values and norms focused on hierarchy and control limit active follower beliefs in shared responsibility for leadership. The findings of Carsten et al. (2010) echo this argument by suggesting that followers' ability to take initiative is diminished by strong bureaucracy.

Third, we explored the relationship of followership with self-efficacy for the first time. In our hypotheses, we postulated that the followers' self-efficacy substantially results from ascribing (at least parts of) the leadership success to own efforts when carrying out an active and independent follower role as they experience mastery in this way. According to Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1997), mastery experience is considered to have the strongest impact on the development of self-efficacy. We could only detect a negative relation of ICT (at t1) with later self-efficacy (at t2) in Study 2, although we had predicted a positive relation. One reason could be again that ICT was not appreciated by the leaders. The followers' efforts to contribute independently then might had been not successful and, thus, they were experienced as a personal failure rather than personal mastery. In addition, we did not detect any significant relationship of self-efficacy (at t1) with later followership behaviors (at t2), which might result from strong autoregressive paths or inconvenient time-lags. Future research should further investigate whether followership can predict self-efficacy or vice versa with different time-lags. Thereby, research should also clarify whether or under which circumstances exemplary followership implies mastery experience and to which extent Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1997) is applicable to followership research. Moreover, future studies could additionally build on other sources for self-efficacy. If other sources than mastery experience played a more important role than we had expected based on Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1997), different effects could have cancelled each other out. This would be the case, for instance, if simply taking directions (i.e., uncritical followership) led to vicarious experience for some followers, while high levels of independent thinking led to mastery experience for others.

4.7.2 Practical Implications

Our findings provide interesting information for followers, leaders, and organizations. We could demonstrate that followership behaviors are relatively stable behavior patterns, even though it is possible that they change under certain circumstances. Thus, Kelley's (1992) "Identify Your Followership Style Questionnaire" indeed allows for assessing one's own general behavioral tendencies and preferences regarding the interaction with the leader. Hence, our findings support Kelley's (1992) conceptual idea of followership styles in this respect. Since followership, here, is enacted from a formal follower rank or position (see also Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), followership styles should be particularly relevant in the contexts of hierarchical organizations. It may be more difficult to "Identify Your Followership Style", when the reference leader is not apparent in nonhierarchical organizational structures. This would be the case, for instance, in selforganized or agile teams, in which leader and follower roles shift more fluently (see, for instance, Srivastava & Jain, 2017; Zhu et al., 2018).

Our finding regarding the consistency of Kelley's (1992) followership behaviors is valuable for followers, because knowing one's own style allows for reflecting on how the style might fit or not with the leader and/or organization. This is important, because many studies have demonstrated that person-organization-fit, for example, increases satisfaction and reduces the employee's intention to leave the organization (Verquer et al., 2003; Jin, McDonald & Park, 2018). Furthermore, person-supervisor fit is associated with greater leader satisfaction and with a better relationship between leader and follower (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Marstand et al., 2016). For leaders, the assessment of the followers' individual styles may help to understand why followers tend to behave in certain ways. This, in turn, can facilitate an adequate handling of leader-follower-interactions.

For organizations, recognizing followership styles as rather stable behavioral patterns can help to inspire development programs for followership styles that are needed or preferred within the organization. An increasing number of authors calls for such development programs (see, for instance, Bufalino, 2018; Hoption, 2014; Logan & Ganster, 2007). While complementing effective leadership training with followership development programs (Bufalino, 2018; Hoption, 2014) might be a useful approach to foster desired followership behaviors, our findings suggest that it might not be sufficient to simply call for active and/or critical followership to obtain positive organizational outcomes. According to our study, satisfied and committed followers are more likely to participate actively in the leadership process. Thus, our findings at least indirectly point to satisfactory working conditions and appropriate organizational goals as beneficial settings for active followership.

Following Andersson's (2018) argumentation that followership is an important social resource for organizational resilience, organizations might care about developing

desired followership to successfully meet future challenges that could emerge from a pandemic or from other far-reaching developments like, for instance, technological change, disruptive innovation, or climate change. Consequently, followers, leaders, and organizations should reflect on what styles of followership they want to have or show, and which styles they need. Kelley's (1992) operationalization of followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT) can be a useful tool to learn about the way followers actually carry out their follower role. Still, there is more research needed to better understand the impact that different followership styles can have both on the individual and on the organizational level.

4.7.3 Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. First, we used only self-report data, which implies certain risks of common-method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). We addressed related problems by using a time-lagged design. However, future research could complement the evaluations of the followers with their leader's perceptions or with independent observations to further decrease such risks (for related recommendations, see also Gatti et al., 2014; Ribbat et al., 2021).

Second, an increasing number of authors (see, for instance, Antonakis et al., 2010; Bastardoz et al., 2023; Wulff et al., 2023) pointed to the threat of making false causal claims due to endogeneity problems. Since our analysis relied on self-assessment assessed with survey measures both for behaviors and attitudes, our analyses were at risk to suffer from such endogeneity problems. However, the inclusion of multiple measurement points and the cross-lagged design should have reduced the risks for simultaneity bias and reverse causality in our studies. Still, causal inferences should be made with due caution. Future studies, therefore, could apply a variety of methods to further test the causal relationships between followership behaviors and followership outcomes (e.g., experimental designs or multi-method designs with independent observations). Third, we used data from different samples that had been collected within different time-lags. We used data from a preexisting more comprehensive data set that had a time lag of nine to 12 months in our first study. Since we assumed that a positive impact of followership may have vanished by this time and since there are some comparable studies that used shorter time lags to detect interrelations of job attitudes and behaviors (for an overview, see, for instance, Riketta, 2008), we used a shorter time-lag (i.e., four months) in our second study. While our findings suggest that followership behaviors affect job attitudes and self-efficacy rather short-term than long-term, change in relatively stable followership behaviors might unfold rather slowly. However, several relationships that we had hypothesized were neither significant in Study 1 nor in Study 2. While our studies still can be an orientation for designing time-lags for followership research, we recommend future research to consider different time lags in order to learn in which time frames the effects of followership behaviors occur and when they potentially decline. Furthermore, future studies could include more than two time points for a more comprehensive understanding of the longitudinal relationships.

Finally, the sample of our first study consisted of employees that were employed within 11 organization from the service sector. The sample of our second study was a heterogeneous convenience sample from an online respondent pool. Hence, we cannot claim generalizability of our findings, even if several findings were consistent across both of our studies. Future research should, however, further investigate followership behavior in various samples and different sectors to study the generalizability of the impact of active and critical followership.

4.8 Conclusion

Our study contributes to a better understanding of Kelley's (1992) followership behaviors and its relations to important job-related variables (i.e., job attitudes and selfefficacy). Active engagement and independent critical thinking were both found to be stable and rather consistent followership behavior patterns across two different samples and within two different time-lags. Furthermore, we could detect positive relationships between followership behaviors, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and a negative relationship between independent, critical thinking and self-efficacy above and beyond the autoregressive effects. However, across the two studies, we obtained mixed results for several relationships that we had predicted. While some of our hypotheses were only supported in one of the two studies, other relationships that we had predicted were neither significant in Study 1 nor Study 2. Hence, more research is necessary to explore potential mechanisms (including time) that link followership with relevant outcomes. Still, our studies open up promising avenues for future research and provide starting points for its conceptual designs (i.e., for instance, with regard to the treatment of followership behaviors as rather consistent behavior patterns or the definition of appropriate time-lags for longitudinal followership research).

5 Study 3 – Empirical Followership Research Since the Publication of the Formal Theory of Followership by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) – A Systematic Review

Authors: Mirko Ribbat, Kai Klasmeier, Joachim Hüffmeier

5.1 Introduction

The statement "there is no leadership without followers" (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 83) might be self-evident. It clearly underlines the necessity to improve our knowledge of followers and their following in the leadership process (i.e., followership) to overcome limitations of the predominantly leader-centric leadership research (for related reviews, see, for instance, Avolio et al., 2009; Dinh et al., 2014). Considering followership cannot only improve the current understanding of leadership (see, for instance, Chaleff, 1995; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; Kelley, 1992), it is also crucial to gain insights into the active role and contribution of followers influencing relevant organizational outcomes and the leadership process (e.g., Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). It is further relevant not least because followership can explain variance beyond leadership in central organizational outcomes such as task performance or voice (e.g., Qian et al., 2018; Zheng et al., 2019).

In their authoritative and now already classic work from 2014 with more than 1,700 citations in googlescholar in January 2024, Uhl-Bien and colleagues reviewed the treatment of followers in leadership research and developed their integrative "Formal Theory of Followership". They distinguished genuine followership approaches from prior approaches to study followers in the leadership process. Specifically and deviating from prior approaches, they stressed that genuine followership approaches should privilege the role of the follower by investigating the nature and impact of followers and following (i.e., followership characteristics or behavior) in the leadership process (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). According to Uhl-Bien et al (2014), followership characteristics describe traits, motivations, perceptions, or constructions that affect how followership is defined and enacted (i.e., for instance, implicit assumptions about how followers should carry out

their role). Followership behaviors describe behaviors enacted from the standpoint of a follower role (i.e., a position in relation to leaders) or in the act of following (e.g., activities to obey or resist the leader's influence attempts).

With their Formal Theory of Followership (FTF), Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) explicitly warned that genuine followership research has to be more than a mere replication of extant leadership research from another perspective (see Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). This calls for research considering (a) followers and followership as co-producers of leadership influencing the leader, the leadership process, and organizational outcomes (the so-called reversing the lens or co-production approach), or (b) followers and leaders co-constructing followership and leadership in a social interaction process (the so-called co-construction approach; see DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). However, ensuing primary research and also literature reviews that build on Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) risked to blur the clear conceptual boundaries set by the authoritative research of Uhl-Bien et al. (2014).

For instance, there are various studies that refer to Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) and/or have been framed as studying followership, but rather approached general employee behaviors as followership substitutes (such as organizational citizenship behaviors or employee conflict behaviors; e.g., Ahmad et al., 2021; Aw & Ayoko, 2017; A. J. Xu et al., 2019), or that study followership only as a result or boundary condition of the leadership process (thereby once again privileging the leader and perpetuating leadercentric research; e.g., Ali et al., 2020; Coetzee & Henning, 2019; Cook et al., 2021; Derler & Weibler, 2014; Goswami et al., 2020; Kong et al., 2020). According with these primary studies, there are also literature reviews on followership, that—despite clearly having merits—conceptualize followership rather broadly and thereby go very far beyond the followership conceptualization of Uhl-Bien et al. (2014). For instance, Oc et al. (2023) included follower-related predictors (e.g., demographics, traits, affect, sleep, or team climate perceptions) in leadership research, which are neither inherent nor limited to the role of a follower. To increase the conceptual clarity regarding genuine followership research, we take the theoretical lens of Uhl-Bien et al.'s (2014) influential model and conduct a systematic and comprehensive review of pertinent empirical followership research. By doing so, we refine and further develop the criteria for what can and what cannot be classified as genuine followership research in accordance with the theory. Hence, our review is the first to investigate empirical followership research based on the definitions, the framework, and the recommendations of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018).

Accordingly, our goal is to investigate empirical followership research in the context of work and organizations from the publication of the FTF by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) onward. To test which of their calls and impulses have been addressed in subsequent studies, we investigate different pre-registered research questions.¹¹ Specifically, we study how the field of empirical followership research has developed since 2014 (i.e., how many studies with which properties and results have been conducted), which approaches to followership, variables, methods, and measures have been applied in empirical studies since 2014, in how far followership can influence the leader, the leadership process, and organizational outcomes alongside and beyond the leader's influence, and which new impulses for followership research arise from those empirical studies.

By answering those research questions, our systematic literature review makes several contributions to followership theory, research, and practice. First, by translating the definitions of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) into clear inclusion and exclusion criteria for our systematic review, we test whether its theoretical

¹¹ We pre-registered our research questions and procedures at the Open Science Framework: https://osf.io/h4k8a/?view_only=cce4942721a04bd983eeca23fe808784.

notions can in fact be applied to unambiguously identify the proposed followership approaches and variables within published empirical studies. Thus, a study's research questions, operationalizations, and measurements must truly reflect the followership context to be included in our review. Hence, instead of further widening the scope towards all kinds of follower-related variables (see Oc et al., 2023), our review refines and further develops the criteria for what can and what should not be classified as genuine followership research. Second, as the first systematic and comprehensive review of empirical followership studies that either "reversed the lens" or studied followership from the co-construction perspective (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), our review allows us evaluating whether followership is indeed an emerging field as is commonly assumed (see, for instance, Carsten et al., 2018; Khan et al., 2019). Third, we focus on investigated topics and blind spots of previous studies. In this way, we can show which calls and impulses of Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) have been answered in subsequent studies and which aspects have been neglected, both theoretically and methodologically. Based on this analysis, we point out opportunities for future followership studies and approaches, including future methodological choices. Thus, our analysis can guide future research so that it can focus on either improving the current state, continuing promising avenues, and/or on breaking new ground.

Fourth, our review identifies numerous additional followership variables that go beyond Uhl-Bien's et al. (2014) suggestions. In this way, we contribute to a more nuanced understanding of followership and how it has been studied so far. By systematically reviewing all applied followership variables, we aim to update and extend the FTF framework (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018).

Fifth and finally, we critically review the methodological choices and various measurement approaches in existing followership studies. This is relevant because different authors (e.g., Baker, 2007) assumed that a lack of appropriate followership

measures prevented followership research from progressing. Our review outlines which validated followership measures were applied in the reviewed studies, which measures were adapted from other contexts to the context of followership, and which new measurement instruments were developed and/or validated. Hence, we provide an overview of practical tools both for future followership studies and for organizations that may want to assess followership behaviors and/or characteristics to develop followership competencies. This aspect of our review resonates with the increasing number of authors calling for followership development programs equivalent to the common leadership trainings (see, for instance, Bufalino, 2018; Hoption, 2014).

5.2 The Formal Theory of Followership

In their seminal work, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) postulated that followership studies should privilege the role of the follower in the leadership process so that the study of followership aims to better understand the nature and impact of followers and following in the leadership process. In this way, they clearly distinguished followership approaches from prior approaches (i.e., leader-centric, follower-centric, and relational approaches, see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), which privileged the role and contribution of the leader instead. That is, those prior approaches focused, for instance, on the nature and impact of leaders and leading in the leadership process (i.e., leader-centric approaches). Moreover, follower-centric approaches drew attention to the followers' perspective, but still focused on leader and leadership constructions (such as implicit leadership theories or the romance of leadership) instead of follower or followership constructions (such as implicit followership theories or follower role orientations, see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Rather than studying the nature of followership or the followers' contribution to leadership success, those follower-centric approaches explored, for instance, how followers attribute charisma to a leader (e.g., Bligh et al., 2004) or how followers rate their leaders in accordance with their cognitive schema of leader behaviors (e.g., Eden & Leviatan,
1975). Other studies considered leadership as a social exchange process, but positioned the leader as the driving force for the exchange and the relationship building (i.e., traditional relational approaches; see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Hence, prior approaches regularly discussed followers, but not necessarily followership in accordance with the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). To provide a clear theoretical framework that can enhance and truly advance genuine followership research, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) proposed the FTF. This integral theoretical framework contains (i) definitions of followership characteristics and behaviors (see above), (ii) two fundamental approaches to followership (i.e., co-production and co-construction), and (iii) a set of variables that were considered pertinent for the study of followership.

According to Uhl-Bien et al (2014), followership necessarily occurs in the context of hierarchical relationships with leaders and is clearly associated with a follower role or with the act of following. Hence, followership characteristics or behaviors clearly differ from general employee characteristics (e.g., demographics; see Oc et al., 2023) or general behaviors at work that do not occur in relation to leaders (such as general proactivity or work engagement; see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

The first of the two proposed approaches to followership (i.e., the "reversing the lens" or co-production approach) has been described as follows:

The 'reversing the lens' approach [...] centers on investigating ways that followers construe and enact their follower role, and the outcomes associated with follower role behavior. Rather than studying leaders as the entities that "cause" outcomes, this framework focuses on studying followers' characteristics and behaviors as antecedents (i.e., causal agents) of followership outcomes (Shamir, 2007) at the individual, relationship and work unit levels of analysis. (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014, p. 97).

Thus, people in the role of followers are considered to be co-producers of leadership and its outcomes along with their leaders (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). Uhl-Bien and Carsten (2018) later specified that this approach might also involve an informal role perspective, in which leader and follower role-switching can occur in social relations. However, within the role-based "reversing the lens" approach, followership is enacted from a predefined formal or informal follower rank or position (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018).

In contrast, the second approach to followership has been defined as a constructionist approach (see also DeRue & Ashford, 2010) that goes beyond fixed hierarchical role assignments for leaders and followers and explores leadership and followership as a social construction process. This means that the co-construction or leadership process approach to followership investigates how individuals mutually interact and engage in social and relational contexts to construct (or not construct) leadership and followership, while these relational interactions do not necessarily align with formal hierarchical roles (i.e., superiors might not lead and subordinates might not follow; see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). It provides a framework, in which followership studies explore the dynamic interactions between leading and following patterns, take a close look on what characterizes social constructions of following behaviors and identities, or analyze how and why non-following occurs (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Hence, within the co-construction approach, followership does not mean showing behaviors that are carried out from a follower (i.e., subordinate) role, rank or position, but emerges from combined acts of leading and following, leader and follower identity claims or grants, and from the meaning-making processes of different social actors (see Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018).

In addition to these two approaches to followership, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) provided a set of potential constructs and variables that they considered pertinent for the study of followership. According to the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018), variables in followership research must reflect the unique context and research questions associated with followership. That is, followership occurs in the context of hierarchical relationships with leaders or refers to the act of following within a social interaction process. Furthermore, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) echoed Shamir's (2007) call for considering leaders and followers as co-producers of leadership, followership, and its outcomes rather than only "reversing the lens" by studying just the same variables that have been used in leader-centric research. This means that followership research should not just mirror or replicate leadership research from the followers' perspective, but it should provide research questions and models that allow for a better understanding of the specific nature and impact of followers and following (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Among the proposed followership characteristics in the FTF are, for instance, followers' implicit followership theories, follower role orientations, follower identity, or the followers' political skill (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Proposed followership behaviors are, for instance, obedience, resistance, upward influence, initiative-taking, or voice. The authors also suggest leader characteristics (i.e., for instance, satisfaction with followers or leader identity) and leadership behaviors (i.e., for instance, feedback seeking or follower development) as pertinent variables for followership studies. Furthermore, pertinent outcomes are supposed to be genuine individual follower outcomes (e.g., organizational advancement), individual leader outcomes (e.g., motivation), relationship outcomes (e.g., trust), and leadership process outcomes (e.g., unethical conduct; see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

5.3 Review Methodology

To systematically review empirical followership research since 2014, we selected empirical studies based on the following procedure. We searched for empirical followership studies within the fields of psychology, social science, and business research that were published as peer-reviewed journal articles between 2014 and 2022 in English language, and that referred to work and organizational contexts. In the following, we will first describe our search strategy in more detail. We will then elaborate on the criteria for study inclusion and outline the review procedure.¹²

5.3.1 Search Strategy

For our systematic literature review, we developed a search string and applied it to six databases (i.e., Scopus and APA PsychInfo, APA PsychArticles, SocIndex, Business Source Primier, and Econlit via EBSCO) on February 10th, 2022 (all details of the search string can be found in Appendix K). The search string contained four basic elements.

With the first element of the string, we intended to find every article that had the words "follower" or "followership" in the title. With the second element of the string, we intended to additionally perform a more nuanced search to find studies that investigate the followership constructs Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) had suggested. Therefore, in addition to the title search for "follower" and "followership", we also searched for "follower", "member", or "employee" in combination with followership characteristics or behaviors such as "resistance", "dissent", or "influence tactics" (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) in titles, abstracts and keywords.¹³ With the third element of the string, we intended to additionally find followership studies that might use new or additional followership constructs, which were not mentioned by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014). Hence, we added a few more general terms to the title, abstract, and keyword search, for instance, "characteristic", "skill", or "identity" in combination with "follower". In the fourth element of the string, we added some limitation criteria (i.e., for instance, time range [2014-2022], scientific disciplines, and English as the publication language). With the "AND NOT" operator, we excluded hits outside our region of interest (i.e., for instance, "animal", "child", or "social media"). Furthermore, given our strict focus on empirical followership studies, we excluded notes,

¹² We pre-registered our research questions and procedures at the Open Science Framework: https://osf.io/h4k8a/?view_only=cce4942721a04bd983eeca23fe808784.

¹³ Note that we applied several Boolean Operators to make our search string as precise as possible. For instance, we used asterisks for variations of the keywords and proximity operators to connect related terms.

editorials, reviews, conference papers, and books. With a separate search, however, we tried to ensure that there was no other systematic review that conflicts with our research interest.

Our search resulted in 6,330 hits total (see Figure 5). In addition, we conducted a citation forward search of Uhl-Bien et al. (2014), which resulted in additional 356 hits. After removing duplicates, we obtained 4,716 articles for abstract screening. The screening of the abstracts resulted in 182 articles that we selected for full-text screening, because either the study was considered eligible for our review or we could not yet make a decision based on the abstract. The first author performed the full literature search and study selection. Following common practice (e.g., Fischer et al., 2021; Forner et al., 2023; Gullifor et al., 2023), another author additionally performed one half of the full-text screening for inter-rater reliability with substantial agreement (84%; k = .67, p < .001; Cohen, 1960; Landis & Koch, 1977). All discrepancies between the two authors were discussed and resolved, which finally led to 100 percent agreement. A total of 89 studies were included in our review.

5.3.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

To identify followership studies in our systematic literature search, we referred to the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). Hence, we included followership research that either (i) "reversed the lens" (see Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) or (ii) studied followership from a leadership process/co-construction perspective (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). In contrast, we excluded leader-centric, follower-centric, or relational approaches that neglected the role and contribution of the followers in leadership. Based on the theoretical principles and definitions of the FTF (see above; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018), we specified clear inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study selection of our systematic review (see Table 8).

Figure 5

PRISMA flow chart



Note. *Scopus, and APA PsychInfo, APA PsychArticles, SocIndex, Business Source Primier, Econlit (via EBSCO); ** no organizational / work context (e.g., social media, supply chains, politics); *** e.g., theoretical paper, editorial, review; **** e.g., leadercentric, follower-centric, general employee behavior.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
In general, we aimed to identify empirical studies that focused specifically on the nature and impact of followers and following in the leadership process.	
We included quantitative and qualitative studies that investigated followership characteristics and/or behaviors as independent or mediator variables.	In contrast, we excluded studies that studied followership characteristics and/or behaviors only as moderators or dependent variables.
We solely included studies, which investigated followership characteristics and/or behaviors that were clearly related to a leader (i.e., related to the followership role such as follower role orientations, leader support or dissent with the leader).	In contrast, characteristics and/or behaviors that were not specifically related to a leader (i.e., for instance, personality traits of followers or general employee behaviors such as work engagement) were not considered followership characteristics or behaviors in our review.
Leader behaviors and characteristics (for pertinent examples, see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) can play a role in followership studies (e.g., as moderator or outcome variables). However, we solely included studies that linked leader-related variables to followership characteristics or behaviors as described above. This also applied to other context variables (i.e., for instance, organizational culture).	In contrast, we excluded studies that did not link leader-related (or context) variables to followership characteristics or behaviors as described above.
We also included followership studies that did not investigate leader behaviors, perceptions, or characteristics at all (i.e., for instance, when they focused on the interrelation of followership characteristics and followership behaviors as defined above).	
We included studies that, for instance, investigated followers' implicit followership theories in relation to leaders' implicit followership theories.	However, we did not include studies that focused on leader-follower fit or the differences in perceptions between leaders and followers (i.e., for instance, the congruence or discrepancy of general values) as long as they did not aim to understand better the nature and impact of followers and following in the leadership process.
We also included studies that investigated followership in informal roles (e.g., when leader and follower roles fluctuate or switch within persons).	
We included quantitative and qualitative studies with student samples, or occupational intervention studies.	However, we excluded articles from an educational context with empirical evidence that was not sufficient for the purposes of our review (i.e., for instance, anecdotal reports from followership or leadership training programs, or surveys about the question whether followership should play a more important role in such programs).
We included scale development and validation studies of followership questionnaires.	
We also included constructionist approaches that studied followership as part of a dynamic relational process. Specifically, we included studies that considered followers to be active participants with leaders in co-constructing leadership, followership, and outcomes. In order to be considered a followership study, those studies, however, had to investigate the nature and impact of following (or non-following) in the leadership process (i.e., for instance, why, when, or how people claim or grant a follower identity).	In contrast, studies that were limited to the construction of leaders or to the act of leading were considered as leader-centric and, therefore, were excluded from our systematic followership review (i.e., for instance, studies that focused exclusively on leader emergence; see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018).

5.3.3 Review Procedure

To answer our research questions, we analyzed the 89 included studies and extracted and synthesized the following information: (i) descriptive information (i.e., for instance, types of samples and sample size, or countries where the research was conducted), (ii) the research question of the study, (iii) the followership constructs investigated, (iv) the applied measures to operationalize the followership constructs, (v) the investigated non-followership variables, (vi) the applied methods, and (vii) the main findings. We also categorized each study according to the following approaches: (a) "reversing the lens"/co-production" approach to followership (see Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), (b) "leadership process/co-construction" approach to followership (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018), and (c) scale development/validation study.

Furthermore, we assessed the quality of each study to review the state of followership research and which evidence the selected studies were able to provide. To do so, we largely followed the Study Design and Implementation Assessment Device (Valentine & Cooper, 2008) to assess the quality of the included studies. Specifically, we evaluated the (i) study design, (ii) operationalization and measurement, and (iii) statistical approaches. We categorized each study as "adequate", "fair", or "questionable" in these three domains. For (i) study design, we assessed whether the research design was appropriate to address the aims of the research. Specifically, we determined if sample sizes were reported, justified, and whether the sample sizes were adequate to provide sufficiently precise estimates of effect sizes (see Valentine & Cooper, 2008; for details, see also Appendix L). In addition, we identified whether the outcome was measured at an appropriate time for capturing the proposed effect and to what extent directions of effects could be identified for important measured outcomes (see Valentine & Cooper, 2008). For (ii) operationalization and measurement, we evaluated to what extent variables were assessed in a way that is consistent with the definitions of the study and its proposed effects. That is, measures should represent the content of interest (i.e., they should at least have face validity), and measures should be sufficiently reliable to allow adequately precise estimates of the effect sizes (see Valentine & Cooper, 2008). For (iii) statistical approaches, we determined whether the statistical tests were adequately reported and whether effect sizes and their standard errors were accurately reported (see Valentine & Cooper, 2008). Similarly, the qualitative data analysis in qualitative studies should also be reported precisely and plausibly. Further details concerning the quality assessment procedure can be found in Appendix L.

5.4 Review Findings

Although followership research is still only a small part of leadership research, Figure 6 shows that it can indeed be described as an emerging field. The majority of studies were conducted in North America or Europe (n = 52), followed by Asia (n = 37). Sample sizes ranged from 56 to 212,223 participants for quantitative studies. The median was 297. If we treat the extraordinarily large sample of 212,223 participants as an outlier, the other studies realized an average sample size of 342. For qualitative studies, sample sizes ranged from 4 to 92 participants with an average sample size of 39. The median was 29. The majority of studies were single-study reports (n = 65), while 24 studies were multistudy reports. The 89 studies comprised 128 different samples. A comprehensive overview of all included studies that contains information on the chosen followership approach, the unit of analysis, the methodological approach, the sample, and a brief summary of results can be found in Appendix M.

Figure 6



Amount of empirical followership studies since 2014

5.4.1 Followership Approaches and Methods

Table 9 shows the distribution of the studies with regard to their followership approaches and their methodological approaches. In a first step, we sought to answer our first two research questions: Which approaches to followership have been applied in empirical studies since 2014? And is there possibly a lack of balance between the two fundamental approaches? To do so, two authors independently assigned the selected studies to one of the followership approaches as part of the coding process to obtain information on inter-rater reliability (see the search strategy as described above). With only one discrepancy, which was later resolved by discussion, substantial agreement was achieved (97%; k = .65, p < .001; Cohen, 1960; Landis & Koch, 1977).

The vast majority of studies (n = 78) that we identified for this review used a "reversing the lens"/co-production approach to followership (Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Those studies were role-based, because followership referred to a static formal follower role or position (see Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). One study (Falls & Allen, 2020),

however, investigated the dynamics and switching between leader and follower roles within individuals and, hence, explored followership from an informal role perspective (see Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). We could identify only three studies that used a leadership process/co-construction approach to followership (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018), which indicates an asymmetry between the two fundamental approaches within the FTF framework. Furthermore, 14 out of 89 studies were scale development or psychometric validation studies.

In a second step, we sought to answer the following research questions: Which methods have been applied to investigate followership in empirical studies since 2014? And were different methods used for the "reversing the lens"/co-production approach than for the leadership process/co-construction approach?

Table 9 shows that most of the reviewed studies used a quantitative methodological approach. Within the "reversing the lens"/co-production followership approach (Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), most studies used a cross-sectional quantitative approach (n = 43), 27 studies used a time-lagged or longitudinal approach, and 12 studies used an experimental design. Qualitative methods were applied in nine role-based followership studies. All three leadership process/co-construction (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) studies used exclusively qualitative methods. For scale development and validation, a cross-sectional quantitative approach was primarily used (n = 14), while four studies also applied qualitative methods for scale development.

The assessment of study quality revealed that the study designs of 30 out of 89 studies were questionable (see Table 10). One of the main reasons for this assessment was that those studies used a cross-sectional quantitative design to test cause-effect relationships (e.g., consequences of followership behaviors). Another frequent problem of certain study designs was a sample that lacked sufficient statistical power. Furthermore, for 12 studies, the operationalization or measurement of the main variables were questionable.

Approaches to followership (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) used in the reviewed studies

Approach to followership	Methods used for investigation	Reviewed studies
Reversing the lens / Co-production		
Role-based (formal)	Quantitative (cross-sectional)	n = 43 (Aghaei et al., 2021; Almeida et al., 2021; Arain et al., 2020; Baker et al., 2016; Camps et al., 2020; Clarke et al., 2019; Coyle & Foti, 2022; Dahling & Whitaker, 2016; Ellis et al., 2021; Essa & Allatari, 2019; Garner, 2016; Gatti et al., 2017; Geertshuis et al., 2015; Granger et al., 2020; Hoption, 2016; Huang & Zhang, 2021; Ivanoska et al., 2019; Jin et al., 2018; Jin et al., 2019; Kang et al., 2016; Khan et al., 2020; Kim & Schachter, 2015; Kosasih et al., 2020; Kudek et al., 2020; Lapalme et al., 2017; Leung & Sy, 2018; Li, Zhao et al., 2020; Li, Zheng et al., 2020; Liu & Dong, 2020; Metwally et al., 2018; Qian et al., 2018; Redmond et al., 2016; Ren & Chen, 2018; Ren et al., 2022; Sibunruang et al., 2014; Stegmann et al., 2020; Wang & Peng, 2016; Xu et al., 2014; Yang et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2022; Zhang & Wang, 2021; Zhang , 2020; Zheng et al., 2019)
	Quantitative (time-lagged/ longitudinal)	<i>n</i> = 27 (Babalola et al., 2021; Carsten et al., 2018; Carsten et al., 2021; De Clercq et al., 2021; de Jong et al., 2021; Ellis et al., 2021; Gong et al., 2020; Howell et al., 2015; Huang et al., 2018; Jiang et al., 2021; Klotz et al., 2018; Lu et al., 2019; Mao, 2022; Peters & Haslam, 2018; Ren et al., 2022; Sessions et al., 2020; Shen & Abe, 2022; Veestraeten et al., 2021; Vriend et al., 2020; Wen et al., 2021; Xu, Yang et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2021; Yousaf et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2019; Zhong et al., 2021)
	Quantitative (experimental)	n = 12 (Braun et al., 2017; Camps et al., 2020; Ellis et al., 2021; Gloor, 2021; Güntner et al., 2021; Knoll et al., 2017; Lu et al., 2019; Schneider et al., 2014; Sessions et al., 2020; Vriend et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2020)
	Qualitative	n = 9 (Almeida et al., 2021; Benson et al., 2016; Garner, 2016; Gesang & Süß, 2021; Gordon et al., 2015; Kim & Schachter, 2015; Ren et al., 2022; St-Hilaire et al., 2019; Tessema & Florovito, 2021)
Role-based (informal)	Qualitative	n = 1 (Falls & Allen, 2020)
Leadership process / Co-construction	Qualitative	n = 3 (Blom & Alvesson, 2014; Larsson & Nielsen, 2021; Van De Mieroop, 2020)
Other study focus (i.e., scale development or validation studies)	Quantitative (cross-sectional)	n = 14 (Bell, 2020; Gatti et al., 2014; Ghislieri et al., 2015; Granger et al., 2020; Huang & Zhang, 2021; Junker et al., 2016; Li, Zhao et al., 2020; Manning & Robertson, 2016; Peterson et al., 2020; Petruş, 2018; Ren et al., 2022; Ribbat et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2019)
	Qualitative	n = 4 (Huang & Zhang, 2021; Ren et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2019)

Note. Studies that used mixed-method approaches (n = 12) are categorized multiple times; several studies (n = 6) provided a scale development or instrument validation along with additional research questions and are categorized multiple times

Quality assessment

Quality assessment	Number of studies	Reviewed studies
At least fair in all categories	<i>n</i> = 40	Bell (2020), Babalola et al. (2021), Benson et al. (2016), Blom & Alvesson (2014), Carsten et al. (2018), Carsten et al. (2021), De Clercq et al. (2021), De Jong et al. (2021), Falls & Allen (2020), Gatti et al. (2014), Gesang & Süß (2021), Ghislieri et al. (2015), Gong et al. (2020), Gordon et al. (2015), Güntner et al. (2021), Howell et al. (2015), Jiang et al. (2021), Junker et al. (2016), Klotz et al. (2018), Knoll et al. (2017), Larsson & Nielsen (2021), Lu et al. (2019), Mao (2022), Ren et al. (2022), Ribbat et al. (2021), Schneider et al. (2014), Sessions et al. (2020), St- Hilaire et al. (2019), Tessema & Florovito (2021), Van De Mieroop (2020), Veestraeten et al. (2021), Vriend et al. (2020), Wen et al. (2022), Yousaf et al. (2019), Zhang et al. (2020), Zheng et al. (2019), Zhong et al. (2021)
Study design (of multi-study reports) partially fair	<i>n</i> = 12	Almeida et al. (2021), Braun et al. (2017), Camps et al. (2020), Coyle & Foti (2022), Ellis et al. (2021), Garner (2016), Gloor (2021), Granger et al. (2020), Huang & Zhang (2021), Huang et al. (2018), Kim & Schachter (2015), Yang et al. (2020)
Operationalization and measurement (of multi-study reports) partially fair	<i>n</i> = 1	Kim & Schachter (2015)
Study design questionable	<i>n</i> = 30	Aghaei et al. (2021), Arain et al. (2020), Baker et al. (2016), Clarke et al. (2019), Dahling & Whitaker (2016), Gatti et al. (2017), Geertshuis et al. (2015), Hoption (2016), Jin et al. (2018), Jin et al. (2019), Kang et al. (2016), Khan et al. (2020), Kosasih et al. (2020), Lapalme et al. (2017), Leung & Sy (2018), Li, Zhao et al. (2020), Li, Zheng et al. (2020), Liu & Dong (2020), Manning & Robertson (2016), Metwally et al. (2018), Peters & Haslam (2018), Qian et al. (2018), Redmond et al. (2016), Ren & Chen (2018), Sibunruang et al. (2014), Stegmann et al. (2020), Wang & Peng (2016), Xu et al. (2014), Zhang & Wang (2021), Zhang (2020)
Operationalization or measurement questionable	<i>n</i> = 12	Essa & Allatari (2019), Ivanoska et al. (2019), Jin et al. (2018), Jin et al. (2019), Kang et al. (2016), Khan et al. (2020), Kosasih et al. (2020), Kudek et al. (2020), Li, Zhao et al. (2020), Manning & Robertson (2016), Petruş (2018), Xu, Yang et al. (2019)
Statistical approaches questionable	<i>n</i> = 6	Kosasih et al. (2020), Metwally et al. (2018), Peterson et al. (2020), Shen & Abe (2022), Xu, Yang et al. (2019), Zhang (2020)

For instance, some studies (e.g., Essa & Alattari, 2019; Ivanoska et al., 2019) used Kelley's (1992) questionnaire in its original form to assess his two proposed dimensions of followership behavior (i.e., active engagement and critical thinking toward the leader). However, different validation studies (see, for instance, Blanchard et al., 2009; Ribbat et al., 2021) showed that the underlying factor structure of this questionnaire differs from what Kelley (1992) had expected. Moreover, several studies reported either questionable reliability of certain scales or no reliability information at all. Furthermore, the statistical approaches were questionable for six studies due to incomplete reporting of the procedure or the results (i.e., for instance, no degrees of freedom were reported for structural equation modeling).¹⁴

We assessed 40 out of 89 studies to be at least "fair" in all categories (i.e., study design, operationalization and measurement, and statistical approaches), which suggests that their findings should be rather robust (see Valentine & Cooper, 2008). Those studies were mainly designed as qualitative, quantitative longitudinal/time-lagged, or experimental studies. Furthermore, some cross-sectional study designs were considered fair as they were validation studies or were only interested in descriptive information, such as how some followership styles were distributed in certain samples. In addition to those 40 studies, we found another 12 multi-study reports to be partially fair designed. That is, one or more studies of the multi-study report were adequately or fairly designed, while other studies were not. Similarly, we found one study (Kim & Schachter, 2015) to be partially fair operationalized.

5.4.2 Investigated Followership Constructs

With regard to investigated followership constructs (i.e., followership characteristics and behaviors), we sought to answer the following research questions:

¹⁴ For a number of studies, more than one aspect was assessed as questionable. For instance, one study was assessed as questionable in all three aspects. Another five studies had both a questionable design and a questionable operationalization. One study was questionable concerning study design and statistical approaches. Another study was questionable concerning operationalization and statistical approaches.

Which followership constructs have been investigated in empirical studies since 2014? Which followership constructs have been neglected? And are there additional followership constructs that Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) did not suggest in their review? Table 11 shows the followership constructs that were investigated in the reviewed studies. We found several followership characteristics and behaviors in our systematic review that Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) had suggested in their theoretical framework, variables that brought new perspectives on those proposed constructs, and constructs that went beyond Uhl-Bien's et al. (2014) suggestions. Following our quality assessment as described above (see also Table 10), in this section, we only refer to those studies with at least fair operationalizations and measurements of the followership constructs.

5.4.2.1 Followership Characteristics and Behaviors as Conceived by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014)

First, several studies investigated followership characteristics and behaviors as conceived by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014; see Table 11). (i) Implicit followership theories (e.g., Junker et al., 2016), (ii) Kelley's (1992) followership behaviors and styles (e.g., Gatti et al., 2014), (iii) upward influence tactics and impression management (e.g., De Clercq et al., 2021), (iv) voice behaviors (e.g., Carsten et al., 2018), and (v) feedback seeking (e.g., Gong et al., 2020) were the most studied constructs and, thus, can be highlighted as the main focus of empirical followership research since 2014. In contrast, advising was the only construct that was conceptualized as followership behavior by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) and not investigated in the reviewed studies at all. Furthermore, political skill, Machiavellianism, motivation to lead, and romance of leadership were considered potential followership characteristics by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014), but were not under investigation in the reviewed studies.

Followership characteristics and behaviors that were investigated in the reviewed studies

Category	Variables
Followership co	nstructs as conceived by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014)*
Followership characteristics	Implicit followership theories (Aghaei et al., 2021; Braun et al., 2017; Coyle & Foti, 2022; Junker et al., 2016; Knoll et al., 2017; Stegmann et al., 2020; Veestraeten et al., 2021; Wang & Peng, 2016; Yang et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2022; Zhang & Wang, 2021)
	Group level implicit followership theories (Leung & Sy, 2018)
	Role orientation (Carsten et al., 2018; Carsten et al, 2021)
	Followership identity (Peters & Haslam, 2018; Schneider et al., 2014; Tessema & Florovito, 2021)
Followership	Proactive and effective followership behaviors (Benson et al., 2016; Gesang & Süß, 2021; Manning & Robertson, 2016 ¹ ; Tessema & Florovito, 2021)
behaviors	Kelley's (1992) followership behaviors and styles (Bell, 2020; Gatti et al., 2014; Gatti et al., 2017; Ghislieri et al., 2015; Jiang et al., 2021; Kim & Schachter, 2015; Peterson et al., 2020; Ribbat et al., 2021; Shen & Abe, 2022)
	Profiles of followership behaviors (Almeida et al., 2021; Gordon et al., 2015)
	Obedience (Almeida et al., 2021)
	Resistance (Aghaei et al., 2021; Almeida et al., 2021; Güntner et al., 2021)
	Upward influence tactics and impression management (Clarke et al., 2019; De Clercq et al., 2021; Geertshuis et al., 2015; Klotz et al., 2018; Lu et al., 2019; Sibunruang et al., 2014; Zhang, 2020) Unward delegation (Carsten et al., 2018)
	Voice behaviors (Carsten et al., 2018: Howell et al., 2015: Huang et al., 2018: Xu et al., 2021: Yousaf et al., 2019: Zhang et al., 2020)
	Implicit voice delivery (Ren et al., 2022)
	Group voice behaviors (Babalola et al., 2021; Sessions et al., 2020)
	Dissent (Garner, 2016)
	Feedback seeking (Dahling & Whitaker, 2016; Gong et al., 2020; Lapalme et al., 2017; Mao, 2022; Qian et al., 2018; Zheng et al., 2019)
	Claiming a follower role or identity (Blom & Alvesson, 2014; Larsson & Nielsen, 2021; Van De Mieroop, 2020)
Additional follow	vership constructs as identified in this review**
Followership	Leader-related political knowledge (Granger et al., 2020)
characteristics	Follower's power profile (Metwally et al., 2018)
	Implicit voice theories (Ellis et al., 2021)
	Subordinate Moqi (Wen et al., 2021; Zheng et al., 2019; Zhong et al., 2021)
	Individual perception of group-level guanxi practice (Ren & Chen, 2018)
	Reciprocity motives (Vriend et al., 2020)

Followership behaviors	Helping behavior (Hoption, 2016)			
	Courageous communication (Baker et al., 2016)			
	Relationship building with the leader (Baker et al., 2016; Lapalme et al., 2017)			
	Supervisor-subordiante guanxi building behaviors (Ren & Chen, 2018)			
	Perspective taking of the leader (Baker et al., 2016; Huang & Zhang, 2021; Liu & Dong, 2020)			
	Promotion and prevention behaviors (Xu, Yang et al., 2019)			
	Routine / strategic behaviors (Tessema & Florovito, 2021)			
	Followership behaviors to promote the leader's health (St-Hilaire et al., 2019)			
	Emotional masking, surface and deep acting (Xu et al., 2014; Yang et al., 2021)			
	Feedback avoidance behavior (Arain et al., 2020)			
	Interaction avoidance (Huang & Zhang, 2021)			
	Sarcastic interaction with leader (Gloor, 2021)			
	Abusive followership behavior (Camps et al., 2020)			
	Subordinate psychological contract breach (de Jong et al., 2021)			
	Conflict management styles with leader (Redmond et al, 2016)			
	Leader-follower role switching (Falls & Allen, 2020)			

Note. *Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) suggested potential followership constructs and variables on page 97; **followership constructs that were not listed by

Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) but that were investigated in the reviewed studies.

Second, some studies brought up new perspectives to those research lines that were suggested by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014), that is, while the constructs were part of Uhl-Bien et al.'s (2014) model, they were investigated in new ways. For instance, some authors introduced group-level variables to the framework of followership constructs. Leung and Sy (2018), for instance, studied group-level implicit followership theories that represent shared conceptions of followers at the group level. Babalola et al. (2021) and Sessions et al. (2020) focused on group-level voice behaviors, which represent combined contributions or shared suggestions and concerns that are put forward to the leader in order to challenge the status quo.

5.4.2.2 Framework Extensions: Newly Identified Followership Characteristics

In addition to those constructs that were suggested by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014), we identified 23 more followership constructs (i.e., six followership characteristics and 17 followership behaviors) that were investigated in the reviewed studies (see Table 11). With regard to followership characteristics, Ellis et al. (2021), for instance, studied an equivalent to implicit followership theories with implicit voice theories (i.e., "socially acquired beliefs, or implicit theories, about what makes voice risky in social hierarchies"; Detert & Edmondson, 2011, p. 462). Metwally et al. (2018) investigated the followers' power profiles as the sum of power sources that let the leader comply to the followers' influence attempts. Granger et al. (2020) introduced leader-related political knowledge as a followership characteristic, which refers to the follower's perceived understanding of the relationships, demands, resources, and preferences of the leader as the target of influence. A few studies (Wen et al., 2021; Zheng et al., 2019; Zhong et al., 2021) went in a similar direction by investigating subordinate moqi as a followership characteristic that is considered to be more specific to Asian culture. It refers to the followers' proactive understandings about leaders' unspoken requirements, expectations, intentions, and desires

based on non-verbal cues (such as body gestures, facial expressions, and voice tone; Zheng et al., 2019).

Subordinate-supervisor guanxi is another concept from the Asian background, which is related to leader-member-exchange. It involves close personal links that emerge from informal connections and relationship building outside the workplace (H. Ren & Chen, 2018). Ren and Chen (2018) studied the individual perception of group-level guanxi practices along with subordinate's guanxi-building behaviors. The individual perception of group-level guanxi refers to the perception of whether guanxi typically influences their supervisor's decisions (H. Ren & Chen, 2018). Hence, it can be considered a followership characteristic. Furthermore, Vriend et al. (2020) investigated follower motivation in the form of reciprocity motives, defined as the intention to reciprocate former experiences with the leader either in favor of the leader or in favor of oneself.

5.4.2.3 Framework Extensions: Newly Identified Followership Behaviors

In addition to those followership characteristics, we could also detect several forms of followership behavior that extend the list of potential followership constructs and variables as conceived by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014; see Table 11). That is, for instance, some followership behaviors that we identified aim to mimic prominent leadership behaviors, such as abusive followership (Camps et al., 2020). Furthermore, we found several forms of behaviors that provide a more nuanced understanding of proactive followership, such as followers' helping behaviors related to their leaders (Hoption, 2016), courageous communication toward the leader (Baker et al., 2016), and relationship- or guanxi-building behaviors that were carried out by the followers (Baker et al., 2016; Lapalme et al., 2017; H. Ren & Chen, 2018). Three studies (Baker et al., 2016; Q. Huang & Zhang, 2021; Liu & Dong, 2020) investigated the follower's taking of the leader's perspective as followership behavior. Tessema and Folovorito (2021) distinguished routine and strategic followership behaviors. Routine behaviors referred to regular, repetitive actions without taking into account benefits to one's future career or position, whereas strategic behaviors focused on the follower's action grounded in one's future career or position aspiration.

Apart from followers' facilitative proactivity, some studies focused on avoidant behaviors. That is, some studies applied previously suggested followership behaviors but inspected feedback avoidance (Arain et al., 2020) instead of feedback seeking, or interaction avoidance (Q. Huang & Zhang, 2021) instead of proactive behavior. With reference to emotional labor research in the context of service work, Xu et al. (2014) and Yang et al. (2021) adapted the concepts of emotional masking, surface and deep acting to the followership context. This means that followership behaviors were investigated in form of followers' attempts to disguise their true inner feelings and the modification of their displayed affect in front of their leaders (J. Xu et al., 2014; J. Yang et al., 2021).

De Jong et al. (2021) brought up another perspective on followership behaviors as they explored the consequences of subordinates' psychological contract breach (i.e., the failure to meet expectations about obligations and benefits within the employment relationship). In contrast to previous leader-centric research, de Jong et al. (2021) focused on the consequences of the subordinates' psychological contract breach vis-à-vis the leader and, thus, presented another construct within the framework of followership behavior. Similarly, Gloor (2021) investigated social norm violations of followers and studied the followers' sarcastic interactions with their leader as a form of followership behavior. Finally, the three leadership process/co-construction studies (Blom & Alvesson, 2014; Larsson & Nielsen, 2021; Van De Mieroop, 2020) explored individuals' claiming and granting of the follower role or identity in different social interactions.

5.4.2.4 Measures of Followership Characteristics and Behaviors

In addition to the identification of followership characteristics and behaviors that were investigated in the reviewed studies, we also sought to answer the following research questions: Which measures were used for the different followership constructs? And which new ways to measure followership have been developed, applied, or adapted in empirical studies since 2014? We provide an overview of such measures in Table 12. Following our quality assessment of the reviewed studies (see also the previous chapter and Table 10), we additionally present information on whether the specific measure refers to a previously established measure, whether a validation of a measure was provided within the reviewed study, whether the instrument displays at least face validity, or whether its validity is questionable according to our assessment (see Table 12).

In sum, 52 different measures were used in the reviewed studies to investigate various forms of followership characteristics and behaviors. Among these 52 measures, previously established instruments (n = 31) were applied to measure followership characteristics and behaviors.¹⁵ In addition, 13 new measures were developed since 2014. Four of these 13 newly developed measures were also applied in other studies that we reviewed (i.e., beyond the study introducing them). Furthermore, nine newly developed measures were validated within the followership studies that we reviewed. The other four measures displayed at least face validity, even if they were not validated within the reviewed studies.

Twelve existing measures were adapted to comply with the followership context (i.e., with the followership role) and, hence, could be considered followership characteristics or behaviors. That is, for instance, Yang et al. (2021) used the instrument to measure emotional labor by Grandey (2003) and modified the reference person of the items by replacing "customers" with "supervisor" to measure the extent to which subordinates engaged in deep and surface acting directed at their leader. Similarly, existing measures were adapted for the follower's power profile (Metwally et al., 2018), supervisor-subordinate guanxi building behaviors (H. Ren & Chen, 2018), perspective

¹⁵ Note that Kelley's (1992) followership styles and behaviors were, in fact, measured in different ways. Six of those eight measurement instruments were valid and reliable. The measurement instruments were based on the questionnaire as proposed by Kelley (1992), but showed that underlying different factor structure was more adequate than Kelley's original suggestion and/or differed regarding the language used.

taking vis-à-vis the leader (Liu & Dong, 2020), subordinate psychological contract breach (de Jong et al., 2021), emotional masking (J. Xu et al., 2014), and abusive followership (Camps et al., 2020). All 12 adapted measures display face validity according to our assessment (see Table 12).

5.4.3 Investigated Non-Followership Constructs

Apart from identifying followership constructs (i.e., followership characteristics and behaviors) and its measures, we also sought to answer the following research question: Which variables other than followership characteristics and behaviors have been investigated in followership studies since 2014? By analyzing these variables and the central findings of the studied research models, we also address the following research question: How has the field of empirical followership research developed since 2014? Table 13 shows the non-followership specific variables that were explored within the reviewed studies with their function in the different followership models (i.e., as another independent variable, moderator variable, mediator variable, or dependent variable). Furthermore, Table 13 indicates, which of these variables were investigated in studies that were assessed to have at least fair quality.

Category	Application	Measures
followership characteristics	Applied	Implicit followership theories (Junker et al., 2016 ¹ ; Sy, 2010 ¹)
		Implicit voice theories (Detert and Edmondson, 2011)
		Role orientation (Carsten et al., 2018 ¹ ; Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012 ¹)
		Followership identity (Carsten et al., 2010 ¹)
		Subordinate Moqi (Zheng et al., 2017 ¹ ; Zheng et al., 2019 ¹)
		Reciprocity motives (Perugini et al., 20031)
	Adapted	Follower's power profile (Hersey et al., 1979 ³)
		Individual perception of group-level guanxi practice (Chen et al., 2004 ³)
	Newly developed	Implicit followership theories (Junker et al., 2016 ²)
		Implicit followership theories for Chinese context (Yang et al., 2020 ²)
		Role orientation (Carsten et al., 2018 ²)
		Follower identity (Peters & Haslam, 2018 ³)
		Subordinate Moqi (Zheng et al., 2019 ²)
		Leader-related political knowledge (Granger et al., 2020 ²)
followership behaviors	Applied	Kelley's followership styles and behaviors (Bell, 2020 ² ; Blanchard et al., 2009 ¹ ; Colangelo, 2000 ¹ ; Kelley, 1992*; Kim & Schachter, 2015*; Gatti et al., 2014 ² ; Peterson et al., 2020 ² ; Ribbat et al., 2021 ²)
		Relationship building with leader (Rosenbach et al., 1997 ³)
		Perspective taking of the leader (Rosenbach et al., 1997 ³)
		Courageous communication (Rosenbach et al., 1997 ³)
		Resistance (Tepper et al., 2001 ¹)
		Upward influence tactics (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1990 ¹ ; Kipnis et al, 1980 ¹ ; Kumar & Beyerlein, 1991 ¹ ; Yukl et al., 2008 ¹)
		Impression management (Bolino & Turnley, 1999 ¹ ; Bolino et al., 2006 ¹)
		Voice behaviors (Detert and Burris, 2007 ¹ ; Liang et al., 2012 ¹ ; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014 ¹ ; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998 ¹)
		Group voice behaviors (Huang and Paterson, 20171)
		Dissent (Garner, 2009 ¹)
		Feedback seeking (Ashford, 1986 ¹ ; Callister et al., 1999 ¹ ; Fedor et al., 1992 ¹ ; VandeWalle et al., 2000 ¹)
		Feedback avoidance behavior (Moss et al., 20031)
		Interaction avoidance (Nifadkar et al., 2012 ¹)
		Conflict management styles with supervisor (Rahim, 1983)
	Adapted	Helping behavior (Ng & Van Dyne, 2005 ³)
		Supervisor-subordiante guanxi building behaviors (Law et al., 2000 ³)
		Relationship building with the leader (Ashford & Back, 1996 ³)
		Perspective taking of the leader (Grant & Berry, 2011 ³)
		Subordinate psychological contract breach (Robinson & Morrison, 2000 ³)
		Emotional masking, surface and deep acting (Gross & John, 1998; Grandey, 2003 ³)
		Abusive followership (Tepper, 2000 ³)
		Group voice behaviors (Liang et al., 2012 [group average] ³)
		Upward delegation (Carsten et al., 2018 ³)
	Newly developed	Brief followership scale for nurses based on Kelley's (1992) (Ghislieri et al., 2015 ²)
		Index based on Kelley's (1992) (Jin et al., 2018*)
		Defee's (2009) followership styles (Li, Zhao et al., 2020 ²)
		Implicit voice delivery (Ren et al., 2022 ²)
		Feedback seeking (Dahling & Whitaker, 2016 ³)
		Idea enactment as an upward influence tactic (Lu et al., 2019 ³)
		Perspective taking of the leader (Huang & Zhang, 2021 ²)

Measures of followership characteristics and behaviors

Note. Applied = existing measures were applied; adapted = existing measures were adapted

to comply with the followership role; newly developed = new measures were developed.

Non-followership variables that were investigated in the reviewed studies (as dependent,

moderator, mediator, or additional independent variables)

Category	Application	Variables
Follower characteristics	Additional (independent) variable	Age (Stegmann et al., 2020 ¹)
		Gender (Braun et al., 2017 ²)
		Positive or negative health and wellbeing (Gatti et al., 2014; Ribbat et al., 2021; Gatti et al., 2017 ¹)
		Job satisfaction (Gatti et al., 2014; Ghislieri et al., 2015; Ribbat et al., 2021)
		Organizational commitment/identification (Ribbat et al., 2021)
		Political skill, political will and political savvy (Granger et al., 2020 ²)
		Personality traits (Kudek et al., 2020 ¹ ; Ribbat et al., 2021; Xu, Yang et al., 2019 ¹)
		Emotional intelligence (Metwally et al., 2018 ¹)
		Implicit leadership theories (Petrus, 2018 ¹)
		Image enhancement motive (Dahling & Whitaker, 2016 ¹)
		Person-organization-fit (Jin et al., 2018^{1})
		Person-supervisor-int (Ren & Chen, 2018)
		Public service motivation (Jin et al., 2019)
	Mediator variable	Perceived leader support (Jin et al., 2019 ¹ ; Shen & Abe, 2022 ¹ ; Yang et al., 2021; Zhang & Wang, 2021 ¹)
		Job satisfaction (Jin et al., 2018 ¹)
		Positive or negative health and wellbeing (Kang et al., 2016 ¹ ; Klotz et al., 2018) Behavioral regulation focus (Xu, Yang et al., 2019 ¹)
		Change readiness (Kosasih et al., 2020 ¹)
		Goal clarity (Zheng et al., 2019)
		Perceived Leader expectations (Veestraeten et al., 2021)
		Role clarity (Lapalme et al., 2017 ¹)
		Self-efficacy (Leung & Sy, 2018 ¹)
		Creativity (Lu et al., 2019)
		Trust in leader (Khan et al., 2020° ; Li, Zheng, et al., 2020°)
		Workplace popularity (De Clercq et al., 2021)
	Moderator variable	Gender (Yang et al., 2022)
		Status (Howell et al., 2015)
		Expertise (Zhang et al., 2020)
		Humility (Zhong et al., 2021)
		Political skill (Dahling & Whitaker, 2016 ¹ ; Klotz et al., 2018; Sibunruang et al., 2014 ¹ ; Xu, Yang et al., 2019 ¹)
		Self-esteem (Sibunruang et al., 2014 ¹)
		Perception of organizational politics (Liu & Dong, 20201)
		Person-organization-fit (Gong et al., 2020)
		Interdependent self-construction (Xu, Yang et al., 2019 ¹)
		Power distance orientation (L1, Zheng et al., 2020 ¹ ; Zheng et al., 2019)
		Social dominance orientation (De Clercq et al., 2021)
Follower behaviors	Additional (independent) variable	Organizational citizenship behavior (Gatti et al., 2014)
	Mediator variable	Work effort (Carsten et al., 2021; Leung & Sy, 2018 ¹) Organizational citizenship behaviors (Aghaei et al., 2021 ¹)
	Moderator variable	Perspective taking (Huang & Zhang, 2021 ² ; Wen et al., 2021)
	Dependent variable	Customer orientation (Kang et al., 2016 ¹)
	<u>.</u>	Employee deviance (Klotz et al., 2018)
		Withdrawal (Carsten et al., 2021)
		Followers' tendency to contribute to unethical leadership (Knoll et al., 2017)
		Employee proactivity (Granger et al., 2020 ²)

		Organizational citizenship behaviors (Junker et al., 2016; Qian et al., 2018 ¹ ; Ribbat et al. 2021; Wen et al. 2021)
		Voice (Oian et al., 2021 , well et al., 2021)
		Work engagement (Veestraeten et al., 2021)
		Help-seeking behavior (Arrain et al., 2018 ¹)
		Knowledge hiding (Zhong et al., 2021)
		Organizational dissent (Redmond et al., 2016 ¹)
Leader	Additional	Leader identity (Falls & Allen, 2020; Larsson & Nielsen, 2021; Peters & Haslam, 2018; Van Da Minnen, 2020)
characteristics	(independent) variable	2018 [•] ; van De Mieroop, 2020)
		Hummity (Zhong et al., 2021)
		Leader's implicit using theories (Veestratien et al., 2021)
		Leader simplicit voice meories (Enis et al., 2021-)
	Mediator variable	Perceived follower support (Xu et al., 2021)
		Moral attentiveness (Babalola et al., 2021)
		Affect (Güntner et al., 2021)
		Leader identity (Jiang et al., 2021)
		Performance pressure (de Jong et al., 2021)
		Perceived interpersonal justice (Camps et al., 2020 ²)
		Accountability (Gloor, 2021 ²)
	Moderator variable	Gender (Hoption, 2016 ¹)
		Sense of power (Sessions et al., 2020)
		Cognitive style (Xu et al., 2021)
		Leader's implicit followership theories (Güntner et al., 2021)
		Self-doubt (Camps et al., 2020 ²)
		Moral identity (Gloor, 2021 ²)
	Dependent variable	Perceived follower support (Carsten et al., 2018)
		Perceptions of follower contribution to goal attainment (Carsten et al., 2018)
		Perceived appropriateness of followership behaviors (Garner, 2016 ²)
Leader behaviors	Additional	Abusive supervision (Arain et al., 2020 ¹)
	(independent) variable	(Un)ethical leadership behavior (Knoll et al., 2017; Yousaf et al., 2019)
		Authentic leadership behavior (Wen et al., 2021)
		Empowering leadership behavior (Oian et al.: 2018 ¹)
		Leadership styles (Essa & Allatari, 2019 ¹ ; Ivanoska et al., 2019 ¹ ; Li, Zhao et al., 2020 ¹)
		Participative leadership behavior (Kim & Schachter, 2015 ²)
		Emotion display (Schneider et al., 2014; Yang et al., 2022)
	Mediator variable	Leader receptivity and recognition (Howell et al., 2015; Huang et al., 2018 ² ; Sessions et al., 2020)
	Moderator variable	Authentic leadership behavior (Zhang et al., 2020)
		Emotion control (Ren et al., 2022)
	Dependent variable	Abusive supervision (Babalola et al., 2021; Camps et al., 2020 ² ; Mao, 2022)
		Benevolent leadership behavior (Wang & Peng. 2016)
		Destructive leadership behavior (Güntner et al., 2021)
		Empowering leadership behavior (Li, Zheng et al., 2020 ¹)
		Transformational leadership behavior (Hoption, 2016 ¹ ; Khan et al., 2020 ¹ ; Li, Zhao et al., 2020 ¹)
		Leader receptivity and recognition (Zhang et al., 2020)
		Voice endorsement (Ren et al., 2022)
		Voice solicitation (Liu & Dong, 2021)
		Leader overpay (Gloor, 2021 ²)
Followership Outcomes	Dependent or mediator variable	
Individual Follower		Positive or negative health and wellbeing (Kang et al., 2016 ¹ ; Stegmann et al., 2020 ¹ ; Xu et al., 2014 ¹ ; Yousaf et al., 2019)
Outcomes		Job satisfaction (Coyle & Foti, 2022 ² ; Gatti et al., 2017 ¹ ; Stegmann et al., 2020 ¹ ; Xu et al., 2014 ¹)
		Organizational commitment/identification (Stegmann et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2014)

		Self-efficacy (Zhang & Wang, 2021 ¹)
		Turnover intention (Jin et al., 2018 ¹ ; Stegmann et al., 2020 ¹ ; Xu et al., 2014 ¹)
		Performance evaluations (Carsten et al., 2021; Clarke et al., 2019 ¹ ; Dahling & Whitaker, 2016 ¹ ; Ellis et al., 2021 ² ; Geertshuis et al., 2015 ¹ ; Howell et al., 2015; Huang et al., 2018 ² ; Huang & Zhang, 2021 ² ; Junker et al., 2016; Kim & Schachter, 2015 ² ; Kosasih et al., 2020 ¹ ; Lapalme et al., 2017 ¹ ; Leung & Sy, 2018 ¹ ; Qian et al., 2018 ¹ ; Shen & Abe, 2022 ¹ ; Xu, Yang et al., 2019 ¹ ; Zheng et al., 2019)
		Career adaptability (Gong et al., 2020)
		Promotability/rehiring chances (Huang et al., 2018 ² ; Lapalme et al., 2017 ¹ ; Sibunruang et al., 2014 ¹ ; Zhang, 2020 ¹)
		Potential for serving in a leadership role (Baker et al., 2016 ¹)
		Leader emergence (Jiang et al., 2021; Peters & Haslam, 20181)
		Person-organization fit (Jin et al., 20191)
		Flexible work arrangement (Clarke et al., 2019)
		Follower effectiveness (Garner, 2016 ² ; Lu et al., 2019)
		Organizational/social influence (De Clercq et al., 2021; Metwally et al., 2018 ¹)
Individual Leader		Positive or negative health and wellbeing (de Jong et al., 2021; Gesang & Süß, 2021; Sessions et al., 2020; St-Hilaire et al., 2019)
Outcomes		Positive or negative emotions (Gesang & Süß, 2021; Schneider et al., 2014)
		Leader motivation (Carsten et al., 2018)
		Leader performance evaluations (Sessions et al., 2020)
Relationship Outcomes		Leader-member-exchange (Junker et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2021) Relationship satisfaction (Hention, 2016)
		Collegial relationships (Vang et al. 2020^2)
Leadership Process Outcomes		Managerial leadership (Blom & Alvesson, 2014) Unethical conduct (Vriend et al., 2020)
Contextual/ situational	Additional (independent) variable	Ambidextrous organization (Kosasih et al., 2020 ¹)
variables	(Leader member exchange (Gatti et al., 2017) Leader te al., 2016 ¹ ; Ribbat et al., 2021; Vriend et al., 2020)
	Mediator variable	Leader-member-exchange (Ellis et al., 2021 ² ; Lapalme et al., 2017 ¹ ; Stegmann et al., 2020 ¹ ; Xu et al., 2014 ¹)
		Mutual respect (Clarke et al., 2019 ¹)
		Feedback environment (Gong et al., 2020)
		Goal congruence (Liu & Dong, 20201)
	Moderator variable	Co-worker support (Arain et al., 2020 ¹)
		Team characteristics (Babalola et al., 2021)
		Contact frequency with supervisor (Carsten et al., 2021; Metwally et al., 2018 ¹)
		Leader-follower tenure (Shen & Abe, 2022 ¹)
		Job tenure (Yang et al., 2022)
		Working conditions (de Jong et al., 2021; Coyle & Foti, 2022 ²)
		Work climate (Coyle & Foti, 2022 ²)
		Leader-member-exchange (Coyle & Foti, 2022 ² ; Huang et al., 2018 ²)
		Workplace friendship (Zhang & Wang, 2021 ¹)

Note. ¹Study quality is questionable in at least one category (i.e., study design, operationalization and management, statistical approaches); ²study quality is partly questionable (i.e., one or more studies of the multi-study report were adequately or fair designed, while other studies were not; see also Table 10).

5.4.3.1 The Nomological Network of Followership Characteristics and Behaviors

In what follows, we proceed largely in correspondence with the scheme of theoretical constructs and variables for the study of followership as suggested by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014). However, we present the actually studied variables since 2014 and extend the scheme by using a somewhat more differentiated approach: In our presentation, we clearly distinguish followership characteristics and behaviors from other variables in the authors' nomological network. While followership characteristics and behaviors (which were analyzed in the previous chapter), by definition, must refer to the followership role, the variables presented in the current part of the review represent all other, non-followership specific variables that were part of the studied models (i.e., as another independent variable, mediator variable, or dependent variable).

The first column of Table 13 clusters those studied variables into six different categories. These categories are (i) follower characteristics, (ii) follower behaviors, (iii) leader characteristics, (iv) leader behaviors, (v) followership outcomes, and (vi) contextual/situational variables. Follower characteristics and behaviors (i.e., followerrelated variables) here represent all characteristics and behaviors of followers that do not refer to the follower role (i.e., for instance, general characteristics of the followers such as age or self-esteem, or general behaviors of the followers such as work effort or helpseeking behavior that was not directed at the leader) and, hence, could not be considered followership characteristics or behaviors. Leader characteristics and behaviors are all leader-related variables that were studied in the reviewed studies. Followership outcomes refer to individual follower outcomes, individual leader outcomes, relationship and leadership process outcomes of followership characteristics or behaviors as conceived by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014). All other variables were categorized as contextual/situational variables. The second column of Table 13 clusters the studied variables by their function in the followership models (i.e., the variables were either used as an additional [independent] variable, as a mediator variable, as a moderator variable, or as a dependent variable of followership characteristics and/or behaviors). Finally, the third column of Table 13 provides the different variables along with the corresponding references.

Several variables that Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) suggested for the study of followership, however, were not considered in the reviewed studies. These variables were (i) the leaders' satisfaction with followers, (ii) democratic or autocratic decision making, (iii) feedback seeking, and (iv) consultation with followers. Moreover, several leadership process outcomes that Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) proposed were not directly investigated in the reviewed studies (i.e., (i) goal accomplishment, (ii) mission fulfillment, and (iii) advancing change/maintaining the status quo.

5.4.3.2 Central Findings of Followership Research Since 2014

To provide an overview of the evidence that the reviewed followership studies were able to provide, we summarize their central findings in this section. We only refer, however, to those studies that had at least a fair quality according to our assessment (see Table 10). As described above, we found several studies with questionable designs, operationalizations, or reporting of statistical procedures or results. Hence, those studies could not ensure sufficient robustness of their findings (see Valentine & Cooper, 2008) and are thus left out of our in-depth overview.

First, a wide variety of studies provided evidence for the presence of different followership characteristics, styles, and behaviors. That is, for instance, the findings of numerous studies (e.g., Braun et al., 2017; Coyle & Foti, 2022; Junker et al., 2016; Knoll et al., 2017; Veestraeten et al., 2021; A. Yang et al., 2022; Y. Yang et al., 2020) support the assumption that followers have distinct cognitive schemas about ideal or prototypical and counter-ideal or anti-prototypical followers (i.e., different implicit followership theories), about different follower identities (e.g., Peters & Haslam, 2018; Schneider et al., 2014), and different follower role orientations (e.g., Carsten et al., 2018, 2021). Numerous studies

support Kelley's (1992) assumption that active engagement and independent, critical thinking toward the leader are two distinctive followership behaviors (e.g., Bell, 2020; Gatti et al., 2014; Ghislieri et al., 2015; Ribbat et al., 2021). Furthermore, several qualitative studies uncovered distinct active and passive followership behaviors (such as contributing to the overall vision or simply executing commands; e.g., Benson et al., 2016; Gesang & Süß, 2021; Gordon et al., 2015; Kim & Schachter, 2015), or routine and strategic followership behaviors (Tessema & Florovito, 2021). St-Hilaire et al. (2019) inductively developed a taxonomy of followership behaviors that promote the leader's health. Almeida et al. (2021) inductively identified different types of followers that were confronted with a destructive leader (i.e., resisters, obedient, and mixed-behavior followers). Moreover, the findings of Falls and Allen (2020) suggest that managers need to be flexible to switch between leader and follower roles in order to be effective.

Second, proactive and constructive followership identities and behaviors were largely found to be positively related to what are usually considered desirable individual, interpersonal, or organizational variables, and mainly negatively related to what are usually considered undesired variables. For instance, three studies found that implicit theories, role orientations, or identities that associate the ideal follower with proactivity or a coproduction belief were positively related to effort, performance, voice, or positive leader emotions, whereas associating a follower with passivity and/or disobedience rather had the opposite effects (Carsten et al., 2018, 2021; Schneider et al., 2014). Similarly, Kelley's (1992) active and independent followership behaviors were positively associated with organizational citizenship behaviors (Gatti et al., 2014; Ribbat et al., 2021) and the follower's emergence as a leader (Jiang et al., 2021). Furthermore, they were negatively associated with the followers' disengagement (Gatti et al., 2014). In addition, the findings of Gesang and Süß (2021) and Benson et al. (2016) also suggest that proactive rather than passive followership behaviors were preferred by the leaders.

However, inconsistent results were found for the two dimensions of Kelley's (1992) followership behavior (i.e., active engagement and independent, critical thinking toward the leader) with regard to job-related attitudes (Gatti et al., 2014, 2017; Ribbat et al., 2021), emotional exhaustion (Gatti et al., 2014; Ribbat et al., 2021), and leadermember exchange (LMX; Gatti et al., 2014; Ribbat et al., 2021). That is, for instance, active engagement was found to be positively related to job satisfaction (Ribbat et al., 2021), while critical thinking was found not to be related to job satisfaction at all (e.g., Gatti et al., 2014). Furthermore, according to the findings of Veerstraeten et al. (2021), followers might reduce their engagement at work, when they have the general belief that followers should be hardworking and productive, but feel that their leader does not convey high expectations. In addition, the findings of Knoll et al. (2017) suggest that implicit followership theories could either increase (i.e., the schema of being a "good citizen") or decrease (i.e., the schema of "insubordination") the followers' tendencies to contribute to unethical leadership. These findings also point to the specific situational context as an important boundary condition, under which implicit followership theories unfold their effects (Knoll et al., 2017).

Furthermore, the findings of eight studies suggest that voice behavior directed at the leader can have a positive impact for both the individual and the organization. For instance, voice was found to be related to greater follower well-being (Yousaf et al., 2019), leader receptivity and recognition (Howell et al., 2015; Z. Zhang et al., 2020), better performance evaluation (Howell et al., 2015), follower endorsement by the leader (R. Ren et al., 2022), perceived follower support, leader motivation, contribution to goal attainment (Carsten et al., 2018), LMX (A. J. Xu et al., 2021), as well as lower abusive supervision (Babalola et al., 2021) and lower emotional exhaustion for the leader (Sessions et al., 2020). In addition, the findings of three studies suggest that the follower's feedbackseeking from the leader represents a form of proactive, constructive followership behavior, since it was found to be positively associated with the follower's career adaptability (Gong et al., 2020) and subsequent perceptions of moqi with the leader (Zheng et al., 2019). Furthermore, Mao (2022) found that directly asking the leader for feedback was negatively related to abusive supervision. However, trying to get feedback by simply watching the leader's reactions was found to be positively related to abusive supervision (Mao, 2022).

Additionally, two studies found upward influence tactics and impression management to be predictors for personal success or favorable leader reactions, such as social influence over others (De Clercq et al., 2021), or positive idea assessments by the leader (Lu et al., 2019). However, the findings by Klotz et al. (2018) suggest that the use of impression management can have negative implications for the followers themselves (i.e., in form of resource depletion) and it might lead to harmful behavior from an organizational perspective. Additionally, follower moqi was found to be a helpful resource for desired followership outcomes. The findings of three studies (Wen et al., 2021; Zheng et al., 2019; Zhong et al., 2021) suggest that follower moqi can be useful for followers to be effective within the leadership process and the organization (i.e., for instance, with regard to social influence exerted over the leader or getting rewards from the leader; see Zheng et al., 2019).

Third, inconsistent findings were reported for masking, opposing, and destructive followership behaviors. That is, the findings of Yang et al. (2021) suggest that emotional masking might have a negative impact on LMX quality, while followers' attempts to actually change their underlying affective experience (i.e., deep acting) might rather benefit LMX quality (J. Yang et al., 2021). With regard to opposing followership behaviors, Garner (2016) reports a general openness from the interviewed leaders to constructive dissent in his qualitative study. Resisting behaviors, however, might appear either constructive (Gloor, 2021) or destructive (Güntner et al., 2021) for the leader and the organization. Two studies linked destructive followership behaviors with negative

consequences for the leader, such as emotional exhaustion (de Jong et al., 2021), perceived interpersonal injustice by the leader, and with abusive supervision (Camps et al., 2020). The findings of Gloor (2021), however, suggest that a social norm violation in form of sarcastic interaction with the leader can reduce the leader's self-interested behavior (i.e., leader self-overpay). Inconsistent results were also found for the effects of reciprocity motives of followers on the intention for unethical conduct. For instance, Vriend et al. (2020) found that the relationship between a positive reciprocity motive and intended proself unethical behavior was negative in one of their studies and positive in their other study.

Finally, the studies that applied the constructionist approach to followership provided insights into follower identity claims and grants within different social interactions. Blom and Alvesson (2014) explored who influenced, inhibited, and initiated managerial leadership among engineers in two organizations. Results indicate that subordinates rather than their manager defined the leadership situation, although subordinates temporarily and partially accepted a followership identity (Blom & Alvesson, 2014). Moreover, Larsson and Nielsen (2021) examined how people collaboratively construct identities in eight organizations. Their conversation analysis of different team and department meetings revealed that leader and follower roles remained abstract in workplace interactions and that participants rather focused on negotiated, task-oriented, and practical identities (such as expert or non-expert identities, see Larsson & Nielsen, 2021). Furthermore, they worked out risks and challenges of claiming a follower identity (i.e., for instance, the challenge to identify a leader identity at play and creating an appropriate follower identity, see Larsson & Nielsen, 2021). Additionally, Van De Mieroop (2020) also analyzed the construction of leader and follower identities by using a discourse-analytical approach. She worked out how participants of various meetings of healthcare workers either actively co-constructed the superior's leader identity or projected a leader identity upon the superior by actively enacting their identities as followers (Van De Mieroop, 2020).

5.5 Discussion

Our systematic review of empirical followership research since 2014 revealed that an increasing number of studies conceptualizes followers as relevant contributors, coproducers, or co-constructors of leadership and its outcomes. While not all studies that we included in our review referred to the followership framework explicitly, a wide variety of constructs were investigated in line with the FTF by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014). Based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria that we developed in line with the FTF, we could examine the different followership approaches, the studied followership characteristics and behaviors, several measures for their assessment, its nomological network, and the different methods used. By analyzing the reviewed studies, however, we also uncovered some shortcomings, research gaps, and promising avenues for future research that we discuss in the following. Thereby, we refer to our following two research questions: Which new impulses for followership research arise from the empirical studies since 2014? And what has been neglected so far?

5.5.1 Key Findings, Shortcomings, And Future Directions

Based on our key findings and current shortcomings, which we have highlighted in this section, we have summarized potential areas for future research in Table 14. We also identified possible research topics and open research questions for each of these areas.

Directions for future research

Current issues and areas for future research	Suggested topics and research questions
Approaches to followership	 Address the imbalance between the two approaches by conducting more studies focusing on the co-construction approach Compare different approaches to followership for a more nuanced understanding of their interrelations (e.g., in how far does the co-construction of leader and follower roles relate to the co-production of organizational outcomes?) Study different approaches to followership in the context of major societal and organizational changes (e.g., technological change, climate change)
Co-production approach	 More rigorous study designs (e.g., longitudinal studies, experimental designs) are needed to address issues of endogeneity and causality Considering the simultaneous influence of leaders <i>and</i> followers in more comparative ways Study a wider variety of followership constructs and advance knowledge through more in-depth analysis Study more diverse outcomes of followership that truly reflect the followership domain (e.g., satisfaction with followership performance instead of employee performance in general)
Co-construction approach	 Advance understanding of why individuals claim or do not claim a follower role/identity (i.e., construction of followership) Use mixed-method and quantitative designs (i.e., extensive longitudinal studies or behavioral interaction coding) to investigate the co-construction of leadership and followership
Measurement of followership	 Develop and validate new followership measures to address issues of reliability and validity Move beyond questionnaire-based measures of followership (e.g., behavioral observations)
Synthesis of followership and leadership studies	• Leadership research should move from the top-down, leader-oriented approach to a more comprehensive approach that also considers and values followership and the followers' active contribution to the leadership process

5.5.1.1 The Two Fundamental Approaches to Followership

In our analysis of empirical followership research since Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) presented their FTF, we found that most followership studies "reversed the lens" (Shamir, 2007) or studied the followers' leadership co-production. Only three out of 89 studies applied a leadership process/co-construction approach. These findings correspond to the concerns that Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) themselves expressed when they introduced their theory: They assumed that leadership researchers would prefer the role-based approach over the constructionist approach, as it appears to be easier to study (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Neglecting the leadership process/co-construction approach is a relevant shortcoming of followership research, since the constructionist perspective is an integral part of the FTF (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). The constructionist approach allows for a deeper understanding of the interplay of leading, following, and nonfollowing and, thereby, of the co-construction of leadership and followership as a dynamic social interaction process between social actors regardless of their formal position (i.e., supervisor or subordinate). Our analysis, however, shows that empirical followership research—apart from a few exceptions—has missed the opportunity to move forward to a new and better understanding of the social processes that co-construct leadership and followership, as most studies stuck to the predetermined labels of leaders and followers.

Moreover, several studies from the context of leadership identity construction processes could not be included in our review in the first place because they were leadercentric (e.g., Ali et al., 2020; Cook et al., 2021). For instance, an increasing number of studies focus on leader emergence or shared leadership as consequences of leadership identity construction (see, for instance, Wu et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2018), without asking, however, why, when, or how people claim or grant a follower identity (i.e., the construction of followership; see also Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). Thus, while we found a trend toward more pertinent research activity, the application of the two fundamental approaches to followership is unbalanced. Neglecting the constructionist approach to followership reveals a gap that should be filled in future studies (see Table 14).

5.5.1.2 The Investigated Followership Characteristics and Behaviors

Our systematic review reveals a large number of studied constructs and variables that fit into the integrative framework of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). However, our findings also reveal that empirical followership research still lacks depth in several ways. Firstly, a few constructs were studied (much) more often than others, which indicates an imbalance of constructs under investigation. In fact, most of the followership constructs that we identified in our review appeared in only one or two studies, thus preventing cumulative knowledge (see Table 11). It is not surprising, however, that Kelley's (1992) followership behaviors or Sy's (2010) implicit followership theories were among the most studied variables, as they belong to those prominent (and early) theoretical approaches that are a core part of the followership concept. Still, we would have expected more progress for empirical tests of further prominent theoretical approaches that were specifically developed to conceptualize followership. For instance, Chaleff's (1995) courageous followership or the partnership model by Hurwitz and Hurwitz (2015) were not investigated at all in the reviewed studies and, hence, are still lacking empirical exploration.

Secondly, even the most studied followership constructs (i.e., Kelley's [1992] followership behaviors and styles, implicit followership theories, upward influence tactics and impression management, voice behaviors and feedback seeking) were investigated in a rather fundamental way: This research included validation studies of new or existing measures (e.g., Gatti et al., 2014; Petruş, 2018), related studies often focused on a limited number of variables, and some studies were even limited to the description of (preferred) followership styles (e.g., Essa & Alattari, 2019; Ivanoska et al., 2019). While some research lines do have a longer tradition that exceeds the time period that we reviewed (for an overview of upward influence tactics research, for instance, see Lee et al., 2017), we, thus, observe that most followership research lines have just begun empirical exploration.

Third, we found that several variables that Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) suggested for the study of followership were not investigated in the reviewed studies at all (e.g., the followers advising or various followership outcomes such as goal accomplishment and mission fulfillment). Hence, there are several opportunities for future research that our analysis could identify.
Thus, going forward, one promising avenue would be to explore the variety of constructs presented in our review in more depth. It might be particularly promising to further test the various prominent theoretical approaches that are a core part of the followership concept (i.e., for instance, Carsten et al., 2010; Chaleff, 1995; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; Kelley, 1992; Sy, 2010) to make progress both theoretically and empirically (Table 14).

Additionally, it is important to provide comparative tests of different followership approaches and concepts. This can help to establish theoretical parsimony by avoiding construct redundancy. Hence, future studies may focus on comparing different followership approaches in terms of their utility and incremental validity to predict organizational outcomes (cf. Hoch et al., 2018; Montano et al., 2023; Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). According to our analysis of followership studies between 2014 and 2022, proactive and constructive followership characteristics and behaviors seem to be positively related to what are usually considered desirable individual, interpersonal, or organizational outcomes, and mainly negatively related to what are usually considered undesired outcomes. Future research could compare which of these followership concepts is more effective and for instance results in better performance outcomes or greater satisfaction. Such comparative research can also be meaningful to further establish and distinguish followership from leadership.

5.5.1.3 The Nomological Network of Followership Characteristics and Behaviors

In addition to followership characteristics and behaviors, we also analyzed the variables that extend or contribute to the nomological network of followership constructs. Since Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) echoed Shamir's (2007) call for considering leaders and followers as co-producers of leadership and its outcomes rather than "reversing the lens" by studying just the same variables that have been used in leader-centric research, we asked as one of our research questions: In how far did the studied variables truly reflect the

unique context and research questions associated with followership? Our findings show that there is in fact a large overlap between the variables that have been investigated in the context of followership characteristics and behaviors and variables that have been traditionally studied in leader-centric research (e.g., wellbeing, organizational commitment, performance, LMX). However, we found several leader-related variables (such as perceived follower support) and followership outcome variables (such as LMX) that correspond to the proposed scheme by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014). In addition, several followership outcomes, which were not proposed by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014), can still help followers to learn about how to be effective in creating a desired work environment and, thus, should also be considered suitable for the study of followership. For instance, follower well-being is an important goal for successful leadership in organizations, not least since it is also associated with better performance (see, for instance, Inceoglu et al., 2018; Montano et al., 2023). Furthermore, our findings show that several studies included leader characteristics and behaviors as additional independent variables (e.g., the leader's implicit followership theories), as mediator variables (e.g., perceived follower support), or as moderator variables (e.g., leader's emotion control) in their followership models. Hence, those followership studies explored the contribution and impact of followers (i.e., they were followership studies by definition), while considering both followers and leaders as co-producers of leadership (i.e., these studies answered the call by Uhl-Bien et al. [2014] and Shamir [2007]).

Some variables that we found in the reviewed studies, however, do not appear unique to the context of followership and, therefore, rather mirror traditional leadership research questions from a different perspective. For instance, general behaviors of followers that were not enacted from the standpoint of a follower role were also studied as dependent variables in the reviewed models (such as customer orientations, employee proactivity, or work engagement). Furthermore, the attempts to explain leadership styles (e.g., transformational leadership behavior) from a followership perspective are indeed at risk of just mirroring leader-centric research from the follower's perspective. However, it is a plausible assumption that leaders alter their behavior in the wake of their experiences with certain followers (see, for instance, Güntner et al., 2021; L. Li et al., 2020).

Hence, apart from a few exceptions, a clear exclusion of variables, which were also studied in traditional leadership research, based on conceptual or theoretical grounds is, in fact, hardly possible. That is, leadership and followership are closely related and, therefore, a certain overlap of the variables of interest is natural to some extent. In addition, we found the derivation of theoretical hypotheses in the reviewed studies largely to be plausible. Since the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) provides a rather integrative framework for the study of the nature and impact of followers and following in leadership, followership studies usually have to rely on additional theoretical foundations in order to derive well-grounded and plausible hypotheses. Still, if future studies set out to advance knowledge on followership, they should carefully focus on outcome variables that relate closely to the follower role or the act of following. For instance, future research could explicitly explore the satisfaction with followership behavior as a performance measure that fits the followership framework instead of assessing employee performance in general (as many studies that we reviewed did, see Table 13).

5.5.1.4 Methodological Approaches and Quality Concerns

We found strengths and weaknesses in existing research in our analysis of the methodological approaches, which can guide future research. First of all, many methods were applied in the reviewed studies, which is, of course, a strength (see Table 9). Hence, those studies echoed the call by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) for methodological approaches that can result in both deductively and inductively developed models. Most studies, however, used a quantitative approach rather than a qualitative approach and survey measures were primarily used to inspect the followership variables. Therefore, future research might

consider using different methodological approaches (and especially mixed-method approaches), which also corresponds to the argument that a range of paradigmatic perspectives is needed for a true scholarly advance (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Ospina, 2012).

In addition, it is noteworthy that the reviewed studies varied widely with regard to their methodological conceptions and complexity. Moreover, we found quality concerns in a large number of the reviewed studies. A key problem was that most of the quantitative studies were cross-sectional. This is a relevant shortcoming of current followership research, because research questions almost always refer to the temporal link between followership variables and related outcomes, which cannot be properly determined when both are measured at the same time (see, for instance, Mitchell & James, 2001). Even if we found a clear trend toward more followership research activity in our systematic review, taking these methodological issues into account, extant empirical evidence is still limited. The problem of relying on cross-sectional data, however, is not unique to followership research and it is also prevalent in leadership and other organizational studies (see, for instance, Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010). Future research, therefore, should conduct more longitudinal studies and use more experimental designs or even mixed-method approaches. These methodological approaches would help to gain a better understanding of the causeand-effect relationships in leadership and followership, which is essential to test the appropriateness of both a "reversing the lens" and a co-construction approach. Regarding the co-construction approach, quantitative studies can also supplement existing qualitative studies. Extensive longitudinal studies (e.g., diary studies; see Gabriel et al., 2019) can be used to examine the reciprocity or the mutual interplay of claiming and granting of leadership and followership. Furthermore, behavioral observation designs offer the opportunity to investigate leader-follower interactions with high temporal resolution (Klonek et al., 2019).

In our review, we could identify a large number of measures that were applied in the reviewed studies. While only a few instruments were developed to measure followership explicitly (e.g., Kelley's [1992] followership behaviors and styles, implicit followership theories, or follower role orientation), our findings provide a wide variety of measures that fit in the integral followership framework of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018; see Table 12). Moreover, our analysis revealed options to adapt measures from other contexts to comply with the followership role (e.g., Metwally et al., 2018; J. Yang et al., 2021), which opens up new ways to assess various kinds of characteristics and behaviors that followers might display to contribute to or withdraw from the leadership process. However, many studies that we reviewed relied on face validity. Some studies even displayed questionable operationalizations and measurements. Therefore, more research is needed to demonstrate the required validity and reliability of the numerous followership measures (e.g., for abusive followership or emotional masking, see Table 12).

Another cause for concern is that only six out of the 26 included studies that were published after 2020 considered potential impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. This means that most studies neglect this important topic, although the pandemic challenged both organizations and their members to adapt to a drastically changed environment of an unexpected external crisis. Organizations and their members were forced to react constantly to changing conditions, lock downs, and varying legal requirements that led to internal adjustments of work organization and forms of collaboration—at least temporarily. Carsten et al. (2021), for instance, pointed out that the COVID-19 pandemic created a context of high physical separation and varying interaction frequency between leaders and followers as increased numbers of employees began to work remotely (see also Hickman & Robison, 2020). Their study on follower adjustments to distal leadership during COVID-19 suggests that the link between interaction frequency with the leader and the followers' level of engagement depended on the followers' role orientation (Carsten et al., 2021). Hence, more studies would have been and still are desirable that study potential impacts of the pandemic on followership experiences, behaviors, and outcomes.

Moreover, future research could further explore the role of followership in contexts of global crises. Nohria (2020), for instance, suggested that in the complex and uncertain environment of a sustained, evolving crisis, the most robust organizations will not simply rely on centralized leadership or specialized risk management teams, but on the networks and members' adaption abilities within the organizations. Andersson (2018) argued that the cooperative relationships between leaders and followers facilitate the mobilization of resources, especially in times of crisis. He concluded that developed followership is an important social resource for organizational resilience. In consideration of future challenges that could emerge from for instance a pandemic, technological change, disruptive innovation, or climate change, a better understanding of beneficial and destructive followership has become even more relevant (see also Ribbat et al., 2023). For instance, critical followership may become an essential skill to question AI-based decisions that are at risk to be incomprehensible, unfair, or biased due to scarce or false data (see, for instance, Guan et al., 2022; Tambe et al., 2019). Hence, future research should find out how followership has to and will change in relation to AI-based management. Furthermore, the digital transformation of work and organizations raise important questions for change management: Can followership theory help to explain why some leaders fail to communicate or effectively implement their vision for the organization's digital future? Or how can followers be the driving force for change when leaders resist to adapt to technological change?

5.5.2 Theoretical Implications

Our review contributes to both the further identification and conceptual clarification of followership constructs. We tested whether the theoretical principles of the FTF could be applied to identify the proposed followership approaches and variables within published empirical studies. Additionally, we tested whether these principles were sufficient to clearly delineate between followership variables and studies and non-followership variables and studies. In this process, we identified the need for an important clarification to be able to decide what can and what cannot be classified as a followership study in the strict sense. In this way, we clearly differentiate from the analysis of broadly construed follower-related predictors in leadership by Oc et al. (2023). That is, from an analytical standpoint, we have to distinguish between 'true' followership constructs (i.e., followership characteristics and behaviors) on the one hand and follower-related variables that refer to general characteristics or behaviors at work on the other when evaluating or constructing potential followership research. It is important to make such a distinction, because a preferably concrete determination of the followership domain is essential for FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) to be and further become a valuable theoretical framework. Hence, we were able to advance insights on followership from existing reviews (e.g., Oc et al., 2023) with more theoretical clarity and parsimony.

Reflecting a lack of theoretical clarity, we found some misconceptions in the operationalization of followership characteristics and behaviors during the study selection for our systematic review. Specifically, we had to exclude a few studies from our systematic review because of the misconception of such variables, even if those studies claimed to be followership studies. For instance, several studies (e.g., Ahmad et al., 2021; A. J. Xu et al., 2019) "reversed the lens" by using proactive employee behaviors (such as organizational citizenship behaviors) to predict leadership outcomes (such as LMX). These behaviors were, however, not specifically related to a leader (and, thus, also not to a follower role). Therefore, those studies were not followership studies in accordance with the definitions by the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). These examples show that even if studies refer to the framework of the FTF, they do not

automatically correspond to the definitions of the FTF. Followership research aims to better understand the role and contribution of the followers and following in the leadership process (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Therefore, general characteristics (such as personality, skill or well-being) or behaviors (such as engagement or proactivity) of employees are not followership constructs per se, even if those employees are technically subordinate to a leader.

Our systematic review, however, reveals several 'true' followership characteristics and behaviors that were explored within the reviewed studies and we discovered followership constructs that go beyond Uhl-Bien's et al. (2014) suggestions. In sum, we could identify 23 followership characteristics or behaviors that extend the followership framework (see Table 11). Some authors, for instance, introduced group-level variables to the framework of followership constructs (e.g., group level implicit followership theories). This raises awareness of the need for multi-level perspectives in followership research: Followers of the same leader (i.e., within the same team) might share certain similarities. With the help of the related primary studies, we thus contribute to a more nuanced understanding of followership and add to the framework of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018).

5.5.3 Practical Implications

Our systematic literature review shows that more attention should be paid to the contributions of followers to leadership and organizational success, since an increasing number of studies conceptualizes and demonstrates followers as relevant co-producers or co-constructors of leadership and its outcomes. Various findings associate proactive and constructive followership with desirable outcomes, while destructive and passive followership were rather associated with negative implications. This highlights potential benefits of followership trainings (see, for instance, calls of Bufalino, 2018, or Hoption, 2014) and integrated development programs for leaders and followers. Reflecting on

findings about followership and abusive supervision or leader well-being/exhaustion, trainings, in which followers and their leaders can jointly learn how to engage in constructive and mutually supportive behaviors, may be promising.

Furthermore, our review outlines which existing followership measures were applied in the reviewed studies, which measures were valid and reliable, and which were not. Thereby, we provide an overview of practical tools not only for researchers, but also for organizations that might want to assess followership behaviors and/or characteristics to develop followership competencies. Given the various endeavors of organizations to select and develop leaders, organizations should generally be aware of the important role of followers and following in the leadership process. This is especially important, as modern organizations have an increasing focus on participation and empowerment (e.g., Maynard et al., 2012; Parker et al., 2019), placing followers in a more influential role.

5.5.4 Limitations

Some limitations of this review have to be discussed. We only included published peer-reviewed articles in our review. While this is a common strategy for systematic reviews (e.g., Boon et al., 2019; H. Chen et al., 2022), which also helps to avoid double inclusion of studies (e.g., from dissertations), we might have missed relevant published work (e.g., book chapters) or unpublished work (due to publication bias of non-significant findings; see, for instance, Siddaway et al., 2019). Furthermore, we only included studies written in English, which involves the risk of an ethnocentric bias (see Fischer et al., 2021; Steel et al., 2021). A considerable number of studies that we included in our review, however, came from non-English speaking countries (e.g., China or other Asian countries). Additionally, we excluded studies that were published before 2014. Hence, we might have missed relevant research, which was published before 2014, that would meet our theoretical inclusion criteria for the co-production or co-construction approach. However, with our research questions, we intended to review the empirical followership research since the publication of Uhl-Bien's et al. (2014) seminal work.

Finally, we could not present the findings of each study in detail. Since we discussed how the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) is a rather broad framework that comprises a large number of different followership constructs, we could only provide a concise overview of general findings. However, with our research questions, we intended to identify and analyze the studied variables, the applied followership approaches, the methodological approaches and the main and preferably cumulative results rather than the specific results of the individual studies. Furthermore, several studies had strong limitations due to their cross-sectional nature or small samples (see also our quality assessment). Hence, their findings have to be interpreted with caution.

5.6 Conclusion

Our systematic review of research in line with FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) revealed that FTF provides a valuable theoretical framework to integrate a wide variety of research that contributes to a better understanding of the role of followers and following in leadership. However, we argued that it is critical to delineate between 'true' followership constructs and constructs that refer to followers' general characteristics or behaviors at work. That is, future followership studies should consider the definitions by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) to actually advance followership research and to avoid simply reproducing familiar leadership research from another perspective. With our review, we could provide both a further identification and conceptual clarification of followership constructs.

Our systematic review revealed that followership research is indeed an emerging field. However, most empirical studies are still rather fundamental. Methodological and conceptual issues also currently limit empirical evidence. We found that the study of the two fundamental followership approaches within the FTF was unbalanced, which was also the case for the study of various followership constructs. Hence, even if empirical followership research has developed quantitatively, it still lacks depth in several ways, thus preventing cumulative knowledge. In sum, our analysis of empirical followership research since Uhl-Bien's et al. (2014) seminal work offers various opportunities for future studies to advance the current knowledge about the role of followers and their followership, both theoretically and methodologically.

6 Overall Discussion

The objective of this dissertation was to study the role of followership in leadership to advance both followership theory and empirical research. The main focus was to test Kelley's (1992) prominent and highly influential followership approach. For a better understanding of the role of followership in leadership, I also widened the scope beyond Kelley's (1992) conceptualization to the broader framework of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018).

I conducted three studies to address seven research questions. To do so, I translated and tested Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire (see Study 1). In addition, I tested whether Kelley's (1992) proposed followership behaviors were consistent over time and how they relate to important variables in the context of work (i.e., job attitudes and selfefficacy; see Study 2). Furthermore, I investigated how followership research has evolved since the publication of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018), and whether the framework of the FTF needed to be updated (see Study 3).

In the following, I will present the main findings of the three studies with regard to the overall research questions and I will present the theoretical contribution of this dissertation. I will then outline the practical implications of the findings. Finally, I will discuss the limitations of this dissertation and directions for future research.

6.1 Summary of Findings and Theoretical Contribution

Study 1 was conducted to answer the question of how followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT; Kelley, 1992) can be measured in German (research question 1). In addition, Study 1 addressed the question of whether AE and ICT are two distinctive followership behaviors (research question 2). With regard to research question 1, the adapted German version of Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire showed the intended factorial structure. Furthermore, the results of the tests for convergent, discriminant, criterion-related, and incremental validity were satisfactory. With regard to research question 2, the

results of Study 1 indicate that AE and ICT are two distinctive followership behaviors, even if items did not unanimously load on the two factors that Kelley (1992) had predicted. In accordance with previous studies (Blanchard et al., 2009; Gatti et al., 2014), the two identified factors can be interpreted as AE and ICT. The findings of Study 1, however, underline the need to use the adapted and validated version of the questionnaire rather than the original version (as proposed by Kelley, 1992). This dissertation now provides a measurement tool to correctly assess followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT; Kelley, 1992) in German.

Study 2 was conducted to answer the question of whether followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT; Kelley, 1992) reflect consistent behavior patterns (research question 3). The results of latent state-trait analyses in two different samples revealed that both AE and ICT are more trait-like than state-like. These results support Kelley's (1992) conception of behavioral styles, which has not been tested before. That is, the findings of Study 2 indicate that subordinates tend to enact their follower role rather consistently within a continuum between active and passive, independent and uncritical (see Kelley, 1992). This is an important finding, because a fundamental understanding of the nature of followership behaviors is crucial to create appropriate research models (see also Borsboom et al., 2021; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Another objective of Study 2 was to explore whether followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT; Kelley, 1992) predict critical variables in the context of work (research question 4). To go beyond previous research, Kelley's (1992) followership behaviors were tested longitudinally with a cross-lagged panel design. Some results of Study 2 indicate that followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT) can predict later job attitudes or self-efficacy, thereby supporting Kelley's (1992) assumptions about effective followership. However, most of the results either point in the opposite direction or indicate no significant relationships at all. These results question the original idea of followership theory (Kelley,

1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) that followership behaviors are major predictors for relevant followership outcomes. Hence, the findings of Study 2 contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the relationships between followership behaviors (Kelley, 1992) and critical job-related variables (i.e., job attitudes and self-efficacy). Furthermore, the findings underline how important it is to adequately test the long prevailing assumptions of followership theory (see also Borsboom et al., 2021). That is, some relationships may be more complex than previously assumed (see, for instance, Kelley, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018).

Hence, the findings of Study 2 show that further empirical investigation is urgently needed to better understand which desired and undesired effects followership behaviors may unfold and under which conditions. For instance, the results from my analyses in two samples with two different time lags in Study 2 correspond to the analysis of leadership research by Fisher et al. (2017). These authors analyzed that effects on behaviors (such as active engagement, or independent, critical thinking) typically take longer to unfold and persist longer than do effects on cognitions or emotions (e.g., perceived justice, or openness to change; Fischer et al., 2017). The findings of Study 2 thus highlight the need to recognize time as an important factor both in followership theory and future research to better understand the nature of followership's effects (for a related argument, see also Castillo & Trinh, 2018; Grieß et al., 2021).

With their FTF, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) provided a more comprehensive followership framework und created promising avenues for subsequent studies to advance followership research. Thus, research question 5 asked how the field of empirical followership research (in the context of work and organizations) has evolved since Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) presented their FTF. The systematic literature review in Study 3 shows that empirical followership research has indeed evolved since the FTF was first presented. However, Study 3 also shows that followership research still lacks depth in several ways, which prevents cumulative knowledge accumulation. For instance, it was found that the study of the different followership constructs was unbalanced and rather fundamental. The findings of Study 3 also reveal that methodological and conceptual issues still limit current empirical evidence. However, various findings of the analyzed studies associate proactive and constructive followership with desirable outcomes. In contrast, destructive and passive followership are rather associated with negative consequences.

Study 3 additionally aimed to address the question of whether the FTF framework (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) in fact can be applied to unambiguously identify the proposed followership approaches and variables within published empirical studies (research question 6). By testing the theoretical notions of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018), various followership approaches and variables could be identified within the analyzed studies. However, the findings of Study 3 highlight the need to use variables and models that truly reflect the unique context of followership for followership research to advance (see also Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). That is, followership constructs must relate to the follower role and therefore necessarily refer to a leader. Examining general employee characteristics or behaviors (such as personality traits or proactivity at work) as followership substitutes risks blurring the interest in better understanding the nature and impact of followers and their following in leadership. This dissertation thus delineates from other analyses of follower-related variables (e.g., Oc et al., 2023) and provides an important conceptual clarification for the use of followership constructs: Followership studies should adhere to the FTF definitions (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) to avoid misconceptions in the operationalization of followership characteristics and behaviors.

In contrast to those followership behaviors and characteristics, however, it was hardly possible to determine which models or outcome variables were unique to the followership context and which were more likely to result in a mere replication of existing leadership research from a different perspective. Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) called for a better understanding of followership by developing genuine followership models rather than simply mirroring traditional leadership research. Since leadership and followership are closely related, some overlap of the variables of interest may be natural to a certain extent. Moreover, when followers are viewed as active co-producers (see, for instance, Carsten et al., 2010; Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), the common purpose of followers and leaders should be considered (Chaleff, 1995). The findings of Study 3, therefore, show that FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) needs to be conceptually sharpened in view of this aspect. My findings reveal a theoretical ambiguity that should be addressed in future developments to help FTF clarify what the 'unique' context of followership is to create research questions and models that in fact study followership. The findings of Study 3 show, for followership research to advance, that future studies should carefully focus on outcome variables that closely relate to the follower role or the act of following.

Finally, Study 3 aimed to identify emerging theoretical constructs, measures, or methodological approaches that develop the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) further (research question 7). The findings of the systematic literature review reveal numerous additional followership variables that go beyond Uhl-Bien's et al. (2014) suggestions (e.g., leader-related political knowledge, follower's power profile, or emotional masking towards the leader). In addition, the findings of Study 3 reveal a large number of measures that fit into the integrative framework of the FTF. Hence, with Study 3, this dissertation provides both conceptual clarification and further identification of followership constructs. As a result, the extended followership framework offers a variety of variables and constructs that future research can build on. The findings of Study 3 offer various opportunities for future studies to advance the current knowledge, both theoretically and methodologically. What all three studies have in common is that they contribute to a more nuanced understanding of followers and their followership. With the three studies, this dissertation provides a long overdue empirical examination of fundamental theoretical assumptions of the prevailing and most frequently cited followership concepts (i.e., Kelley, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). As described above, Study 1 and Study 2 were among the first to adequately test key assumptions of the most prominent and influential work on followership (i.e., Kelley, 1988; 1992). In Study 3, I systematically tested and further developed the more comprehensive framework of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018), which had also emerged as an authoritative and already classic theoretical work. Furthermore, I uncovered relevant findings, methods, strengths, and weaknesses of published empirical studies that help to develop a better understanding of followers and their following.

Thus, with the three studies, this dissertation offers new insights into the role of followership in leadership. All three studies support the theoretical notion of followers as active co-producers in leadership (see Carsten et al., 2010; Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). The findings of all three studies indicate that proactive followership is rather positively associated with desired outcomes, even if relationships may be more complex than previously assumed (see, for instance, Kelley, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). In sum, this dissertation provides empirical evidence for prevailing assumptions that have not been tested before, it advances followership theory (Kelley, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018), and it shows promising avenues for future followership research.

6.2 Practical Implications

The findings of this dissertation have several practical implications for followers, leaders, and for organizations in general. That is, the findings of the three studies suggest that followers are active co-producers of leadership and its outcomes. Hence, organizations should raise awareness for the role and contributions of followers in leadership. A better understanding of the followers' contributions to leadership and organizational success (or failure) may help to improve the leadership process and, ultimately, to achieve the common goals within organizations (see, for instance, Chaleff, 1995; Kelley, 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Even if the knowledge about how the effects of followership may unfold within organizations is still limited, this dissertation indicates that active and constructive followership is likely to be beneficial. In contrast, passive and destructive followership tends to be associated with negative implications. Since Andersson (2018) suggests that effective followership is an important social resource for organizational resilience, organizations may (and as I believe should) care about developing desired followership to successfully meet future challenges. Those challenges could emerge from, for instance, another pandemic, technological changes (e.g., artificial intelligence), or political, demographic, or climate change (see, for instance, Černe et al., 2023; Lynn et al., 2023).

Therefore, several authors (e.g., Bufalino 2018; Hoption, 2014; Logan & Ganster, 2007) have called for followership development programs that complement the currently common leadership trainings. Thereby, organizations should open up discussions on followership and treat this topic with the same appreciation as they usually treat the leadership topic (see Bufalino, 2018). Moreover, integrated development programs for both leaders and followers may be particular promising for them to learn how to engage in mutually supportive behaviors.

Furthermore, the findings of Study 1 and Study 2 of this dissertation indicate that followers adopt certain followership styles, which result from the level of the followers' active engagement in the leadership process and their independent, critical thinking towards their leader (see Kelley, 1992). For followers, understanding their own followership style may help to reflect on their personal situation at work. A negative fit with the leader (e.g., an independent, critical follower and an authoritarian leader), for instance, might open up discussions about which style could better serve the common purpose in the organization, or whose routines need to be changed. For leaders, a better understanding of why followers tend to behave in certain ways may help to handle leaderfollower interactions adequately.

This dissertation now provides a validated version of Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire that allows for a valid assessment of his followership behaviors in Germanspeaking countries (see Study 1). Furthermore, Study 3 provides an overview of various practical tools that can be applied to reflect on different followership aspects. These tools may not only be helpful for researchers, but also for practitioners that might want to assess followership behaviors or characteristics to reflect on leadership and followership roles, or to develop followership competencies.

6.3 Limitations and Directions for Future Research

In the following, I will discuss the limitations of this dissertation and directions for future research. First, both Study 1 and Study 2 relied on self-report data. In fact, it was one objective of this dissertation to test Kelley's (1992) approach and, specifically, to test his followership questionnaire (see research questions 1 and 2). However, exclusively relying on self-report questionnaires to measure the constructs of interest can be a source of common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Furthermore, it may cause endogeneity problems that increase the risk of making false causal claims (see Antonakis et al., 2010; Bastadorz et al., 2023). The cross-lagged panel design with multiple measurement points in Study 2 should have reduced the risks of simultaneity bias and reverse causality. However, causal inferences should be made with due caution. To avoid or minimize endogeneity threats, future studies could further test for causality with experimental designs or multimethod designs (e.g., using self- and other-ratings, see Hill et al., 2020). Future studies could also make use of more advanced techniques that aim to reduce simultaneity bias,

such as including instrumental variables (Bastadorz et al., 2023; Semadeni et al., 2014), or using exogenous events (Angrist & Pischke, 2010; see also Hill et al., 2020). Furthermore, independent observations could complement the followers' self-assessment of their followership behavior to reduce the risk for common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Second, the adapted questionnaire to measure followership behavior (Kelley, 1992) might be at risk for social-desirability bias (Krumpal, 2013; see also Gatti et al., 2014). That is, the mean values for the followership dimensions (i.e., AE and ICT; Kelley, 1992) were relatively high in both field studies (i.e., Study 1 and 2). To cope with potential social-desirability bias (Krumpal, 2013), future studies could further develop the questionnaire by changing the wording of the questions, by varying the interview method (i.e., for instance, applying the unmatched count technique; see Coutts & Jann, 2011; Krumpal, 2013), or by including a social desirability scale to obtain a control variable (Larson, 2018).

Furthermore, most of the respondents in Study 1 and Study 2 of this dissertation were either "exemplary" or "pragmatist" followers (see Kelley, 1992). Hence, it may be difficult to detect existing effects due to low variance in followership styles (see also Study 2). Therefore, it would be promising for future studies to match the followers' selfassessment of followership styles with the ratings of their leaders, or with independent observations. Moreover, the congruence between leader and follower ratings may itself be a relevant mechanism for certain effects. Zhao et al. (2024), for instance, found that the congruence of leader and follower ratings of transformational leadership behavior moderated the relationship between the followers' evaluation of transformational leadership and team performance. The relationship was stronger when the leader's selfevaluation and the follower's evaluation of the leader's behavior were congruent rather than when they were incongruent (Zhao et al., 2024). This could similarly apply to the congruence of leader and follower ratings of followership behavior when examining the impact on potential followership outcomes.

Third, more extensive longitudinal designs are desirable to better understand the nature of the predicted and observed effects (Mulder & Hamaker, 2020; Mund & Nestler, 2019). By systematically reviewing the current state of followership research, Study 3 of this dissertation uncovered several methodological problems. A major problem was that the methodological quality of many of the reviewed studies was rather questionable, because causes and effects were very often tested with cross-sectional designs (see also Mitchell & James, 2001). This dissertation, therefore, tested Kelley's (1992) approach longitudinally (i.e., with two measurement time points) for the first time (see Study 2). However, longitudinal designs with three or more time points would allow for an even deeper understanding of the processes (see also Mulder & Hamaker, 2020; Mund & Nestler, 2019). Since this dissertation shows that followership behavior (Kelley, 1992) is rather consistent, future studies could study followership models over a longer time period with multiple measurement points. As highlighted in Study 2 of this dissertation, time could be an important factor both in followership theory and future research. It should therefore receive more attention in future studies (see also Castillo & Trinh, 2018; Grieß et al., 2021).

All three studies of this dissertation provide several hints for future studies to enhance the quality of followership research. Those suggestions refer to the different approaches to followership, to the measurement of followership, and to the synthesis of followership and leadership studies (see also Table 14). For instance, Study 3 revealed that the followership field needs more in-depth analyses of relevant followership constructs to generate cumulative knowledge. This even includes Kelley's (1992) long existing and highly influential approach. While this dissertation provides long overdue tests of his critical assumptions, the empirical investigation of Kelley's (1992) approach remains rather fundamental. Future studies, therefore, should build on the findings of this dissertation and take into account that followership behaviors (i.e., AE and ICT, Kelley, 1992) reflect rather consistent behavior patterns. Furthermore, future studies could further explore potential mechanisms that might link followership behaviors (Kelley, 1992) with relevant outcomes (e.g., the leader's preference for a certain followership style as a mechanism for positive outcomes of followership behaviors; see also Study 2).

In addition, the findings of Study 3 of this dissertation reveal that the constructionists' approach to followership (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) has been nearly totally neglected. It was found that this is a relevant shortcoming of followership research, since the co-construction approach is an integral part of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018). In fact, this dissertation also focused on the role-based approach by placing Kelley's (1992) conception at the center of its empirical investigation (see Study 1 and 2). This allowed for a better understanding of proactive and independent behaviors of followers in their subordinate position (i.e., followers as co-producers of leadership; see Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). It might be, however, particular promising for future followership research to also advance the understanding of the followership-leadership co-construction processes (i.e., the co-construction approach; see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Finally, several limitations of the systematic literature review (i.e., Study 3 of this dissertation) should be mentioned here. That is, the study identification and selection of the systematic review were limited to certain criteria (i.e., scientific discipline, language, publication type, time frame), which can elicit publication biases or ethnocentric biases (see, for instance, Siddaway et al., 2019; Steel et al., 2021). While this approach of Study 3 was in line with common strategies for systematic reviews (see, for instance, Boon et al., 2019, Chen et al., 2022), future reviews could complement the here presented analysis with studies of different languages or from multiple sources (such as books or dissertations).

Furthermore, the findings of the studies that were analyzed within the systematic review (i.e., Study 3) could not be presented in detail. However, with research questions 5 to 7, this dissertation intended to identify different constructs, methodological approaches, and the main and preferably cumulative results rather than the specific results of the individual studies. Study 3, therefore, provided a short overview of the general findings. Future studies, however, can use this overview as a starting point for more in-depth analyses of the specific models that were tested in the individual studies.

7 Conclusion

With three studies, this dissertation advanced both followership theory and empirical research. It could provide empirical evidence for prevailing theoretical assumptions (such as the presence of followership styles; see Kelley, 1992), while some findings indicate that relationships of followership with critical job-related variables may be more complex than previously assumed (see Study 2). The FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) was found to be a valuable theoretical framework that can be applied to unambiguously identify followership studies. However, this dissertation developed the FTF-framework further to incorporate the latest developments of empirical followership research. Furthermore, this dissertation provided a conceptual clarification. That is, followership studies must adhere to the definitions of the FTF (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018) to fulfill the purpose of better understanding followers and their followership. In addition, this dissertation has shown that it is necessary to clarify what genuine followership research from the followers' perspective (see Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

In sum, this dissertation could provide new insights into the role of followership in leadership. It contributes to a more nuanced understanding about followers and their following in organizations. The three studies offer various opportunities for future studies to advance current knowledge, both theoretically and methodologically. The findings of this dissertation may also help followers and leaders to engage in mutually supportive behaviors.

- Adachi P., & Willoughby T. (2015). Interpreting effect sizes when controlling for stability effects in longitudinal autoregressive models: Implications for psychological science. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 12, 116–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2014.963549.
- Aghaei, M., Nasr Isfahani, A., Ghorbani, A., & Roozmand, O. (2021). Implicit followership theories and resistance to leaders' unethical requests: The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-06-2021-2830
- Ahmad, M. G., Klotz, A. C., & Bolino, M. C. (2021). Can good followers create unethical leaders? How follower citizenship leads to leader moral licensing and unethical behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *106*(9), 1374–1390. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000839
- Ali, A., Wang, H., & Johnson, R. E. (2020). Empirical analysis of shared leadership promotion and team creativity: An adaptive leadership perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(5), 405–423. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2437
- Almeida, T., Ramalho, N. C., & Esteves, F. (2021). Can you be a follower even when you do not follow the leader? Yes, you can. *Leadership*, 17(3), 336–364. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715020987740
- Anderson, M. H., & Sun, P. Y. T. (2017). Reviewing leadership styles: Overlaps and the need for a new 'Full-Range' theory. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19, 76–96. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12082
- Andersson, T. (2018). Followership: An important social resource for organizational resilience. In S. Tengblad & M. Oudhuis (Eds.), *The Resilience Framework* (pp. 147–162). Springer.

- Angrist, J. D., & Pischke, J.-S. (2010). The credibility revolution in empirical economics: How better research design is taking the con out of econometrics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24(2), 3–30. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.24.2.3
- Antonakis, J., Bendahan, S., Jacquart, P., & Lalive, R. (2010). On making causal claims: A review and recommendations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(6), 1086–1120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.10.010.
- Arain, G. A., Bukhari, S., Khan, A. K., & Hameed, I. (2020). The impact of abusive supervision on employees' feedback avoidance and subsequent help-seeking behaviour: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 26(5), 850–865. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2018.44
- Aronson, E., & Mills, J. (1959). The effect of severity of initiation on liking for a group. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59(2), 177–181. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047195
- Ashford, S. J. (1986). Feedback-seeking in individual adaptation: A resource perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(3), 465–487. https://doi.org/10.2307/256219
- Ashford, S. J., & Black, J. S. (1996). Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(2), 199–214. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.2.199
- Avolio, B., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621
- Aw, V. K. J., & Ayoko, O. B. (2017). The impact of followers' conflict behaviors on teams' transformational leadership, team member exchange and engagement. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 28(4), 509–532. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCMA-04-2016-0020

Babalola, M. T., Garcia, P. R. J. M., Ren, S., Ogunfowora, B., & Gok, K. (2021). Stronger together: Understanding when and why group ethical voice inhibits group abusive supervision. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2582

Baker, S. D. (2007). Followership. The theoretical foundation of a contemporary construct. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 14(1), 50–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002831207304343

- Baker, S. D., Mathis, C. J., Stites-Doe, S., & Javadian, G. (2016). The role of trust and communication in fostering followers' self perceptions as leaders. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 28(3/4), 210–230.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W. H. Freeman.

- Banks, G. C., Gooty, J., Ross, R. L., Williams, C. E., & Harrington, N. T. (2018).
 Construct redundancy in leader behaviors: A review and agenda for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly 29*(1), 236–251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.005
- Barrick, M. R., Parks, L., & Mount, M. K. (2005). Self-monitoring as a moderator of the relationships between personality traits and performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(3), 745–767. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00716.x
- Bashur, M. R., & Oc, B. (2015). When voice matters: A multilevel review of the impact of voice in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 41(5), 1530–1554. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314558302
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. (1995). The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Mind Garden.

- Bastardoz, N., Matthews, M.J., Sajons, G.B., Ransom, T., Kelemen, T.K., & Matthews,
 S.H. (2023). Instrumental variables estimation: Assumptions, pitfalls, and
 guidelines. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *34*(1), 101673.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2022.101673
- Beal, D. J., Weiss, H. M., Barros, E., & MacDermid, S. M. (2005). An episodic process model of affective influences on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1054–1068. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1054
- Bell, R. M. (2020). Toxic leadership and followership typologies: A partial replication study with scale refinement. *Integral Leadership Review*, *20*(1), 47–57.
- Benson, A. J., Hardy, J., & Eys, M. (2016). Contextualizing leaders' interpretations of proactive followership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(7), 949–966. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2077
- Bierhoff, H., Wegge, J., Bipp, T., Kleinbeck, U., Attig-Grabosch, C., & Schulz, S. (2005).
 Entwicklung eines Fragebogens zur Messung von Eigenverantwortung oder: "Es gibt nichts Gutes, außer man tut es" [Development of a questionnaire to measure self-responsibility or: "Don't talk about it, just do it"]. Zeitschrift Für Personalpsychologie, 4(1), 4–18. https://doi.org/10.1026/1617-6391.4.1.4
- Blair, B. A., & Bligh, M. (2018). Looking for leadership in all the wrong places: The impact of culture on proactive followership and follower dissent. *Journal of Social Issues*, 74(1), 129–143. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12260
- Blanchard, A. L., Welbourne, J. L., Gilmore, D., & Bullock, A. (2009). Followership styles and employee attachment to the organization. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, *12*(2), 111–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/10887150902888718

- Blickle, G., & Gönner, S. (1999). Studien zur Validierung eines Inventars zur Erfassung intraorganisationaler Einflußstrategien [Validating an inventory to assess intraorganizational influence strategies]. *Diagnostica*, 45(1), 35–46. https://doi.org/10.1026//0012-1924.45.1.35
- Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C., & Meindl, J. R. (2004). Charting the language of leadership: A methodological investigation of President Bush and the crisis of 9/11. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 562–574. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.562
- Blom, M., & Alvesson, M. (2014). Leadership on demand: followers as initiators and inhibitors of managerial leadership. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 30(3), 344–357. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2013.10.006
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (1999). Measuring impression management in organizations: A scale development based on the Jones and Pittman taxonomy. *Organizational Research Methods*, 2(2), 187–206. https://doi.org/10.1177/109442819922005
- Bolino, M. C., Varela, J. A., Bande, B., & Turnley, W. H. (2006). The impact of impression management tactics on supervisor ratings of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(3), 281–297. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.379
- Boon, C., Den Hartog, D. N., & Lepak, D. P. (2019). A Systematic Review of Human
 Resource Management Systems and Their Measurement. *Journal of Management*, 45(6), 2498–2537. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318818718
- Borsboom, D., van der Maas, H. L. J., Dalege, J., Kievit, R. A., & Haig, B. D. (2021). Theory construction methodology: A practical framework for building theories in psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 16(4), 756–766. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620969647

- Bracken, B. A., & Barona, A. (1991). State of the art procedures for translating, validating and using psychoeducational tests in cross-cultural assessment. *School Psychology International*, 12(1–2), 119–132. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034391121010
- Brand, A., Allen, L., Altman, M., Hlava, M., & Scott, J. (2015). Beyond authorship: Attribution, contribution, collaboration, and credit. *Learned Publishing*, 28(2), 151–155. https://doi.org/10.1087/20150211
- Braun, S., Stegmann, S., Hernandez Bark, A. S., Junker, N. M., & van Dick, R. (2017). Think manager—think male, think follower—think female: Gender bias in implicit followership theories. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 47(7), 377–388. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12445
- Bufalino, G. (2018). Followership under the spotlight: Implications for followership development. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 50(2), 55–60. https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-04-2017-0028
- Burris, E. R. (2012). The risks and rewards of speaking up: Managerial responses to employee voice. Academy of Management Journal, 55(4), 851–875. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0562
- Byun, G. D., Lee, S. J., & Kang, S. W. (2018). A review of international empirical research on followership (1988–2015). *Korean Journal of Human Resource Management Research*, 6, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.14396/jhrmr.2016.23.2.1
- Callister, R. R., Kramer, M. W., & Turban, D. B. (1999). Feedback seeking following career transitions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), 429–438. https://doi.org/10.5465/257013
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56(2), 81–105. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0046016

- Camps, J., Stouten, J., Euwema, M., & De Cremer, D. (2020). Abusive supervision as a response to follower hostility: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 164(3), 495–514. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-4058-0
- Carsten, M., Goswami, A., Shepard, A., & Donnelly, L. I. (2021). Followership at a distance: Follower adjustment to distal leadership during COVID-19. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12337
- Carsten, M. K., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2012). Follower beliefs in the co-production of leadership: Examining upward communication and the moderating role of context. *Journal of Psychology*, 220(4), 210–220. https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000115
- Carsten, M. K., Uhl-Bien, M., & Huang, L. (2018). Leader perceptions and motivation as outcomes of followership role orientation and behavior. *Leadership*, 14(6), 731–756. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715017720306
- Carsten, M. K., Uhl-Bien, M., West, B. J., Patera, J. L., & McGregor, R. (2010). Exploring social constructions of followership: A qualitative study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(3), 543–562. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.015
- Castillo, E. A., & Trinh, M. P. (2018). In search of missing time: A review of the study of time in leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(19), 165–178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.001
- Chaleff, I. (1995). *The courageous follower. Standing up to and for our leaders*. Berrett-Koehler.
- Chen, C. C., Chen, Y. R., & Xin, K. (2004). Guanxi practices and trust in management: A procedural justice perspective. *Organization Science*, 15(2), 200–209. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1030.0047

- Chen, H., Mehra, A., Tasselli, S., & Borgatti, S. P. (2022). Network Dynamics and Organizations: A Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, 48(6), 1602–1660. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063211063218
- Chiu, C.-Y. (C.), Owens, B. P., & Tesluk, P. E. (2016). Initiating and utilizing shared leadership in teams: The role of leader humility, team proactive personality, and team performance capability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(12), 1705–1720. https://doi.org/10.1037/ap10000159
- Cho, H., & Abe, S. (2013). Is two-tailed testing for directional research hypotheses tests legitimate? *Journal of Business Research*, 66, 1261–1266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.02.023
- Clarke, N., Alshenalfi, N., & Garavan, T. (2019). Upward influence tactics and their effects on job performance ratings and flexible working arrangements: The mediating roles of mutual recognition respect and mutual appraisal respect. *Human Resource Management*, 58(4), 397–416. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21967
- Coetzee, L., & Henning, S. (2019). A tale of two ships: Follower attributions of leadership with reference to team morale in an air traffic control centre. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 22(1), 1–10.

https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v22i1.2109

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and *Psychological Measurement*, 20, 37–46.

https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000104

- Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. Routledge.
- Cole, D. A., Ciesla, J. A., & Steiger, J. H. (2007). The insidious effects of failing to include design-driven correlated residuals in latent-variable covariance structure analysis.
 Psychological Methods, *12*(4), 381–398. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.12.4.381

- Colangelo, A. J. (2000). Followership: Leadership Styles (PhD Dissertation, Oklahoma University). SHAREOK Repository. https://shareok.org/bitstream/handle/11244/5979/9972517.PDF
- Cook, K. F., Kallen, M. A., & Amtmann, D. (2009). Having a fit: Impact of number of items and distribution of data on traditional criteria for assessing IRT's unidimensionality assumption. *Quality of Life Research*, 18(4), 447–460. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-009-9464-4
- Cook, A., Zill, A., & Meyer, B. (2021). Perceiving leadership structures in teams: Effects of cognitive schemas and perceived communication. *Small Group Research*, 52(3), 251–287. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496420950480
- Coutts, E., & Jann, B. (2011). Sensitive questions in online surveys: Experimental results for the randomized response technique (RRT) and the unmatched count technique (UCT). *Sociological Methods & Research, 40*(1), 169–193. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124110390768
- Coyle, P. T., & Foti, R. (2022). How do leaders vs. followers construct followership? A field study of implicit followership theories and work-related affect using latent profile analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 29(1), 115–130. https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518211053529
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555

Dahling, J. J., & Whitaker, B. G. (2016). When can feedback-seeking behavior result in a better performance rating? Investigating the moderating role of political skill. *Human Performance*, 29(2), 73–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2016.1148037 Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 63–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.004

- De Jong, J. P., Clinton, M., Bal, M., & Van Der Heijden, B. (2021). Caught in the middle: How and when psychological contract breach by subordinates relates to weekly emotional exhaustion of supervisors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 464774. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.464774
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499– 512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499
- De Clercq, D., Fatima, T., & Jahanzeb, S. (2021). Impressing for popularity and influence among peers: The connection between employees' upward impression management and peer-rated organizational influence. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *161*(5), 608– 626. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2020.1851639
- Derler, A. and Weibler, J. (2014). The ideal employee: Context and leaders' implicit follower theories. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 35(5), 386–409. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-12-2012-0158
- DeRue, S., & Ashford, A. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), 627–647. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2010.53503267
- Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open?. Academy of Management Journal, 50(4), 869–884. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.26279183

- Detert, J. R., Burris, E. R., Harrison, D. A., & Martin, S. R. (2013). Voice flows to and around leaders: Understanding when units are helped or hurt by employee voice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(4), 624–668. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839213510151
- Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Implicit voice theories: Taken-for-granted rules of self-censorship at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3), 461–488. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2011.61967925
- Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 36–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.005
- Dixon, G., & Westbrook, J. (2003). Followers revealed. *Engineering Management Journal*, *15*(1), 19–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/10429247.2003.11415192
- Dunn, T. J., Baguley, T., & Brunsden, V. (2014). From alpha to omega: A practical solution to the pervasive problem of internal consistency estimation. *British Journal of Psychology*, 105, 399–412. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12046
- Dwyer, J. E. (1983). *Statistical models for the social and behavioral sciences*. Oxford University Press.
- Eden, D., & Leviatan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(6), 736–741. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.60.6.736
- Eid, M., Schneider, C., & Schwenkmezger, P. (1999). Do you feel better or worse? The validity of perceived deviations of mood states from mood traits. *European Journal* of Personality, 13(4), 283–306. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0984(199907/08)13:4<283::AID-PER341>3.0.CO;2-0

- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001).
 Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(5), 771–783. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.42
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. https://doi.org/ 10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500
- Ellis, A. P. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Mai, K. M. (2021). The impact of supervisor– employee self-protective implicit voice theory alignment. *Journal of Occupational* and Organizational Psychology. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12374
- Enzmann, D., & Kleiber, D. (1989). *Helfer-Leiden: Streß und Burnout in psychosozialen Berufen* [Helpers' ordeals: Stress and burnout in psychosocial professions].
 Asanger.
- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2005). From Ideal to Real: A Longitudinal Study of the Role of Implicit Leadership Theories on Leader-Member Exchanges and Employee Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(4), 659–676. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.659
- Erdfelder, E., Faul, F. & Buchner, A (1996). GPOWER: A general power analysis program. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 28, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03203630
- Essa, E. B., & Alattari, A. (2019). The relationship between followership styles and leadership styles. *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership*, 4(2), 407–449. https://doi.org/10.30828/real/2019.2.7
- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4(3), 272–299. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.4.3.272
- Falls, A., & Allen, S. (2020). Leader-to-follower transitions: Flexibility and awareness. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 14(2), 24–37. https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21696
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146
- Favara, L. F. (2009). Examining followership styles and their relationship with job satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Business & Leadership*, 5(2), 68–77.
- Fedor, D. B., Rensvold, R. B., & Adams, S. M. (1992). An investigation of factors expected to affect feedback seeking: A longitudinal field study. *Personnel Psychology*, 45(4), 779–805. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1992.tb00968.x

Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford University Press.

- Fischer, T., Dietz, J., & Antonakis, J. (2017). Leadership process models: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1726–1753. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316682830
- Fischer, T., Tian, A. W., Lee, A., & Hughes, D. J. (2021). Abusive supervision: A systematic review and fundamental rethink. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(6), 101540. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2021.101540
- Ford, J., & Harding, N. (2018). Followers in leadership theory: Fiction, fantasy and illusion. *Leadership*, *14*(1), 3–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715015621372
- Forner, V. W., Holtrop, D., Boezeman, E. J., Slemp, G. R., Kotek, M., Kragt, D., Askovic, M., & Johnson, A. (2023). Predictors of turnover amongst volunteers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2729

- Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T., Leng, K., & Tag, A. (1997). The concept of personal initiative: Operationalization, reliability and validity in two German samples. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70(2), 139–161. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00639.x
- Gabriel, A. S., Podsakoff, N. P., Beal, D. J., Scott, B. A., Sonnentag, S., Trougakos, J. P.,
 & Butts, M. M. (2019). Experience Sampling Methods: A Discussion of Critical Trends and Considerations for Scholarly Advancement. *Organizational Research Methods*, 22(4), 969–1006. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428118802626
- Garner, J. T. (2009). When things go wrong at work: An exploration of organizational dissent messages. *Communication Studies*, 60(2), 197–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970902834916
- Garner, J. T. (2016). Open doors and iron cages: Supervisors' responses to employee dissent. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 53(1), 27–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/2329488414525466
- Gatti, P., Ghislieri, C., & Cortese, C. G. (2017). Relationships between followers' behaviors and job satisfaction in a sample of nurses. *PLoS ONE*, *12*(10), Article e0185905. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185905
- Gatti, P., Tartari, M., Cortese, C. G., & Ghislieri, C. (2014). A contribution to the Italian validation of Kelley's followership questionnaire. *Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 21(1), 67–87. https://doi.org/10.4473/TPM21.1.5

Geertshuis, S. A., Morrison, R. L., & Cooper-Thomas, H. D. (2015). It's not what you say, it's the way that you say it: The mediating effect of upward influencing communications on the relationship between leader-member exchange and performance ratings. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 52(2), 228–245. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2329488415572784

- Geiser, C. (2020). Longitudinal structural equation modeling with Mplus. A latent statetrait perspective. Guilford.
- Gesang, E., & Süß, S. (2021). A shift in perspective: Examining the impact of perceived follower behavior on leaders. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 37(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2021.101156
- Ghislieri, C., Gatti, P., & Córtese, C. G. (2015). A brief scale for investigating followership in nursing. *BPA Applied Psychology Bulletin*, 63(272), 25–32.
- Gloor, J. L. P. (2021). Cheap talk? Follower sarcasm reduces leader overpay by increasing accountability. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 96, 104166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2021.104166
- Gong, Z., Xu, Z., van Swol, L., Zhang, T., & Xu, J. (2020). Proactive feedback seeking has a positive effect on career adaptability. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 48(1), 1– 12. https://doi.org/10.2224/SBP.8441
- Gordon, L. J., Rees, C. E., Ker, J. S., & Cleland, J. (2015). Dimensions, discourses and differences: Trainees conceptualising health care leadership and followership.
 Medical Education, 49(12), 1248–1262. https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.12832
- Göritz, A. S. (2014). Determinants of the starting rate and the completion rate in online panel studies. In M. Callegaro, R. Baker, J. Bethlehem, A. S. Göritz, J. A. Krosnick, & P. J. Lavrakas (Eds.), *Online panel research: A data quality perspective* (pp. 154–170). Wiley.
- Goswami, A., Park, H. I., & Beehr, T. A. (2020). Does the congruence between leaders' implicit followership theories and their perceptions of actual followers matter? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 35, 519–538. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-019-09638-7

- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership:
 Development of leader–member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25
 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5
- Grandey, A. A. (2003). When "the show must go on": Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(1), 86–96. https://doi.org/10.2307/30040678
- Granger, S., Neville, L., & Turner, N. (2020). Political knowledge at work:
 Conceptualization, measurement, and applications to follower proactivity. *Journal* of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 93(2), 431–471.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12293
- Grant, A. M., & Berry, J. W. (2011). The necessity of others is the mother of invention: Intrinsic and prosocial motivations, perspective taking, and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(1), 73–96. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.59215085
- Greiff, S., & Heene, M. (2017). Why psychological assessment needs to start worrying about model fit. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 33(5), 313–317. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000450
- Griep, Y., Vranjes, I., Kraak, J., Dudda, L., & Li, Y. (2021). Start small, not random: Why does justifying your time-lag matter? *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 24, [e45]. https://doi.org/10.1017/SJP.2021.42

Griep, Y., & Zacher, H (2021). Temporal dynamics in organizational psychology. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Psychology. Retrieved 13 Apr. 2022, from https://oxfordre.com/psychology/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190236557.001.0001/ acrefore-9780190236557-e-32.

- Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (1998). Mapping the domain of expressivity: Multimethod evidence for a hierarchical model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 170–191. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.170
- Guan, H., Dong, L., & Zhao, A. (2022). Ethical Risk Factors and Mechanisms in Artificial Intelligence Decision Making. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12(9), 343. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12090343
- Gullifor, D. P., Gardner, W. L., Karam, E. P., Noghani, F., & Cogliser, C. C. (2023). The impostor phenomenon at work: A systematic evidence-based review, conceptual development, and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2733
- Güntner, A. V., Klasmeier, K. N., Klonek, F. E., & Kauffeld, S. (2021). The power of followers that do not follow: Investigating the effects of follower resistance, leader implicit followership theories and leader negative affect on the emergence of destructive leader behavior. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 28(3), 349–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518211012408
- Guo, S. (2018) The Review of the Implicit Followership Theories (IFTs). *Psychology*, 9, 623–632. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2018.94039.
- Haire, M., Ghiselli, E. E., & Porter, L. W. (1966). Managerial thinking: An international study. John Wiley & Sons.
- Harmon-Jones, E., Armstrong, J., & Olson, J. M. (2018). The influence of behavior on attitudes. In D. Albarracín & B. T. Johnson (Eds.), *The Handbook of Attitudes Volume 1: Basic Principles* (pp. 404–449). Routledge.
- Harmon-Jones, E., & Mills, J. (2019). An introduction to cognitive dissonance theory and an overview of current perspectives on the theory. In E. Harmon-Jones (Ed.), *Cognitive dissonance: Reexamining a pivotal theory in psychology* (pp. 3–24). American Psychological Association.

- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Natemeyer, W. E. (1979). Situational leadership,
 perception, and the impact of power. *Group and Organization Studies*, 4(4), 418–428. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F105960117900400404
- Hickman, A., & Robison, J. (2020, April 24). *Remote work trends to guide high performance during COVID-19*. Retrieved January 4, 2024 from Gallup website: https://www.gallup.com/workplace/309170/remote-work-trends-guide-highperformance-during-covid.aspx
- Hill, A. D., Johnson, S. G., Greco, L. M., O'Boyle, E. H., & Walter, S. L. (2021).
 Endogeneity: A review and agenda for the methodology-practice divide affecting micro and macro research. *Journal of Management*, 47(1), 105–143.
 https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320960533
- Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1990). Relationships between subordinate perceptions of leader influence tactics and attributed bases of supervisory power. *Human Relations*, 43(3), 221–237. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679004300302
- Hinojosa, A. S., Gardner, W. L., Walker, H. J., Cogliser, C., & Gullifor, D. (2017). A review of Cognitive Dissonance Theory in management research: Opportunities for further development. *Journal of Management*, *43*(1), 170–199. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316668236
- Hobfoll, S. E., Lilly, R. S., & Jackson, A. P. (1992). Conservation of social resources and the self. In H. Veiel & U. Baumann (Eds.), *The series in clinical and community psychology. The meaning and measurement of social support* (pp. 125–141). Hemisphere. https://doi.org/10.1037/t08391-000
- Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do Ethical, Authentic, and Servant Leadership Explain Variance Above and Beyond Transformational Leadership? A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 501–529. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316665461

- Holland, J. L. (1996). Exploring careers with a typology: What we have learned and some new directions. *American Psychologist*, 51(4), 397–406. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.51.4.397
- Hoption, C. (2014). Learning and Developing Followership. *Journal of Leadership Education*, *13*(3), 129–137. https://doi.org/10.12806/V13/I3/IB1
- Hoption, C. (2016). The double-edged sword of helping behavior in leader-follower dyads. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 37(1), 13–41. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-09-2013-0124
- Hopwood, C. J., & Donnellan, M. B. (2010). How should the internal structure of personality inventories be evaluated? *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14(3), 332–346. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868310361240
- Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 30(2), 179–185. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02289447
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., Gupta, V., & GLOBE associates.(2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*.Sage.
- Howell, T. M., Harrison, D. A., Burris, E. R., & Detert, J. R. (2015). Who gets credit for input? Demographic and structural status cues in voice recognition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(6), 1765–1784. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000025
- Howell, J., & Mendez, M. (2008). Three perspectives on followership. In R. Riggio, I.Chaleff & J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.). *The Art of Followership: How GreatFollowers Create Great Leaders and Organizations* (pp. 25–40). Joessey-Bass.
- Huang, L., & Paterson, T. A. (2017). Group ethical voice: Influence of ethical leadership and impact on ethical performance. *Journal of Management*, 43(4), 1157–1184. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314546195

- Huang, Q., & Zhang, K. (2021). The relationship between perceived leader busyness and perspective taking and interaction behavior of followers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 676810. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.676810
- Huang, X., Xu, E., Huang, L., & Liu, W. (2018). Nonlinear consequences of promotive and prohibitive voice for managers' responses: The roles of voice frequency and LMX. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *103*(10), 1101–1120. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000326
- Hunt, T., & Fedynich, L. (2019). Leadership: Pats, present, and future: An Evolution of an idea. *Journal of Arts & Humanities*, 8(2), 20–26. https://doi.org/10.18533/journal.v8i2.1582
- Hurwitz, M., & Hurwitz, S. (2015). Leadership is half the story. A fresh look at followership, leadership, and collaboration. University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442622395
- Inceoglu, I., Thomas, G., Chu, C., Plans, D., & Gerbasi, A. (2018). Leadership behavior and employee well-being: An integrated review and a future research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 179–202.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.006

- Ivanoska, K. S., Markovic, Z., & Sardzoska, E. (2019). The preferred leadership and followership styles of employees in state- and privately-owned organizations in Serbia and Macedonia. *Journal of East European Management Studies*, *24*(2), 305– 323. https://doi.org/10.5771/0949-6181-2019-2-305
- Jiang, X., Snyder, K., Li, J., & Manz, C. C. (2021). How followers create leaders: The impact of effective followership on leader emergence in self-managing teams. *Group Dynamics*, 25(4), 303–318. https://doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000159

- Jin, M. H., McDonald, B. D., Park, J., & Trevor Yu, K. Y. (2019). Making public service motivation count for increasing organizational fit: The role of followership behavior and leader support as a causal mechanism. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 85(1), 98–115. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852316684008
- Jin, M. H., McDonald, B., & Park, J. (2018). Person–organization fit and turnover intention: Exploring the mediating role of employee followership and job satisfaction through Conservation of Resources Theory. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 38(2), 167–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X16658334
- Jones, L. V. (1952). Tests of hypotheses: One-sided vs. two-sided alternatives. *Psychological Bulletin*, 49(1), 43–46. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0056832
- Junker, N. M., Stegmann, S., Braun, S., & Van Dick, R. (2016). The ideal and the counterideal follower – advancing implicit followership theories. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 37(8), 1205–1222. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-04-2015-0085
- Kang, J. W., Heo, J. H., & Kim, J. H. (2016). The followership of hotel employees and the relationship between occupational burnout, job stress, and customer orientation:
 Targeting the hotel service providers at luxury hotels. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *16*(4), 345–358. https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358415610374
- Kelemen, T. K., Matthews, S. H., & Breevaart, K. (2020). Leading day-to-day: A review of the daily causes and consequences of leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 31(1), 101344. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2019.101344
- Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters*. Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Kellerman, B. (2008). Followership. How followers are creating change and changing leaders. Harvard Business Press.

Kelley, R. E. (1988, November). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/1988/11/in-praise-of-followers

Kelley, R. E. (1992). The power of followership. Doubleday Currency.

- Kelley, R. E. (2008). Rethinking followership. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff, & J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *The art of followership. How great followers create great leaders* and organizations (pp. 5–15). Jossey-Bass.
- Khan, S. N., Abdullah, S. M., Busari, A. H., Mubushar, M., & Khan, I. U. (2020).
 Reversing the lens: The role of followership dimensions in shaping transformational leadership behaviour; mediating role of trust in leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, *41*(1), 1–18.
 https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-03-2019-0100
- Khan, S. N., Busari, A. H., & Abdullah, S. M. (2019). The essence of followership:
 Review of the literature and future research directions. In Y. Mughal & S. Kamal (Eds.), *Servant leadership styles and strategic decision making* (pp. 148–170). IGI Global.
- Kim, C., & Schachter, H. L. (2015). Exploring followership in a public setting: Is it a missing link between participative leadership and organizational performance? *American Review of Public Administrati*on, 45(4), 436–457. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074013508219
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics:
 Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65(4), 440–452.
 https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.65.4.440
- Klasmeier K. N., & Rowold, J., (2020). A multilevel investigation of predictors and outcomes of shared leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *41*(9), 915– 930. https://doi.org/ 10.1002/job.2477

- Kline, P. (1998). The new psychometrics: Science, psychology, and measurement. Routledge.
- Klonek, F., Gerpott, F. H., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Parker, S. K. (2019). Time to go wild: How to conceptualize and measure process dynamics in real teams with highresolution. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 9(4), 245–275. https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386619886674
- Klotz, A. C., He, W., Yam, K. C., Bolino, M. C., Wei, W., & Houston, L. (2018). Good actors but bad apples: Deviant consequences of daily impression management at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *103*(10), 1145–1154. https://doi.org/10.1037/ap10000335
- Knoll, M., Schyns, B., & Petersen, L. E. (2017). How the influence of unethical leaders on followers is affected by their implicit followership theories. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *24*(4), 450–465. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051817705296
- Kong, M., Xin, L., Chen, M., & Li, H. (2020). Select the Mr. Right: The interaction effect between implicit leadership and implicit followership on employees' workplace behaviors. *Personnel Review*, 50(3), 845–864. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-01-2019-0005
- Kosasih, K., Wibowo, W., & Saparuddin, S. (2020). The influence of ambidextrous organization and authentic followership on innovative performance: The mediating role of change readiness. *Management Science Letters*, 10(7), 1513–1520. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2019.12.015
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., Mak, S., & Chao, G. T. (2016). Team-centric leadership: An integrative review. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 3(1), 21–54. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062429

- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individual's fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, persongroup, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281–342. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x
- Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: A literature review. *Quality & Quantity*, 47, 2025–2047. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-011-9640-9
- Kudek, D. R., Winston, B., & Wood, J. A. (2020). Followership and the relationship between Kelley's followership styles and the Big Five Factor Model of Personality. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 20(3), 102–117. https://doi.org/10.33423/jop.v20i3.2943
- Kumar, K., & Beyerlein, M. (1991). Construction and validation of an instrument for measuring ingratiatory behaviors in organizational settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(5), 619–627. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.5.619
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived Organizational Support: A Meta-Analytic Evaluation of Organizational Support Theory. *Journal of Management*, *43*(6), 1854–1884. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315575554
- Lakens, D. (2016). *One-sided tests: Efficient and underused*. Retrieved December 6, 2021, from The 20% Statistician website: http://daniellakens.blogspot.com/2016/03/one-sided-tests-efficient-and-underused.html
- Landis, R. S., Edwards, B. D., & Cortina, J. M. (2009). On the practice of allowing correlated residuals among indicators in structural equation models. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and methodological myths and urban legends: Doctrine, verity and fable in the organizational and social sciences* (pp. 193–214). Routledge.

- Landis, J. R. & Koch, G. G (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, *33*(1), 159–174. https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310
- Lapalme, M. È., Doucet, O., Gill, A., & Simard, G. (2017). Can "Temps" secure future employment? Investigating the relationship between proactive behaviors and employers' rehiring decision. *Journal of Career Development*, 44(4), 297–310. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845316652251
- Larson, R. B. (2019). Controlling social desirability bias. *International Journal of Market Research*, *61*(5), 534-547. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470785318805305
- Larsson, M., & Nielsen, M.F. (2021). The risky path to a followership identity: From abstract concept to situated reality. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 58(1), 3–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/2329488417735648.
- Law, K. S., Wong, C. S., Wang, D., & Wang, L. (2000). Effect of supervisor-subordinate guanxi on supervisory decisions in China: An empirical investigation. International *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(4), 751–765. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190050075105
- Law-Penrose, J. C., Schwind Wilson K., & Taylor D. (2015). Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) from the resource exchange perspective: Beyond resource predictors and outcomes of LMX. In T. N. Bauer & B. Erdogan (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Leader-Member Exchange* (pp. 55–66). Oxford Library of Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199326174.013.0017
- Lee, S., Han, S., Cheong, M., Kim, S.L., & Yun, S. (2017). How do I get my way? A metaanalytic review of research on influence tactics. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(1), 210–228. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.11.001

Lee, A., Legood, A., Hughes, D., Tian, A. W., Newman, A., & Knight, C. (2019). Leadership, creativity and innovation: A meta-analytic review. *European Journal* of Work and Organizational Psychology, 29(1), 1–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2019.1661837

- Leiner, D. J. (2016). Our research's breadth lives on convenience samples. A case study of the online respondent pool "SoSci Panel". *Studies in Communication*, 5(4), 367–396. https://doi.org/10.5771/2192-4007-2016-4-36769-134
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 45(1), 79–122. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1994.1027
- Leung, A., & Sy, T. (2018). I am as incompetent as the prototypical group member: An investigation of naturally occurring Golem effects in work groups. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1581. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01581
- Li, H., Zhao, Z., Müller, R., & Shao, J. (2020). Exploring the relationship between leadership and followership of Chinese project managers. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 13(3), 616–647. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-02-2019-0042
- Li, L., Zheng, X., Sun, S., & Diaz, I. (2020). Does subordinate moqi affect leadership empowerment?. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 41(8), 1015– 1034. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-08-2019-0351
- Liang, J., Farh, C. I. C., & Farh, J. L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 71–92. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0176

- Lin, I. D., Cieslak, K., Patel, V., Nicolas, M., & Hertig, J. B. (2023). Global followership models and practices within healthcare settings. In J. F. Marques, J. Schmieder-Ramirez & P. G. Malakyan (Eds.), *Handbook of Global Leadership and Followership* (pp. 401–429). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21544-5
- Liu, F., & Dong, M. (2020). Perspective taking and voice solicitation: A moderated mediation model. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 58(4), 504–526. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12260
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 1297–1349). Rand McNally.
- Logan, M. S., & Ganster, D. C. (2007). The effects of empowerment on attitudes and performance: The role of social support and empowerment beliefs. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(8), 1523–1550. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00711.x
- Lord, R. G., Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Eagly, A. H. (2017). Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 434–451. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000089
- Lu, S., Bartol, K. M., Venkataramani, V., Zheng, X., & Liu, X. (2019). Pitching novel ideas to the boss: The interactive effects of employees' idea enactment and influence tactics on creativity assessment and implementation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(2), 579–606. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.0942
- Lundqvist, D., Wallo, A., Coetzer, A., & Kock, H. (2023). Leadership and learning at work: A systematic literature review of learning-oriented leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 30(2), 205–238.
 https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518221133970

- MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1(2), 130–149. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.1.2.130
- Maier, G. W., & Woschée, R. M. (2002). Die affektive Bindung an das Unternehmen:
 Psychometrische Überprüfung einer deutschsprachigen Fassung des Organizational
 Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) von Porter und Smith (1970) [Affective
 commitment to an organization: Psychometric examination of a German version of
 the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) of Porter and Smith (1970)]. *Zeitschrift Für Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie A&O, 46*(3), 126–136.
 https://doi.org/10.1026//0932-4089.46.3.126
- Malakyan, P. G. (2014). Followership in leadership studies: A case of leader–follower trade approach. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(4), 6–22. https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21306
- Manning, T., & Robertson, B. (2016). A three factor model of followership: Part 3 research on followership, a three factor followership framework and practical implications. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, *48*(8), 400–408.
 https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-01-2016-0005
- Mao, H.-Y. (2022). Employees' feedback-seeking strategies and perceptions of abusive supervision. Social Behavior & Personality, 50(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.10523

Marstand, A. F., Martin, R., & Epitropaki, O. (2016). Complementary person-supervisor fit: An investigation of supplies-values (S-V) fit, leader-member exchange (LMX) and work outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(3), 418–437. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.10.008 Martin, R., Thomas, G., Legood, A., & Dello Russo, S. (2017). Leader–member exchange (LMX) differentiation and work outcomes: Conceptual clarification and critical review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(2), 151–168. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2202

- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1986). *The Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Matthews, S. H., Kelemen, T. K., & Bolino, M. C. (2021). How follower traits and cultural values influence the effects of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(1). 101497. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2021.101497
- Maynard, M. T., Gilson, L. L., & Mathieu, J. E. (2012). Empowerment—Fad or fab? A multilevel review of the past two decades of research. *Journal of Management*, 38(4), 1231–1281. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312438773
- Maynes, T. D., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2014). Speaking more broadly: An examination of the nature, antecedents, and consequences of an expanded set of employee voice behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(1), 87–112. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034284
- McClean, S. T., Barnes, C. M., Courtright, S. H., & Johnson, R. E. (2019). Resetting the clock on dynamic leader behaviors: A conceptual integration and agenda for future. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *13*(2), 479–508. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2017.0081
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2003). Personality in adulthood: A five-factor theory perspective. Guilford Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203428412
- McDonald, R. P. (1978). Generalizability in factorable domains: "Domain validity and generalizability": 1. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 38(1), 75–79. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447803800111

- Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological Methods*, 17(3), 437–455. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028085
- Meindl, J. R. (1995). The romance of leadership as a follower-centric theory: A social constructionist approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(3), 329–341. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90012-8
- Meredith, W. (1993). Measurement invariance, factor analysis and factorial invariance. *Psychometrika*, 58, 525–543. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02294825
- Metwally, M. M., Khedr, W. M., & Messallam, A. A. (2018). The effect of follower's characteristics on the social influence exerted over the leader: The moderator role of follower's immediacy. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, *83*(2), 4–16.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z
- Mitchell, T. R., & James, L. R. (2001). Building Better Theory: Time and the specification of when things happen. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26(4), 530–547. https://doi.org/10.2307/3560240
- Montano, D., Schleu, J. E., & Hüffmeier, J. (2023). A meta-analysis of the relative contribution of leadership styles to followers' mental health. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *30*(1), 90–107.
 https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518221114854
- Moshagen, M., & Erdfelder, E. (2016). A new strategy for testing structural equation models. Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 23(1), 54–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2014.950896

- Moss, S. E., Valenzi, E. R., & Taggart, W. (2003). Are you hiding from your boss? The development of a taxonomy and instrument to assess the feedback management behaviors of good and bad performers. *Journal of Management*, 29(4), 487–510. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(03)00022-9
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1
- Mulder, J. D., & Hamaker, E. L. (2020). Three extensions of the Random Intercept Cross-Lagged Panel Model. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 28(4), 638–648. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2020.1784738
- Mund, M., & Nestler, S. (2019). Beyond the Cross-Lagged Panel Model: Next-generation statistical tools for analyzing interdependencies across the life course. Advances in Life Course Research, 41, 100249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2018.10.002
- Mushonga, S., & Torrance, C. (2008). Assessing the relationship between followership and the big five factor model of personality. *Review of Business Research*, 8(6), 185– 193.
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2015). *Mplus* (Version 7.4) [Computer software]. Muthén & Muthén.
- Ng, K. Y., & Van Dyne, L. (2005). Antecedents and performance consequences of helping behavior in work groups: A multilevel analysis. *Group & Organization Management*, 30(5), 514–540. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601104269107
- Nifadkar, S., Tsui, A. S., & Ashforth, B. E. (2012). The way you make me feel and behave: Supervisor-triggered newcomer affect and approach-avoidance behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, *55*(5), 1146–1168. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0133

- Nohria, N. (2020, January 30). *What organizations need to survive a pandemic*. Retrieved January 4, 2024, from Harvard Business Review website: https://hbr.org/2020/01/what-organizations-need-to-survive-a-pandemic
- Nübling, M., Stößel, U., Hasselhorn, H.-M., Michaelis, M., & Hofmann, F. (2005).
 Methoden zur Erfassung psychischer Belastungen Erprobung eines
 Messinstrumentes (COPSOQ) Bremerhaven [Schriftenreihe der Bundesanstalt für
 Arbeitsschutz und Arbeitsmedizin; Fb 1058]: Wirtschaftsverlag NW.
- Oberski, D. L. (2010). Jrule for Mplus (Version 0.91) [Computer software]. http://wiki.github.com/daob/JruleMplus
- Oc, B. (2018). Contextual leadership: A systematic review of how contextual factors shape leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 218–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.004
- Oc, B., & Bashur, M. R. (2013). Followership, leadership and social influence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(6), 919–934.
 - https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.006
- Oc, B., Chintakananda, K., Bashshur, M. R., & Day, D. (2023). The study of followers in leadership research: A systematic and critical review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 34(1), 101674. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2022.101674
- Olaru, G., Schroeders, U., Hartung, J., & Wilhelm, O. (2019). Ant colony optimization and local weighted structural equation modeling. A tutorial on novel item and person sampling procedures for personality research. *European Journal of Personality*, 33(3), 400–419. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2195
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.

- Owens, B., Johnson, M., & Mitchell, T. (2013). Expressed humility in organizations: Implications for performance, teams, and leadership. *Organization Science*, 24, 1517–1538. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0795
- Parker, S. K., Wang, Y., & Liao, J. (2019). When is proactivity wise? A review of factors that influence the individual outcomes of proactive behavior. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6(1), 221–248. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015302
- Perugini, M., Gallucci, M., Presaghi, F., & Ercolani, A. P. (2003). The personal norm of reciprocity. *European Journal of Personality*, 17(4), 251–283. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.474
- Peters, K., & Haslam, S. A. (2018). I follow, therefore I lead: A longitudinal study of leader and follower identity and leadership in the marines. *British Journal of Psychology*, 109(4), 708–723. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12312
- Peterson, T. O., Peterson, C. M., & Rook, B. W. (2020). Exemplary followership. Part 1: Refining an instrument. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 53(2), 128–135. https://doi.org/10.1108/ict-06-2020-0071
- Petruş, A. A. (2018). Construct validity of the ideal implicit leadership theories and implicit followership theories. *Psihologia Resurselor Umane*, 16(1), 4–15. https://doi.org/10.24837/pru.2018.1.482
- Ployhart, R. E., & Vandenberg, R. J. (2010). Longitudinal Research: The Theory, Design, and Analysis of Change. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 94–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352110
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5). 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.

- Prenoveau, J. M. (2016). Specifying and interpreting latent state-trait models with autoregression: An illustration. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 23(5), 731–749. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2016.1186550
- Qian, J., Song, B., Jin, Z., Wang, B., & Chen, H. (2018). Linking empowering leadership to task performance, taking charge, and voice: The mediating role of feedbackseeking. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 2025. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02025
- Rahim, M. A. (1983). Rahim organizational conflict inventories: Professional manual. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2005). Kurzversion des Big Five Inventory (BFI-K):
 Entwicklung und Validierung eines ökonomischen Inventars zur Erfassung der fünf
 Faktoren der Persönlichkeit [Short version of the Big Five Inventory (BFI-K):
 Development and validation of an economic inventory for assessment of the five
 factors of personality]. *Diagnostica*, *51*(4), 195–206. https://doi.org/10.1026/00121924.51.4.195
- Rayton, B. A., & Yalabik, Z. Y. (2014). Work engagement, psychological contract breach and job satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(17), 2382–2400. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.876440
- Redmond, V., Jameson, J. K., & Binder, A. R. (2016). How superior–subordinate relationship quality and conflict management styles influence an employee's use of upward dissent tactics. *Negotiation Conflict Management Research*, 9(2), 158–176. https://doi.org/10.1111/ncmr.12072
- Ren, H., & Chen, C. W. (2018). Why do Chinese employees engage in building supervisor-subordinate guanxi? A planned behavior perspective. *Chinese Management Studies*, 12(1), 148–163. https://doi.org/10.1108/cms-07-2017-0203

- Ren, R., Ma, L., Chen, Z. X., Wang, H., & Ju, D. (2022). Implicit voice delivery: Its antecedents, consequences, and boundary conditions. *Management and Organization Review*, 18(1), 43–72. https://doi.org/10.1017/mor.2021.37
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698 –714. https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.698

Ribbat, M., Krumm, S., & Hüffmeier, J. (2020). *A German Version of Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire* [Data set]. https://osf.io/mvg8x/?view_only=de6efdf9a5044430a785d847c27e1e2d

- Ribbat, M., Krumm, S., & Hüffmeier, J. (2021). Validation of a German version of Kelley's (1992) followership questionnaire. *Psychological Test Adaption and Development*, 2(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1027/2698-1866/a000005
- Ribbat, M., Nohe, C., & Hüffmeier, J. (2023). Followership styles scrutinized: temporal consistency and relationships with job attitudes and self-efficacy. *PeerJ*, *11*, e16135. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.16135
- Rigotti, T., Schyns, B., & Mohr, G. (2008). A short Version of the Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale: Structural and construct validity across five countries. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 16(2), 238–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072707305763
- Riketta, M. (2008). The causal relation between job attitudes and performance: A metaanalysis of panel studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 472–481. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.472
- Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach and violation: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(5), 525–546.

- Rodriguez, A., Reise, S. P., & Haviland, M. G. (2016). Applying bifactor statistical indices in the evaluation of psychological measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 98(3), 223–237. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2015.1089249
- Ropovik, I. (2015). A cautionary note on testing latent variable models. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6(1715), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01715
- Rosenbach, W. E., Pittman, T. S., & Potter, E. H., III. (1997). *Performance and Relationship Questionnaire (survey instrument)*. Retrieved 02 Jan. 2023, from https://www.leadingandfollowing.com/PQR.html
- Rush, M. C., Thomas, J. C., & Lord, R. G. (1977). Implicit leadership theory: A potential threat to the internal validity of leader behavior questionnaires. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 20*(1), 93–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(77)90046-0
- Sadri, G., & Robertson, I. T. (1993). Self-efficacy and work-related behaviour: A review and meta-analysis. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 42(2), 139–152. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1993.tb00728.x
- Saraih, U. N., Razali, R., Abdulsatar Abduljabbar, S, Rozali, N. (2018). The influences of job satisfaction and performance on employees followership styles: A survey in the Malaysian health institution. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 7(4.38), 842–846.
- Saris, W. E., Satorra, A., & van der Veld, W. M. (2009). Testing structural equation models or detection of misspecifications. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 16(4), 561–582. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510903203433
- Scherbaum, C. A., & Ferreter, J. M. (2009). Estimating statistical power and required sample sizes for organizational research using multilevel modeling. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12(2), 347–367. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428107308906

- Schneider, A., Gardner, W. L., Hinojosa, A., & Marin, A. (2014). Emotional responses of leaders to passive versus active members. *Leadership*, 10(4), 412–436. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715013504424
- Schultze, M. (2020). STUART (R package version 0.9.0) [Computer software]. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stuart
- Schyns, B. (2002). Überprüfung einer deutschsprachigen Skala zum Leader-Member-Exchange-Ansatz [Evaluation of a German Scale for Leader-Member Exchange]. Zeitschrift für Differentielle und Diagnostische Psychologie, 23(2), 235–245. https://doi.org/10.1024//0170-1789.23.2.235
- Semadeni, M., Withers, M. C., & Certo, S. T. (2014). The perils of endogeneity and instrumental variables in strategy research: Understanding through simulations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(7), 1070–1079. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2136
- Sessions, H., Nahrgang, J. D., Newton, D. W., & Chamberlin, M. (2020). I'm tired of listening: The effects of supervisor appraisals of group voice on supervisor emotional exhaustion and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *105*(6), 619–636. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000455
- Shamir, B. (2007). From passive recipients to active co-producers: Followers' roles in the leadership process. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. Bligh, M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *Follower-centered perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R. Meindl* (pp. ix–xxxix). Information Age Publishers.
- Shamir, B. (2011). Leadership takes time: Some implications of (not) taking time seriously in leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(2), 307–315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.02.006

- Shen, L., & Abe, T. (2022). How do followership behaviors encourage job performance? A longitudinal study. *Current Psychology*, 42(17), 14652–14662. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02545-2
- Shondrick, S. J., Dinh, J. E., & Lord, R. G. (2010). Developments in implicit leadership theory and cognitive science: Applications to improving measurement and understanding alternatives to hierarchical leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(6), 959-978. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.10.004
- Sibunruang, H., Capezio, A., & Restubog, S. L. D. (2014). Getting ahead through flattery: Examining the moderating roles of organization-based self-esteem and political skill in the ingratiation–promotability relationship. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 22(4), 610–626. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072713514821
- Siddaway, A. P., Wood, A. M., & Hedges, L. V. (2019). How to do a systematic review: A best practice guide for conducting and reporting narrative reviews, meta-analyses, and meta-syntheses. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70(1), 747–770. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-102803

Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2012, October). A 21 word solution. Retrieved December 6, 2021, from Dialogue: The Official Newsletter of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology 26: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2160588

- Sonnentag, S., Binnewies, C., & Mojza, E. J. (2010). Staying well and engaged when demands are high: The role of psychological detachment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 965–976. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020032
- Sonnentag, S., Wehrt, W., Weyers, B., & Law, Y. C. (2022). Conquering unwanted habits at the workplace: Day-level processes and longer term change in habit strength. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(5), 831–853. https://doi.org/10.1037/ap10000930

- Srivastava, P., & Jain, S. (2017). A leadership framework for distributed self-organized scrum teams. *Team Performance Management*, 23(5/6), 293–314. https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-06-2016-0033.
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 240–261. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.240
- Staufenbiel, T., & Hartz, C. (2000). Organizational citizenship behavior: Entwicklung und erste Validierung eines Meßinstruments [Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Development and validation of a measurement instrument]. *Diagnostica*, 46(2), 73–83. https://doi.org/10.1026//0012-1924.46.2.73
- Steel, P., Beugelsdijk, S., & Aguinis, H. (2021). The anatomy of an award-winning metaanalysis: Recommendations for authors, reviewers, and readers of meta-analytic reviews. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 52(1), 23–44. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-020-00385-z
- Steger, J., Manners, G., & Zimmerman, T. (1982). Following the leader: How to link management style to subordinate personalities. *Management Review*, 82(10), 22– 28.
- Stegmann, S., Braun, S., Junker, N., & van Dick, R. (2020). Getting older and living up to implicit followership theories: Implications for employee psychological health and job attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 50(2), 65–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12636
- St-Hilaire, F., Gilbert, M.-H., & Brun, J.-P. (2019). What if subordinates took care of managers' mental health at work? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(2), 337–359. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1276090

- Steyer, R., Mayer, A., Geiser, C., & Cole, D. A. (2015). A theory of states and traits— Revised. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 11, 71–98. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032813-153719
- Steyer, R., Schmitt, M., & Eid, M. (1999). Latent-state-trait theory and research in personality and individual differences. *European Journal of Personality*, 13, 389– 408.
- Stützle, T. & Hoos, H. H. (2000). MAX-MIN ant system. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, *16*(8), 889–914. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-739X(00)00043-1
- Sy, T. (2010). What do you think of followers? Examining the content, structure, and consequences of implicit followership theories. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 113(2), 73–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.06.001
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). Using multivariate statistics. Pearson.
- Tambe, P., Cappelli, P., & Yakubovich, V. (2019). Artificial intelligence in human resources management: Challenges and a path forward. *California Management Review*, 61(4), 15–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/000812561986791
- Tanoff, G. F., & Barlow, C. B. (2002). Leadership and followership: Same animal, different spots? *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 54(3), 157–167.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178–190. https://doi.org/10.2307/1556375
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' resistance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 974–983. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.974

- Tessema, K. A., & Florovito, B. (2021). Subject position and manifestations of workplace followership. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 21(3), 128–144. https://doi.org/10.33423/jop.v21i3.4314
- Tims M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2015). Job crafting and job performance: A longitudinal study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(6), 914–928. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2014.969245
- Tonidandel, S., & LeBreton, J. M. (2011). Relative Importance Analysis: A Useful Supplement to Regression Analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *26*(1), 1– 9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9204-3
- Uhl-Bien, M. & Carsten, M. (2018). Reversing the lens in leadership: Positioning followership in the leadership construct. In I. Katz, G. Eilam-Shamir, R. Kark, & Y. Berson (Eds.), *Leadership now: Reflections on the legacy of Boas Shamir* (pp. 195–222). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-35712018000009005
- Uhl-Bien, M., & Ospina, S. M. (2012). Conclusion—paradigm interplay in relational leadership: A way forward. In M. Uhl-Bien S. M. Ospina (Eds.), *Advancing relational leadership research: A dialogue among perspectives* (pp. 537–580). IAP Information Age Publishing.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 83–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.007
- Valentine, J. C., & Cooper, H. (2008). A systematic and transparent approach for assessing the methodological quality of intervention effectiveness research: The Study Design and Implementation Assessment Device (Study DIAD). *Psychological Methods*, *13*(2), 130–149. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989x.13.2.130

- Van De Mieroop, D. (2020). A deontic perspective on the collaborative, multimodal accomplishment of leadership. *Leadership*, 16(5), 592–619. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715019893824
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108– 119. https://doi.org/10.2307/256902
- VandeWalle, D., Ganesan, S., Challagalla, G. N., & Brown, S. P. (2000). An integrated model of feedback-seeking behavior: Disposition, context, and cognition. *Journal* of Applied Psychology, 85(6), 996–1003. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.6.996
- Vasileiou, K., Barnett, J., Thorpe, S., & Young, T (2018). Characterising and justifying sample size sufficiency in interview-based studies: Systematic analysis of qualitative health research over a 15-year period. *BMC Med Res Methodol*, 18, 148. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0594-7
- Veestraeten, M., Johnson, S. K., Leroy, H., Sy, T., & Sels, L. (2021). Exploring the bounds of Pygmalion effects: Congruence of implicit followership theories drives and binds leader performance expectations and follower work engagement. *Journal of Leadership Organizational Studies*, 28(2), 137–153.
 https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051820980428
- Verquer, M. L., Beehr, T. A., & Wagner, S. H. (2003). A meta-analysis of relations between person–organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 473–489. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00036-2
- Voelkle, M. C., Oud, J. H. L., Davidov, E., & Schmidt, P. (2012). An SEM approach to continuous time modeling of panel data: relating authoritarianism and anomia. *Psychological Methods*, 17, 176–192. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027543.

- Vriend, T., Said, R., Janssen, O., & Jordan, J. (2020). The dark side of relational leadership: Positive and negative reciprocity as fundamental drivers of follower's intended pro-leader and pro-self unethical behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1473. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01473
- Wang, X., & Peng, J. (2016). The effect of implicit-explicit followership congruence on benevolent leadership: Evidence from Chinese family firms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 812. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00812
- Watkins, M. W. (2013). *Omega* (Version 1.0.0.1) [Computer Software]. Ed & Psych Associates.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective Events Theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews* (pp. 1–74). Elsevier Science/JAI Press.
- Wen, Q., Liu, R., & Long, J. (2021). Influence of authentic leadership on employees' taking charge behavior: The roles of subordinates' moqi and perspective taking. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 626877. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.626877
- West, S. G., Taylor, A. B., & Wu, W. (2012). Model fit and model selection in structural equation modeling. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Handbook of structural equation modeling* (pp. 209–231). The Guilford Press.
- Widaman, K. F., & Grimm, K. J. (2014). Advanced psychometrics: Confirmatory factor analysis, item response theory, and the study of measurement invariance. In H. T.
 Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality* psychology (pp. 534–570). Cambridge University Press.

- Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(3), 486–493. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.3.486
- Wu, Q., Cormican, K., & Chen, G. (2020). A meta-analysis of shared leadership: Antecedents, consequences, and moderators. *Journal of Leadership Organizational Studies*, 27(1), 49–64. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051818820862
- Wulff, J. N., Sajons, G. B., Pogrebna, G., Lonati, S., Bastardoz, N., Banks, G. C., & Antonakis, J. (2023). Common methodological mistakes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 34(1), 101677. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2023.101677
- Xu, A. J., Loi, R., & Cai, Z. (2021). Not threats, but resources: An investigation of how leaders react to employee constructive voice. *British Journal of Management*, 34(1), 37–56. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12581
- Xu, A. J., Loi, R., Cai, Z., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Reversing the lens: How followers influence leader–member exchange quality. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 92(3), 475–497. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12268
- Xu, J., Liu, Y., & Guo, Y. (2014). The role of subordinate emotional masking in leader– member exchange and outcomes: A two-sample investigation. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(2), 100–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.11.011
- Xu, S., Yang, T., Guo, R., & Zhang, W. (2019). The antecedents and consequences of employees' followership behavior in social network organizational context: A longitudinal study. *Eurasip Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking*, 2019(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13638-019-1565-3
- Yang, A., Huang, J., Chen, C., & Zhao, H. (2022). To follow or not to follow? A personcentered profile of the perceived leader emotion management-followership associative patterns. *Current Psychology*, 42(16), 13571–13588. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02570-1

- Yang, J., Huang, Y., & Zhou, S. (2021). Emotional labor directed at leaders: The differential effects of surface and deep acting on LMX. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(9), 2070–2089. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1579253
- Yang, Y., Shi, W., Zhang, B., Song, Y., & Xu, D. (2020). Implicit followership theories from the perspective of followers. *Leadership Organization Development Journal*, 41(4), 581–596. https://doi.org/10.1108/lodj-05-2019-0225
- Yousaf, K., Abid, G., Butt, T. H., Ilyas, S., & Ahmed, S. (2019). Impact of ethical leadership and thriving at work on psychological well-being of employees:
 Mediating role of voice behaviour. *Business, Management Education*, *17*(2), 194–217. https://doi.org/10.3846/bme.2019.11176
- Yukl, G., Seifert, C. F., & Chavez, C. (2008). Validation of the extended influence behavior questionnaire. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19(5), 609–621. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.07.006
- Zaccaro, S. J., Green J. P., Dubrow, S., & Kolze, M. (2018). Leader individual differences, situational parameters, and leadership outcomes: A comprehensive review and integration. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 2–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.10.003
- Zaleznik, A. (1965). The dynamics of subordinacy. *Harvard Business Review*, 43(3), 119–131.
- Zhang, R. (2020). An examination of the relationship between hotel employees' use of upward influence tactics and supervisor rating of employee promotability. *Journal* of Human Resources in Hospitality Tourism, 19(3), 296–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2020.1737767

- Zhang, W., & Wang, X.-J. (2021). An understanding of implicit followership toward new employees' self-efficacy: The mediating role of perceived supervisor support. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 759920. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.759920
- Zhang, Z., Liang, Q., & Li, J. (2020). Understanding managerial response to employee voice: A social persuasion perspective. *International Journal of Manpower*, 41(3), 273–288. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijm-05-2018-0156
- Zheng, X., Li, N., Brad Harris, T., & Liao, H. (2019). Unspoken yet understood: An introduction and initial framework of subordinates' moqi with supervisors. *Journal* of Management, 45(3), 955–983. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316687642
- Zheng, X., Li, N., Harris, T. B., & Liao, H. (2017). Unspoken yet understood: An introduction and initial framework of subordinates' moqi with supervisors. *Journal* of Management, 45(3), 955–983. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316687642
- Zhong, J., Zhang, L., Xiao, H., & Wen, Q. (2021). Antecedents and consequences of follower moqi: Leader humility, follower humility, and knowledge hiding. *Current Psychology*, 42(8), 6564–6575. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02001-1
- Zhu, J., Liao, Z., Yam, K. C., & Johnson, R. E. (2018). Shared leadership: A state-of-theart review and future research agenda. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(7), 834–852. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2296

Appendix A. Careless Response Detection

This Appendix refers to Study 1 – Validation of a German Version of Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire (see chapter 3). In this Appendix, I describe the procedures we followed to detect careless responses. We tried to detect careless responses in Study 1 and Study 2 of chapter 3 by following the procedures recommended by Meade and Craig (2012).

Study 1

First, we identified and excluded striking outlier cases by computing the Mahalanobis distance over all items (n = 23). This means, we considered the pattern of responses across the entire series of items in the questionnaire for every case and identified the Mahalanobis distance to a certain pattern of the normal distribution of responses in the sample (χ^2). The respective cut-off for excluding a case was defined as p < .001 for the χ^2 value as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). Second, we tested zero-within-variance in responses (n = 0; i.e., we did not have to exclude anyone based on this criterion).

Study 2

We requested an individual statement on whether we should use the data at the end of the survey. The statements led to the exclusion of four cases of careless respondents. We also identified and excluded striking outlier cases by computing Mahalanobis distance over all items (n = 26) as described above. Finally, we tested zero-within-variance in responses for every scale. If responses had no variance within a particular scale, we recoded the detected values of this respondent as missing values. Depending on the scale, one to 27 respondents were affected.

Appendix B. German Items and Translation Process

This Appendix refers to Study 1 – Validation of a German Version of Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire. We conducted three steps for the translation process as recommended by Bracken and Barona (1991). First, we translated the English version of the questionnaire into German. Second, an organizational psychology expert without prior knowledge of the questionnaire translated our German version back into its original language (English). Third, we asked two native English speakers and experts in industrial-organizational psychology to compare the back-translation with the original. Both reviewers agreed on the equivalence of the two versions in terms of their meaning, wording, word complexity, format, comprehensibility, and comparability of their concepts:

Hilft Ihnen Ihre Arbeit dabei, ein für Sie wichtiges gesellschaftliches Ziel oder einen für sie wichtigen persönlichen Traum zu verwirklichen?

Stehen Ihre persönlichen Arbeitsziele im Einklang mit den vorrangigen Zielen Ihrer Organisation?

Fühlen Sie sich in hohem Maße Ihrer Arbeit und Ihrer Organisation verpflichtet und durch sie angetrieben, so dass Sie ihnen Ihre besten Ideen und Arbeitsleitungen widmen?

Springt Ihr Enthusiasmus auch auf Ihre Kolleginnen und Kollegen über und gibt ihnen Antrieb?

Bestimmen Sie selbst, welche betrieblichen Aktivitäten zum Erreichen der vorrangigen Ziele Ihrer Organisation entscheidend sind, anstatt darauf zu warten oder bloß zu akzeptieren, was Ihnen Ihre Führungskraft sagt?

Entwickeln Sie aktiv eine unverwechselbare Kompetenz für diese entscheidenden Aktivitäten, damit Sie für Ihre Führungskraft und Ihre Organisation wertvoller werden?

Wenn Sie in einem neuen Job oder Aufgabengebiet anfangen, bemühen Sie sich umgehend um einen Nachweis von Erfolgen bei den Aufgaben, die Ihrer Führungskraft wichtig sind?

Kann Ihnen Ihre Führungskraft eine schwierige Aufgabe ohne viel Anleitung übertragen, in dem Wissen, dass Sie Ihre Arbeit mit höchster Qualität fristgerecht abliefern und auftretende Schwierigkeiten meistern, wenn nötig?

Ergreifen Sie die Initiative, Aufgaben ausfindig zu machen und erfolgreich zu erledigen, die weit über Ihre Arbeitsplatzbeschreibung hinausgehen?

Wenn Sie nicht der Leiter/die Leiterin eines Gruppenprojektes sind, leisten Sie trotzdem Ihren Beitrag auf hohem Niveau und tun oft mehr als Ihren Anteil?

Entwickeln Sie und setzen Sie sich eigenständig für neue Ideen ein, die wesentlich zu den Zielen Ihrer Führungskraft oder Ihrer Organisation beitragen?

Versuchen Sie wirklich schwierige Probleme (fachlich oder organisatorisch) selbst zu lösen, anstatt darauf zu setzen, dass das Ihre Führungskraft für Sie erledigt?

Helfen Sie anderen Kolleginnen und Kollegen, sodass diese gut dastehen, selbst wenn Sie dafür nicht selbst belohnt werden?

Spielen Sie wenn nötig des Teufels Anwalt, um Ihrer Führungskraft oder Ihrer Gruppe sowohl die Vorteile als auch die Risiken von Ideen oder Plänen aufzuzeigen?
Verstehen Sie die Bedürfnisse, Ziele und Handlungszwänge Ihrer Führungskraft und arbeiten hart, um bei deren Erfüllung zu helfen?

Geben Sie entschlossen und ehrlich Ihre Stärken und Schwächen zu, anstatt eine Beurteilung auf die lange Bank zu schieben?

Machen Sie es sich zur Gewohnheit, die Klugheit der Entscheidung Ihrer Führungskraft für sich zu hinterfragen, anstatt einfach das zu tun, was Ihnen gesagt wird?

Wenn Ihre Führungskraft Sie bittet, etwas zu tun, das Ihren beruflichen oder persönlichen Präferenzen widerspricht, sagen Sie eher "nein" als "ja"?

Verhalten Sie sich eher gemäß Ihren eigenen ethischen Standards als entsprechend den Standards der Führungskraft oder der Gruppe?

Setzen Sie Ihre Meinung bei wichtigen Themen durch, auch wenn dies vielleicht einen Konflikt mit Ihrer Gruppe oder Repressalien von Ihrer Führungskraft bedeutet?

The final German questionnaire contains the following items:

Active Engagement (AE):

Bestimmen Sie selbst, welche betrieblichen Aktivitäten zum Erreichen der vorrangigen Ziele Ihrer Organisation entscheidend sind, anstatt darauf zu warten oder bloß zu akzeptieren, was Ihnen Ihre Führungskraft sagt?

Entwickeln Sie aktiv eine unverwechselbare Kompetenz für diese entscheidenden Aktivitäten, damit Sie für Ihre Führungskraft und Ihre Organisation wertvoller werden?

Wenn Sie in einem neuen Job oder Aufgabengebiet anfangen, bemühen Sie sich umgehend um einen Nachweis von Erfolgen bei den Aufgaben, die Ihrer Führungskraft wichtig sind?

Kann Ihnen Ihre Führungskraft eine schwierige Aufgabe ohne viel Anleitung übertragen, in dem Wissen, dass Sie Ihre Arbeit mit höchster Qualität fristgerecht abliefern und auftretende Schwierigkeiten meistern, wenn nötig?

Ergreifen Sie die Initiative, Aufgaben ausfindig zu machen und erfolgreich zu erledigen, die weit über Ihre Arbeitsplatzbeschreibung hinausgehen?

Wenn Sie nicht der Leiter/die Leiterin eines Gruppenprojektes sind, leisten Sie trotzdem Ihren Beitrag auf hohem Niveau und tun oft mehr als Ihren Anteil?

Entwickeln Sie und setzen Sie sich eigenständig für neue Ideen ein, die wesentlich zu den Zielen Ihrer Führungskraft oder Ihrer Organisation beitragen?

Versuchen Sie wirklich schwierige Probleme (fachlich oder organisatorisch) selbst zu lösen, anstatt darauf zu setzen, dass das Ihre Führungskraft für Sie erledigt?

Verstehen Sie die Bedürfnisse, Ziele und Handlungszwänge Ihrer Führungskraft und arbeiten hart, um bei deren Erfüllung zu helfen?

Geben Sie entschlossen und ehrlich Ihre Stärken und Schwächen zu, anstatt eine Beurteilung auf die lange Bank zu schieben?

Independent, Critical Thinking (ICT):

Machen Sie es sich zur Gewohnheit, die Klugheit der Entscheidung Ihrer Führungskraft für sich zu hinterfragen, anstatt einfach das zu tun, was Ihnen gesagt wird?

Wenn Ihre Führungskraft Sie bittet, etwas zu tun, das Ihren beruflichen oder persönlichen Präferenzen widerspricht, sagen Sie eher "nein" als "ja"?

Verhalten Sie sich eher gemäß Ihren eigenen ethischen Standards als entsprechend den Standards der Führungskraft oder der Gruppe?

Setzen Sie Ihre Meinung bei wichtigen Themen durch, auch wenn dies vielleicht einen Konflikt mit Ihrer Gruppe oder Repressalien von Ihrer Führungskraft bedeutet?

Appendix C. Followership Item and Scale Analysis

This Appendix refers to Study 1 – Validation of a German Version of Kelley's

(1992) Followership Questionnaire (see chapter 3).

Table 15

Followership	item anal	lysis for	the first	subsamp	ole of Si	tudy 1
		/	./		./	~

Item	М	SD	Difficulty	Corrected Item- Total Correlations
Personally identify (AE)	4.73	1.59	53.35	.58
Actively develop (AE)	5.22	1.40	60.24	.70
Build success (AE)	4.80	1.43	54.30	.46
Highest quality work (AE)	5.96	0.91	70.92	.59
Take initiative (AE)	4.84	0.42	54.87	.65
Contribute high level (AE)	5.48	1.20	64.03	.68
Think up new ideas (AE)	4.96	1.33	56.57	.74
Solve tough problems (AE)	5.58	1.16	65.49	.60
Help coworkers (AE)	5.70	1.06	67.13	.44
See opportunities and risks (AE)	4.73	1.45	53.35	.49
Understanding the needs and objectives (AE)	4.85	1.25	55.06	.58
Recognize one's strengths and weaknesses (AE)	5.45	1.16	63.53	.56
Question decisions (ICT)	5.41	1.29	62.96	.50
Contrary (ICT)	4.55	1.51	50.76	.52
Ethical standards (ICT)	5.26	1.25	60.87	.54
Assert issues (ICT)	4.44	1.35	49.12	.55

Notes. n = 226. M = Mean. SD = Standard Deviation. Dimension classification is presented in brackets.

Study 1, first subsample: AE scale mean is M = 5.19 with SD = 0.90. ICT scale mean is M = 4.92 with SD = 1.01. Correlations with gender are for AE r = .08, p = .23, and for ICT r = -.05, p = .51. Correlations with age are for AE r = .07, p = .30, and for ICT r = .27, p = .00.

Item	М	SD	Difficulty	Corrected Item- Total Correlations
Personally identify (AE)	4.84	1.52	54.86	.52
Actively develop (AE)	5.17	1.34	59.62	.70
Build success (AE)	4.86	1.35	55.17	.44
Highest quality work (AE)	5.92	0.99	70.35	.60
Take initiative (AE)	4.92	1.50	56.06	.62
Contribute high level (AE)	5.38	1.20	62.54	.62
Think up new ideas (AE)	4.97	1.26	56.76	.71
Solve tough problems (AE)	5.59	1.19	65.52	.62
Help coworkers (AE)	5.63	1.14	66.10	.49
See opportunities and risks (AE)	4.81	1.61	54.41	.55
Understanding the needs and objectives (AE)	4.78	1.30	53.97	.54
Recognize one's strengths and weaknesses (AE)	5.45	1.19	63.62	.62
Question decisions (ICT)	5.18	1.35	59.68	.42
Contrary (ICT)	4.49	1.52	49.84	.46
Ethical standards (ICT)	5.00	1.43	57.08	.62
Assert issues (ICT)	4.47	1.53	49.52	.60

Followership item analysis for the second subsample of Study 1

Notes. n = 225. M = Mean. SD = Standard Deviation. Dimension classification is presented in brackets.

Study 1, second subsample: AE scale mean is M = 5.19 with SD = 0.88. ICT scale mean is M = 4.78 with SD = 1.09. Correlations with gender are for AE r = .04, p = .60, and for ICT r = -.05, p = .45. Correlations with age are for AE r = .11, p = .09, and for ICT r = .17, p = .01.

Appendix D. CFA Results, Study 1

This Appendix refers to Study 1 – Validation of a German Version of Kelley's

(1992) Followership Questionnaire (see chapter 3).

Table 17

Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Subsample 2

Item	Factor	STD estimate	S.E.	Two- tailed p-value
Actively develop	AE	.81	.03	.00
Think up new ideas	AE	.78	.03	.00
Take initiative	AE	.71	.03	.00
Highest quality work	AE	.70	.04	.00
Contribute high level	AE	.68	.04	.00
Solve tough problems	AE	.67	.04	.00
Recognize one's strengths and weaknesses	AE	.67	.04	.00
Personally identify	AE	.63	.04	.00
Understanding the needs and objectives	AE	.54	.05	.00
Build success	AE	.50	.04	.00
Assert issues	ICT	.79	.04	.00
Ethical standards	ICT	.68	.05	.00
Question decisions	ICT	.67	.05	.00
Contrary	ICT	.53	.05	.00

Note. n = 225. STD estimate = Standardized estimate. S.E. = Standard error.

Appendix E. Local Misspecification Detection

This Appendix refers to Study 1 – Validation of a German Version of Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire (see chapter 3). Potential local misspecifications of the followership model were detected based on Mplus modification indices (MI), expected parameter change (EPC) und a power test for MI, as proposed by Saris et al. (2009). The test was computed with the software Jrule (Oberski, 2010).

Decision rules:

Minimum misspecification	Alpha	"High" power
0.2	0.05	0.8

Table 18

Local misspecification detection, results for Study 1

Parameter	Jrule Decision for potential misspecification	MI	EPC	Power	NCP
FL_ICT BY FL_11	Misspecified	16.477	0.432	0.468	3.532
FL_AE BY FL_19	Misspecified	10.904	-0.436	0.328	2.294
FL_AE BY FL_17	Misspecified	17.219	0.535	0.342	2.406
FL_16 WITH FL_15	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	67.320	0.334	0.998	24.139
FL_06 WITH FL_05	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	34.177	0.216	1.000	29.301
FL_06 ON FL_05	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	34.177	0.216	1.000	29.301
FL_18 ON FL_19	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	25.100	0.247	0.982	16.457
FL_19 ON FL_18	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	25.100	0.247	0.982	16.457
FL_19 WITH FL_18	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	25.100	0.247	0.982	16.457
FL_15 ON FL_16	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	67.323	0.334	0.998	24.140
FL_05 ON FL_06	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	34.178	0.216	1.000	29.302
FL_16 ON FL_15	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	67.319	0.334	0.998	24.138

Parameter	Jrule Decision for potential misspecification	MI	EPC	Power	NCP
FL_ICT ON FL_17	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	17.218	-0.185	0.994	20.123
FL_17 WITH FL_AE	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	17.219	0.117	1.000	50.315
FL_ICT ON FL_11	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	16.479	0.107	1.000	57.574
FL_AE ON FL_19	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	10.905	-0.095	1.000	48.332
FL_AE ON FL_17	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	17.220	0.117	1.000	50.318
FL_ICT ON FL_19	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	10.907	0.151	0.992	19.134
FL_AE ON FL_11	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	16.478	-0.149	1.000	29.689
FL_17 ON FL_1	6 Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	10.059	0.134	0.997	22.408
FL_17 ON FL_12	2 Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	14.118	0.177	0.989	18.025
FL_11 WITH FL_AE	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	16.479	-0.149	1.000	29.691
FL_19 WITH FL_ICT	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	10.906	0.150	0.993	19.388
FL_10 ON FL_0	8 Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	10.819	0.142	0.996	21.462
FL_10 WITH FL_08	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	10.818	0.142	0.996	21.460
FL_11 ON FL_2	0 Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	11.002	0.106	1.000	39.167
FL_11 WITH FL_ICT	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	16.478	0.107	1.000	57.570
FL_19 WITH FL_AE	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	10.905	-0.095	1.000	48.332
FL_17 WITH FL_ICT	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	17.219	-0.185	0.994	20.124
FL_08 ON FL_1	0 Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	10.819	0.142	0.996	21.462

Parameter	Jrule Decision for potential misspecification	MI	EPC	Power	NCP
FL_ICT BY FL_16	Misspecified	55.454	0.647	0.634	5.299
FL_ICT BY FL_07	Misspecified	12.009	-0.326	0.566	4.520
FL_ICT BY FL_15	Misspecified	63.725	-0.773	0.542	4.266
FL_06 ON FL_05	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	48.949	0.222	1.000	39.728
FL_15 ON FL_18	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	43.381	-0.277	0.997	22.615
FL_15 WITH FL_AE	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	63.725	0.361	0.993	19.559
FL_06 WITH FL_05	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	48.949	0.222	1.000	39.728
FL_15 ON FL_17	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	38.620	-0.207	1.000	36.052
FL_18 ON FL_15	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	33.016	-0.244	0.997	22.182
FL_18 WITH FL_15	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	27.839	-0.240	0.993	19.333
FL_15 WITH FL_ICT	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	63.725	-0.207	1.000	59.488
FL_20 WITH FL_17	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	16.153	-0.210	0.969	14.651
FL_05 ON FL_06	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	48.949	0.222	1.000	39.728
FL_17 ON FL_20	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	16.153	-0.210	0.969	14.651
FL_12 ON FL_08	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	37.173	0.215	1.000	32.167
FL_08 ON FL_12	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	37.173	0.215	1.000	32.167
FL_15 ON FL_20	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	38.967	-0.210	1.000	35.344
FL_ICT ON FL_15	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	63.725	-0.207	1.000	59.488
FL_AE ON FL_16	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	55.453	-0.302	0.999	24.320

Local misspecification detection, results for Study 2

Parameter	Jrule Decision for potential misspecification	MI	EPC	Power	NCP
FL_16 WITH FL_AE	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	55.453	-0.302	0.999	24.320
FL_20 ON FL_17	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	16.153	-0.210	0.969	14.651
FL_12 WITH FL_08	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	37.173	0.215	1.000	32.167
FL_AE ON FL_15	Misspecified (EPC >= delta)	63.725	0.361	0.993	19.559
FL_17 WITH FL_15	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	20.256	-0.195	0.996	21.308
FL_10 WITH FL_09	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	14.590	0.135	1.000	32.022
FL_20 WITH FL_11	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	11.387	0.127	1.000	28.240
FL_07 ON FL_20	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	10.902	-0.106	1.000	38.811
FL_ICT ON FL_07	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	12.010	-0.087	1.000	63.469
FL_20 ON FL_15	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	15.650	-0.174	0.995	20.676
FL_11 ON FL_20	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	10.663	0.094	1.000	48.271
FL_16 ON FL_17	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	37.243	0.179	1.000	46.494
FL_AE ON FL_07	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	12.011	0.152	0.995	20.795
FL_07 WITH FL_AE	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	12.011	0.152	0.995	20.795
FL_16 ON FL_19	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	39.361	0.187	1.000	45.024
FL_10 ON FL_09	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	14.589	0.135	1.000	32.020
FL_17 ON FL_15	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	16.067	-0.169	0.997	22.502
FL_15 WITH FL_11	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	14.781	0.151	0.999	25.930
FL_07 WITH FL_ICT	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	12.010	-0.087	1.000	63.469
FL_19 WITH FL_16	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	24.168	0.178	1.000	30.511

Parameter	Jrule Decision for potential misspecification	MI	EPC	Power	NCP
FL_ICT ON FL_16	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	55.454	0.174	1.000	73.265
FL_09 ON FL_10	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	14.589	0.135	1.000	32.020
FL_16 WITH FL_ICT	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	55.454	0.174	1.000	73.265
FL_19 ON FL_16	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	15.959	0.132	1.000	36.637
FL_17 ON FL_16	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	23.147	0.169	1.000	32.418
FL_20 WITH FL_15	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	19.463	-0.199	0.993	19.659
FL_11 ON FL_15	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	14.781	0.151	0.999	25.930
FL_07 ON FL_19	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	11.085	-0.111	1.000	35.987
FL_10 ON FL_07	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	12.511	0.147	0.998	23.159
FL_07 ON FL_10	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	12.512	0.147	0.998	23.161
FL_10 WITH FL_07	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	12.511	0.147	0.998	23.159
FL_15 ON FL_11	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	14.780	0.151	0.999	25.929
FL_16 ON FL_20	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	21.453	0.136	1.000	46.395
FL_15 ON FL_19	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	17.001	-0.141	1.000	34.206
FL_17 WITH FL_16	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	21.280	0.174	1.000	28.115
FL_20 ON FL_11	Not misspecified (EPC < delta)	13.123	0.123	1.000	34.696

Appendix F. Study 2 Instruments

This Appendix refers to Study 1 - Validation of a German Version of Kelley's

(1992) Followership Questionnaire (see chapter 3).

Table 20

Measurement instruments

Instrument	Authors	Item example	Response scale
Followership AE ICT	Kelley (1992)	"Do you understand the leader's needs, goals, and constraints, and work hard to help meet them?" "Do you assert your views on important issues, even though it might mean conflict with your group or reprisals from the leader?"	(almost) never (1) to (almost) always (7)
Personal Initiative	Frese et al. (1997)	"I actively attack problems."	not correct at all (1) to applies completely (7)
Self-responsibility	Bierhoff et al. (2005)	"I always try to prepare a decision by reflecting intensively on advantages and disadvantages."	incorrect (1) to very correct (7)
Subordinate influence tactics (SITs) Flattering Rational Influence Exerting Pressure Engaging superior authority	Blickle and Gönner (1999)	"I praise my supervisor effusively." "I use rational arguments." "I openly stand against my supervisor." "I officially apply to superior authority."	(almost) never (1) to (almost) always (7)
Leader-member- exchange (LMX)	Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), German: Schyns (2002)	"How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader?"	extremely ineffective (1) to extremely effective (7)
Job satisfaction	Nübling et al., 2005	satisfaction with career perspective, colleagues, leadership, physical working conditions, use of abilities, challenges of work, job satisfaction overall	very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (7)
Organizational commitment	Mowday et al. (1979), German: Maier & Woschée (2002)	"I am proud when I can say that I belong to this company."	strongly disagree (1) to fully agree (7)

Instrument	Authors	Item example	Response scale
Organizational	Staufenbiel		not correct at all (1) to
citizenship behaviors	& Hartz		applies completely (7)
(OCBs)	(2000)		
Helpfulness		"I help others, when they are overworked."	
Initiative		"I take the initiative to save the company from potential problems."	
Emotional exhaustion	Maslach & Jackson (1986), German: Enzmann & Kleiber (1989)	"I feel burned out from my work."	Several times a year or rarer, once in a month, several times in a month, once a week, several times in a week, or daily
Big Five personality	Rammstedt		very wrong (1) to very
Extraversion	(2005)	"I am enthusiastic, able to engage others."	rue (7)
Neuroticism		"I easily become depressed, downcast."	
Openness		"I have wide interests."	
Agreeableness		"I trust others easily, have faith in the good of people."	
Conscientiousness		"I make plans and carry them out."	

Appendix G. Ant Colony Optimization

This Appendix refers to Study 1 – Validation of a German Version of Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire (see chapter 3). Since some of the models we used in Study 2 of chapter 3 had problematic model fit, we used the method of Ant Colony Optimization (ACO; Olaru et al., 2019) to identify sets of items that fit the model and thus improve construct validity. ACO was computed with the STUART package in R (Schultze, 2020), which refers to the classical Max-Min Ant-System (Stützle & Hoos, 2000). With the optimization we tried to minimize RMSEA while maximizing the reliability. The models were adjusted as follows:

Table 21

Model f	fit of	personal	initiative
---------	--------	----------	------------

Model	$\chi^2(df)$	χ^2/df	CFI	RMSEA	WRMR
				(90 CI)	
Initial model	132.826***	8.845	.966	.149	1.055
	(14)			(.127173)	
Final model	11.322*	2.264	.997	.058	.364
	(5)			(.008103)	

Notes. N = 413. Final model: 5 of initial 7 items.

* *p* < .05. *** *p* < .001.

Table 22

Model fit of self-responsi	bil	lity
----------------------------	-----	------

Model	$\chi^2(df)$	χ^2/df	CFI	RMSEA (90 CI)	WRMR
Initial model	1415.408***	8.326	.608	.135	2.248
	(170)			(.129142)	
Final model	111.895***	4.144	.950	.088	.919
	(27)			(.072106)	

Notes. N = 413. Final model: 9 of initial 20 items.

*** *p* < .001.

Model fit of SITs

Model	χ²(df)	χ²/df	CFI	RMSEA	WRMR
				(90 CI)	
Initial model	359.377***	3.667	.928	.081	1.222
	(98)			(.072090)	
Final model	303.157***	3.609	.934	.080	1.164
	(84)			(.070090)	

Notes. N = 413. Final model: All items of pressure, flattering, engaging superior authority

and 3 of initial 4 items of rational influence.

*** *p* < .001.

Table 24

Model fit of LMX

Model	$\chi^2(df)$	χ^2/df	CFI	RMSEA (90 CI)	WRMR
Initial model	79.401***	5.672	.992	.108	.715
	(14)			(.086132)	
Final model	21.567*	2.396	.998	.059	.395
	(9)			(.027092)	

Notes. N = 413. Final model: 6 of initial 7 items.

* *p* < .05. *** *p* < .001.

Table 25

111	1 1.	<i>c</i> •	1	C	
Mada	1 +1+	of 101	haatia	$n + \alpha$	ct101
would	111	OI IOI	9 saus	IU	cuon
				,	

Model	$\chi^2(df)$	χ^2/df	CFI	RMSEA (90 CI)	WRMR
Initial model	97.887***	6.992	.978	.122	.862
	(14)			(.100146)	
Final model	5.711	1.142	1.000	.019	.258
	(5)			(.000074)	

Notes. N = 413. Final model: 5 of initial 7 items.

*** *p* < .001.

Model	$\chi^2(df)$	χ^2/df	CFI	RMSEA (90 CI)	WRMR
Initial model	595.275***	6.614	.946	.118	1.318
	(90)			(.110128)	
Final model	91.423***	3.386	.988	.077	.645
	(27)			(.060095)	

Model fit of organizational commitment

Notes. N = 413. Final model: 9 of initial 15 items.

*** *p* < .001.

Table 27

Model fit of OCBs

Model	$\chi^2(df)$	χ²/df	CFI	RMSEA	WRMR
				(90 CI)	
Initial model	98.119***	2.886	.965	.069	.790
(34)				(.053085)	

Notes. N = 413. No adjustments.

*** *p* < .001.

Table 28

Model fit of emotional exhaustion

Model	$\chi^2(df)$	χ²/df	CFI	RMSEA	WRMR
				(90 CI)	
Initial model	224.949***	8.331	.965	.138	1.236
	(27)			(.121155)	
Final model	21.993**	2.444	.994	.061	.488
	(9)			(.029094)	

Notes. N = 413. Final model: 6 of initial 9 items.

** *p* < .01. *** *p* < .001.

Model	$\chi^2(df)$	χ^2/df	CFI	RMSEA (90 CI)	WRMR
Initial model	1158.715***	6.473	.847	.116	1.945
	(179)			(.110122)	
Final model	575.584***	4.605	.920	.094	1.467
	(125)			(.086102)	

Model fit of Big Five personality traits

Notes. N = 413. Final model: All items of agreeableness and conscientiousness, 4 of initial 5 items of extraversion and openness, 3 of initial 4 items of neuroticism.

*** *p* < .001.

Appendix H. Correlations Without "Actively Develop"

This Appendix refers to Study 1 – Validation of a German Version of Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire (chapter 3). We found substantial residual correlation of the two items "personally identify" ("Instead of waiting for or merely accepting what the leader tells you, do you personally identify which organizational activities are most critical for achieving the organization's priority goals?") and "actively develop" ("Do you actively develop a distinctive competence in those critical activities so that you become more valuable to the leader and the organization?") across two studies. We decided to allow the residual correlation in our analysis. However, when we dropped one of the two items ("actively develop"), thus accounting for the potential redundancy in these items, the correlations with other variables remained unchanged (see the following results and Table 2).

In the following, we refer to the alternative followership model without "actively develop" in the AE factor and to the ACO-adjusted models of the other study variables: AE correlated with personal initiative (r = .76, p < .001), with "flattering" (r = .11, p = .05), with "rational influence" (r = .46, p < .001), with "exerting pressure" (r = .16, p = .004), but not with "engaging superior authority" (r = -.04, p = .49). We found significant correlations of AE with self-responsibility (r = .72, p < .001), with LMX (r = .29, p < .001), with job satisfaction (r = .40, p < .001), with organizational commitment (r = .24, p < .001), with the OCBs "helpfulness" (r = .47, p < .001) and "initiative" (r = .79, p < .001), and with emotional exhaustion (r = .33, p < .001), with extraversion (r = .24, p < .001), with conscientiousness (r = .69, p < .001), but not with agreeableness (r = .04, p = .53).

In the following, we refer to the alternative followership model without "actively develop" in the AE factor and to the initial models of the other study variables:

AE correlated with personal initiative (r = .78, p < .001), with "flattering" (r = .11, p = .05), with "rational influence" (r = .50, p < .001), with "exerting pressure" (r = .16, p = .004), but not with "engaging superior authority" (r = -.04, p = .47). We found significant correlations of AE with self-responsibility (r = .72, p < .001), with LMX (r = .29, p < .001), with job satisfaction (r = .37, p < .001), with organizational commitment (r = .27, p < .001), with the OCBs "helpfulness" (r = .47, p < .001) and "initiative" (r = .79, p < .001), and with emotional exhaustion (r = .13, p = .01). AE also correlated with neuroticism (r = -.29, p < .001), with openness (r = .33, p < .001), with extraversion (r = .34, p < .001), with conscientiousness (r = .69, p < .001), but not with agreeableness (r = .04, p = .54).

Appendix I. Testing for Measurement Equivalence

This Appendix refers to Study 2 – Followership Styles Scrutinized: Temporal Consistency and Relationships with Job Attitudes and Self-Efficacy (see chapter 4). In this Appendix, I describe the procedures that we followed to test for measurement equivalence (ME). Following Geiser (2020), we consecutively tested ME models that differ by the level of ME (i.e., various parameter equality constraints) for every latent variable. First, we tested for configural invariance that specified the same number of factors and the same factor loading pattern across time. Second, we also constrained the factor loadings to remain the same for a given observed variable in addition to configural invariance (weak invariance). Subsequently, we tested for strong invariance (strong ME), which additionally set the intercepts to remain the same across time for a given observed variable. Finally, the strict invariance model (strict ME) additionally determined the measurement error variance to remain the same across time for a given variable.

Study 1

Table 30

Measurement equivalence of AE, Study 1

Model	χ²	df	р	χ²Δ	df∆	p(χ²∆)	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR	AIC	BIC
Configural ME	432.44	167	.00				.09	.84	.08	10,526	10,728
Weak ME	438.34	176	.00	14.90	9	.094	.09	.84	.08	10,514	10,687
Strong ME	450.93	185	.00	12.59	9	.182	.09	.84	.08	10,509	10,653
Strict ME	476.55	195	.00	25.62	10	.005	.09	.83	.11	10,515	10,626

Note. *N* = 184. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; AIC = Akaike's Information Criterion; BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion.

Model	χ²	df	р	$\chi^2 \Delta$	df∆	p(χ² Δ)	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR	AIC	BIC
Configural ME	74.85	19	.00				.13	.80	.07	4,677	4,757
Weak ME	75.80	22	.00	0.95	3	.813	.12	.81	.08	4,672	4,742
Strong ME	76.44	25	.00	0.64	3	.887	.11	.82	.08	4,666	4,727
Strict ME	80.11	29	.00	3.67	4	.453	.10	.82	.09	4,662	4,710

Measurement equivalence of ICT, Study 1

Note. N = 184. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative

Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; AIC = Akaike's

Information Criterion; BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion.

Table 32

Measurement equivalence of job satisfaction, Study 1

Model	χ²	df	р	$\chi^2 \Delta$	df∆	p(χ ² Δ)	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR	AIC	BIC
Configural ME	335.89	53	.00				.17	.80	.08	6,668	6,787
Weak ME	339.69	58	.00	3.80	5	.579	.16	.80	.08	6,662	6,764
Strong ME	344.43	63	.00	4.74	5	.448	.16	.80	.08	6,657	6,743
Strict ME	350.75	69	.00	6.32	6	.388	.15	.80	.08	6,651	6,718

Note. N = 184. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative

Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; AIC = Akaike's

Model	χ²	df	р	$\chi^2 \Delta$	df∆	p(χ²Δ)	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR	AIC	BIC
Configural ME	51.54	8	.00				.17	.90	.04	3,530	3,591
Weak ME	52.40	10	.00	0.86	2	.651	.15	.91	.05	3,527	3,581
Strong ME	55.90	12	.00	3.50	2	.174	.14	.90	.05	3,526	3,574
Strict ME	66.46	15	.00	10.56	3	.014	.14	.89	.08	3,531	3,569

Measurement equivalence of organizational commitment, Study 1

Note. N = 184. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative

Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; AIC = Akaike's

Information Criterion; BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion.

Table 34

Measurement equivalence of self-efficacy, Study 1

Model	χ²	df	р	$\chi^2 \Delta$	df∆	p(χ² Δ)	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR	AIC	BIC
Configural ME	309.53	53	.00				.16	.80	.07	5,892	6,010
Weak ME	311.50	58	.00	1.97	5	.853	.16	.80	.08	5,884	5,986
Strong ME	314.73	63	.00	3.23	5	.665	.15	.80	.08	5,877	5,963
Strict ME	332.55	69	.00	17.82	6	.007	.15	.80	.12	5,883	5,950

Note. N = 184. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative

Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; AIC = Akaike's

Study 2

Table 35

Measurement equivalence of AE, Study 2

Model	χ²	df	р	$\chi^2 \Delta$	df∆	p(χ ² Δ)	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR	AIC	BIC
Configural ME	1345.4	167	.00				.11	.83	.06	32,728	33,000
Weak ME	1354.5	176	.00	9.1	9	.428	.11	.83	.07	32,719	32,953
Strong ME	1363.1	185	.00	8.6	9	.475	.11	.83	.07	32,710	32,904
Strict ME	1370,0	195	.00	6.9	10	.735	.10	.83	.07	32,696	32,848

Note. N = 570. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative

Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; AIC = Akaike's

Information Criterion; BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion.

Table 36

Measurement equivalence of ICT, Study 2

Model	χ²	df	р	χ²Δ	df∆	p(χ²∆)	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR	AIC	BIC
Configural ME	179.67	19	.00				.12	.87	.05	14,396	14,504
Weak ME	180.79	22	.00	1.12	3	.772	.11	.87	.05	14,391	14,486
Strong ME	184.09	25	.00	3.30	3	.348	.11	.87	.06	14,388	14,470
Strict ME	184.83	29	.00	0.74	4	.946	.10	.87	.06	14,381	14,446

Note. N = 570. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative

Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; AIC = Akaike's

Model	χ²	df	р	$\chi^2 \Delta$	df∆	p(χ ² Δ)	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR	AIC	BIC
Configural ME	904.15	53	.00				.17	.83	.06	18,485	18,645
Weak ME	906.57	58	.00	2.42	5	.789	.16	.83	.06	18,478	18,615
Strong ME	911.56	63	.00	4.99	5	.417	.16	.83	.06	18,473	18,589
Strict ME	917.24	69	.00	5.68	6	.460	.15	.83	.06	18,466	18,557

Measurement equivalence of job satisfaction, Study 2

Note. N = 570. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative

Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; AIC = Akaike's

Information Criterion; BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion.

Table 38

Measurement equivalence of organizational commitment, Study 2

Model	χ²	df	р	$\chi^2 \Delta$	df∆	p(χ ² Δ)	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR	AIC	BIC
Configural ME	216.43	8	.00				.22	.88	.06	10,832	10,913
Weak ME	216.86	10	.00	0.43	2	.807	.19	.89	.06	10,828	10,901
Strong ME	220.67	12	.00	3.81	2	.149	.18	.88	.06	10,828	10,892
Strict ME	222.34	15	.00	1.67	3	.644	.16	.89	.06	10,823	10,875

Note. *N* = 570. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative

Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; AIC = Akaike's

Model	χ^2	df	р	$\chi^2 \Delta$	df∆	p(χ ² Δ)	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR	AIC	BIC
Configural ME	419.20	53	.00				.11	.94	.04	16,123	16,282
Weak ME	421.26	58	.00	2.06	5	.841	.11	.94	.04	16,115	16,253
Strong ME	428.26	63	.00	7.00	5	.221	.10	.94	.04	16,112	16,228
Strict ME	442.40	69	.00	14.14	6	.028	.10	.93	.05	16,114	16,204

Measurement equivalence of self-efficacy, Study 2

Note. N = 570. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative

Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; AIC = Akaike's

Appendix J. Distribution of AE and ICT Mean Values (at t1)

This Appendix refers to Study 2 – Followership Styles Scrutinized: Temporal Consistency and Relationships with Job Attitudes and Self-Efficacy (see chapter 4). The distributions of the mean values for both followership scales were as follows:

Figure 7





for Study 1 (t1)

Distribution of AE and ICT mean values for Study 2 (t1)

We see that most participants in both studies adopted the pragmatist or exemplary followership style.

Appendix K. Search String

This Appendix refers to Study 3 - Empirical Followership Research Since the

Publication of the Formal Theory of Followership by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) – A

Systematic Review (see chapter 5).

TITLE

(follower* OR followership AND NOT child* AND NOT "social media" AND NOT "mass media" AND NOT school* AND NOT customer* AND NOT review AND NOT meta-analysis AND NOT "meta analysis" AND NOT editorial AND NOT animal* AND NOT therapy AND NOT patient* AND NOT supplier* AND NOT "supply chain")

OR TITLE-ABS-KEY

((employee* AND voice AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND voice) OR (member* AND voice AND leader*) OR (employee* AND resist* AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND resist*) OR (member* AND resist* AND leader*) OR (employee* AND dissent AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND dissent) OR (member* AND dissent AND leader*) OR (employee* AND proactiv* AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND proactiv*) OR (member* AND proactiv* AND leader*) OR (employee* AND initiative AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND initiative) OR (member* AND initiative AND leader*) OR (employee* AND *obidien* AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND *obidien*) OR (member* AND *obidien* AND leader*) OR (employee* AND dissent AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND dissent) OR (member* AND dissent AND leader*) OR (employee* AND feedback AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND feedback) OR (member* AND feedback AND leader*) OR (employee* AND advis* AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND advis*) OR (member* AND advis* AND leader*) OR (employee* AND "influence tactic*" AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND "influence tactic*") OR (member* AND "influence tactic*" AND leader*) OR (employee* AND engagement AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND engagement) OR (member* AND engagement* AND leader*) OR (employee* AND upward AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND upward) OR (member* AND upward AND leader*) OR (employee* AND "political skill*" AND (leader* OR supervisor*)) OR (follower* AND "political skill*") OR (member* AND "political skill*" AND leader*) OR (follower* AND motivation) OR (member* AND motivation AND leader*)

OR (follower* AND role) OR (follower* AND ident*) OR ((*construct* W/1 leadership) AND follower) OR (follow* W/2 active*) OR (follow* W/2 independent*) OR (follow* W/2 critical*) OR (follow* W/2 courag*) OR (follower* W/2 behavior*) OR (follower* W/2 characteristic*) OR (follower* W/2 trait*) OR (follower* W/2 skill*) OR (follower* W/2 perception*) OR (follower* W/2 construction*) OR (follower* W/2 effectiv*) OR followership

AND NOT child* AND NOT "social media" AND NOT "mass media" AND NOT school* AND NOT customer* AND NOT review AND NOT "meta-analysis" AND NOT "meta analysis" AND NOT editorial AND NOT animal* AND NOT therapy AND NOT patient* AND NOT supplier* AND NOT "supply chain") AND (LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2022) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2021) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2020) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2019) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2018) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2017) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2016) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2015) OR LIMIT-TO (PUBYEAR, 2014)) AND (LIMIT-TO (LANGUAGE, "English") AND (LIMIT-TO (SUBJARA, "PSYC") OR LIMIT-TO (SUBJARA, "BUSI"))

Further Excluded: Notes, Editorials, Reviews, Conference Paper, Books.

Applied to (February 10th, 2022): Scopus, and APA PsychInfo, APA PsychArticles, SocIndex, Business Source Primier, Econlit via EBSCO.

Appendix L. Quality Assessment

This Appendix refers to Study 3 – Empirical Followership Research Since the Publication of the Formal Theory of Followership by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) – A Systematic Review (see chapter 5). We assessed the quality of each study to review the state of followership research and which evidence the selected studies were able to provide. To do so, we largely followed the Study Design and Implementation Assessment Device (Valentine & Cooper, 2008) to assess the quality of the included studies. Specifically, we evaluated the (i) study design, (ii) operationalization and measurement, and (iii) statistical approaches. We categorized each study as "adequate", "fair", or "questionable" in every domain (i.e., study design, operationalization and measurement, and statistical approaches). For (i) study design, we assessed whether the research design was appropriate to address the aims of the research. Specifically, we determined if sample sizes were reported, justified, and whether the sample sizes were adequate to provide sufficiently precise estimates of effect sizes (see Valentine & Cooper, 2008). A study that met all of these criteria had an adequate study design. If a study reported a reasonable sampling but did not justify this sampling explicitly, we still considered this study design at least to be "fair". We rated the study design as "questionable", however, when the sampling was not reported or when it was insufficient.

In order to identify insufficient sample sizes, we compared each study to the requirements that have been suggested in pertinent literature. That is, we followed recommendations by MacCallum et al. (1996) with regard to confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling. We followed the recommendations by Scherbaum and Ferreter (2009) regarding multi-level modeling. For correlational, variance and regression analysis, we used the information on required sample sizes that we obtained from power analyses with GPower (i.e., required sample sizes to detect medium effect sizes with a two-tailed $\alpha = .05$ and a power [1- β] of .80; Erdfelder et al., 1996). While there are no prevalent

guidelines for sampling in qualitative studies, those studies should report and justify their sampling with regard to their research questions or regarding previous research in order to fulfill the requirements of an adequate study design (see, for instance, Vasileiou et al., 2018).

In addition, we identified whether the outcome was measured at a time appropriate for capturing the proposed effect and to what extent directions of effects could be identified for important measured outcomes (see Valentine & Cooper, 2008). For instance, a study with a longitudinal approach should limit reverse causality to at least some degree in order to be considered "adequate". If a proposed cause-and-effect relationship was tested with a cross-sectional design, we categorized this study design as "questionable", since this relationship could not be determined properly when both variables were measured at the same time (see, for instance, Mitchell & James, 2001). A time-lagged approach that measured the outcome at a different time than the predictor, however, was considered at least to be "fair".

For (ii) operationalization and measurement, we evaluated to what extent variables were assessed in a way that is consistent with the definitions of the study and its proposed effects. That is, items on important measures should represent the content of interest (i.e., it should at least have face validity), and measures should be sufficiently reliable¹⁶ to allow adequately precise estimates of the effect sizes (see Valentine & Cooper, 2008). We considered studies as "adequate" in which the definitions and operationalizations fit, which had measures that were reliable, and that applied validated measures or that provided a validation study along with their research. If the measures were not validated but had at least face validity, we considered this operationalization and measurement to be "fair".

¹⁶ We considered the commonly used minimum of .70 (see, for instance, Dunn et al., 2014; Kline, 1998) as a cutoff value for Cronbach's (1951) α or McDonald's (1978) ω .

Measures that did not even display face validity or were not reliable, however, were considered "questionable".

For (iii) statistical approaches, we determined whether the statistical tests were adequately reported and whether effect sizes and their standard errors were accurately reported (see Valentine & Cooper, 2008). Similarly, the qualitative data analysis in qualitative studies should also be precisely reported (i.e., how information was extracted from the qualitative data) and should be plausible (i.e., studies should justify or at least explain their choices to some extent). We considered the statistical and analytical approaches of studies that did not report their tests and analysis adequately as "questionable".

Appendix M. Comprehensive Overview of All Included Studies

This Appendix refers to Study 3 – Empirical Followership Research Since the Publication of the Formal Theory of Followership by Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) – A Systematic Review (see chapter 5). The majority of studies that were included in the systematic review were conducted in North American or European countries (n = 52), followed by Asian countries (n = 37). A few studies used multiple samples from different counties (n = 7) of which three studies included multiple samples that were associated with different cultural areas (i.e., USA and China). The other four of those studies used samples from different countries that were associated with the same cultural background (i.e., Western or Eastern culture). Most samples were from China (n = 26) and the United States of America (n = 23). The other samples came from Belgium (n = 3), Canada (n = 4), Egypt (n = 1), Germany (n = 6), Indonesia (n = 1), Iran (n = 1), Italy (n = 3), Jordan (n = 1), Korea (n = 1), New Zealand (n = 1), the Netherlands (n = 3), North America (n = 1), Pakistan (n = 4), Saudi Arabia (n = 1), Scandinavia (n = 1), Serbia and Macedonia (n = 1), Sweden (n = 1), Taiwan (n = 1), Thailand (n = 1), and the United Kingdom (n = 5). For one study, the sample origin could not be determined.

Comprehensive overview of all included studies

Authors	Followership approach	Unit of analysis	Methodologic	cal approach	Sample	Origin	Main results
Aghaei et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross sectional)	273 employees from a steel manufacturing company	Iran	Followership antiprototype negatively affects both follower's constructive resistance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB mediates the relationship between implicit followership theories and follower's constructive resistance. Both followership prototype and OCB have a positive effect on follower's constructive resistance.
Almeida et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	followers	multi-study report	mixed methods (Study 1: qualitative; Study 2: quantitative, cross-sectional)	123 followers having a destructive leader	indefinite	The authors developed an integrative empirical-based model of six behavioral profiles that emerged in the presence of a destructive leader: active resistant followers, passive resistant followers, passives, conflict avoiders, supporters and mixed behavior followers.
Arain et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	co-workers	single-study report	quantitative (cross sectional)	220 matching pairs of house officers and postgraduates (i.e., junior doctors) from various hospitals	Pakistan	Supervisory feedback avoidance mediated the relationship of abusive supervision with help-seeking from co-workers. The mediating effect of supervisory feedback avoidance was stronger when co-worker support was high as compared to when co-worker support was low.
Baker et al. (2016)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross sectional)	199 healthcare workers	USA	Investigating followers' own views of their effective follower and transformational leader abilities, results show that followers' ability to build trust with the leader and to courageously communicate with the leader were positively related to their seeing themselves as having relational leadership qualities.

Babalola et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	teams	multi-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	Study 1: 521 employees nested in 98 teams from a large hospitality corporation; Study 2: 648 employees embedded in the 132 work groups from large-scale mining enterprises	China	The studies provide convergent evidence that group ethical voice was associated with lower abusive supervision, and that the power, social distance, and size of the group moderated this relationship. Study 2 also showed that the moderating effects of group power and distance were mediated by leader reflective moral attentiveness.
Bell (2020)	other	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross sectional)	330 responses from undergraduate students	USA	The study established a three factor structure of Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire: Active engagement, independent critical thinking, and enthusiastic commitment.
Benson et al. (2016)	reversing the lens	leaders	single-study report	qualitative	14 semi-structured interviews with head coaches of highly competitive sport teams	Canada	The study provides leaders' descriptions of effective and ineffective followership behaviors, their experiences with such followership behaviors, and their reactions to it. The perceived appropriateness of followership behaviors depended upon the social context in which such interactions took place.
Blom & Alvesson (2014)	co-construction	leaders and followers	multi-study report	qualitative (2 empirical case studies)	9 open-ended interviews with managers at three different hierarchical levels in the first company, 13 interviews with managers and co- workers in the second company	Sweden	Based on the two empirical cases, results indicate that it is the subordinates— rather than their manager—that define the leadership situation. Managers were responsive, but only when their subordinates called for it. However, subordinates temporarily and partly accepted a followership position and identity for themselves, thereby offering a leadership position or identity to the managers.

Braun et al. (2017)	reversing the lens	leaders and followers	multi-study report	quantitative (experimental)	Study 1: 109 participants of different companies and universities; Study 2: 187 participants that were acquired trough the researchers' social and professional networks and the department of psychology	Germany	The results show an explicit gender bias in Implicit Followership Theories (IFTs) so that the role of an ideal follower was more strongly associated with the female role.
Camps et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	dyads	multi-study report	mixed methods (Study 1: quantitative, cross sectional; Study 2: experimental)	Study 1: matched data of 366 individuals from a wide variety of industries; Study 2: 193 employees and 348 undergraduate psychology students	Belgium	The results indicate that abusive followership is negatively related to the supervisors' perceived interpersonal justice and that supervisors who experienced moderate or high levels of self-doubt reacted upon this experienced injustice by displaying abusive supervision.
Carsten et al. (2018)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	306 employees and 42 managers from a number of different work areas from a large internet company	China	Results indicate that followers with a stronger co-production orientation are more likely to speak up to the leader with their ideas and suggestions while less likely to pass along problems to the leader. Moreover, voice and upward delegation mediated the relationship between both followership orientations and perceived follower support, leader motivation, and contribution to goal attainment.
Carsten et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	260 participants recruited through Mechanical Turk platform	USA	Followers with a stronger co-production orientation engaged in more effort and reported greater performance and less withdrawal under high levels of leader interaction, whereas passive followers reported less effort, worse performance, and greater withdrawal under conditions of high leader interaction.
Clarke et al. (2019)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (cross sectional)	389 matched supervisor– subordinate dyads from different sectors	Saudi Arabia	Results indicate that mutual appraisal respect and mutual recognition respect mediated relationships between several upward influence tactics and both job performance ratings and flexible working arrangements. Upward influence tactics affected the quality of the relationship between followers and supervisors.

Coyle & Foti (2022)	reversing the lens	leaders and followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	482 full-time working adults (classified as 242 leaders and 240 followers) that were recruited using a snowball sampling strategy	USA	Four profiles of Implicit Followership Theories (IFTs) and work-related affect (Conforming, Alienated, Proactive, and Negative) were found in the follower sample; two profiles (proactive and alienated) were found in the leader sample. The findings suggest that leaders construct followership rather simple, while followers construct their own roles in relation to their work-related affect, resulting in significant differences in job satisfaction.
Dahling & Whitaker (2016)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	279 employed university students and 199 of their corresponding supervisors	USA	Feedback seeking behavior mediated the relationship between the subordinate image enhancement motive and task performance ratings, while political skill moderated the relationship between image enhancement motive and feedback- seeking behavior.
De Clercq et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	co-workers	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal)	224 matched survey sets of co-workers from six organizations from the banking sector	Pakistan	Results indicate that upward impression management behavior related to the leader is associated with peer-rated workplace popularity for employees, who in turn can wield greater influence over colleagues.
De Jong et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	leaders	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal)	56 supervisors from 5 organizations from various sectors	Netherlands	Subordinate psychological contract breach was positively associated with supervisor emotional exhaustion, and performance pressure mediated this relationship.
Ellis et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	dyads	multi-study report	mixed methods (Study 1: quantitative, longitudinal; Study 2: experimental; Study 3: quantitative, cross-sectional)	Study 1: 110 university students; Study 2: 398 working adults; Study 3: 900 employees with 213 matched supervisor data from a single governmental agency within the United States	USA; UK	Findings show that the more self-protective the employees' IVTs were, the lower was the quality of the LMX that they developed with their supervisors.
Essa & Allatari (2019)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	304 participants (academic staff) from various private and public universities	Jordan	Results revealed that the exemplary followership style was the most common, followed by the pragmatic, alienated and passive style. There were no statistically significant differences between the studied leadership and followership styles.

Falls & Allen (2020)	reversing the lens	leaders	single-study report	qualitative	10 public community college deans	USA	The participants described dynamic and transferable leader and follower roles in the interactions between organizational members. They were not restricted to either role, even in situations where their formal role (e.g., being a subordinate in a meeting) suggested otherwise.
Garner (2016)	reversing the lens	leaders	multi-study report	mixed methods (Study 1: qualitative; Study 2: quantitative, cross-sectional)	Study 1: 32 managers from a variety of industries; Study 2: 113 supervisors from various industries	USA	Interview participants expressed their desire to be open to constructive dissent from subordinates. While direct-factual appeal was positively related to effectiveness, and solution presentation and inspirational appeals were positively related to appropriateness, venting was negatively related to effectiveness, and pressure and repetition were negatively related to appropriateness.
Gatti et al. (2014)	other	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	610 respondents from different organizational settings	Italy	The Italian validation study of Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire revealed a two-factor structure with good reliability. Correlations with the other studied variables were generally in line with expectations.
Gatti et al. (2017)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	425 nurses in an Italian hospital	Italy	Results revealed that, in addition to the job demands and job resources considered, followers' active engagement (AE) had a significant impact on job satisfaction and showed a significant linear and curvilinear relationship with the outcome variable. Followers' independent critical thinking was not related to job satisfaction.
Geertshuis et al. (2015)	reversing the lens	leaders	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	107 participants with various management roles from a New Zealand University's Centre for Continuing Education	New Zealand	The positive relationship between LMX and performance ratings was fully mediated by the frequency of upward influencing tactics, with rational argument being positively predictive of performance ratings and assertiveness being negatively associated with ratings of performance.
Gesang & Süß (2021)	reversing the lens	leaders	single-study report	qualitative	21 semi-structured interviews with leaders from various industries	Germany	Results indicate that followers' behaviors affect leaders to varying degrees on emotional, attitudinal, and behavioral levels.
Ghislieri et al. (2015)	other	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	559 nurses working in two healthcare organizations	Italy	The authors could establish a reliable brief followership scale for nurses in Italy, based on Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire.

Gloor (2021)	reversing the lens	leaders	multi-study report	quantitative (experimental)	Study 1: 240 participants via web- based survey platform; Study 2: 526 working adults; Study 3: 524 working adults; Study 4: 501 working adults with leader responsibilities	USA; UK	Results indicate that follower sarcasm can reduce leader overpay, especially for leaders with weak moral identity. Moreover, findings suggest that follower sarcasm reduces the leaders' overpay by increasing accountability.
Gong et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	415 full-time employees from 10 industrial firms	China	Feedback seeking behavior was positively related to career adaptability. Feedback environment mediated this relationship. In addition, the relationship between feedback seeking and feedback environment was more positive for individuals with a poor person–organization fit than for those with a good fit.
Gordon et al. (2015)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	qualitative	11 group and 19 individual interviews with 65 medical trainees from two UK deaneries	UK	The medical trainees described 13 dimensions of followership and commonly referred to followers as a group of people rather than as individuals. While the definitions of leadership behaviors were positively connoted, trainees described followership behaviors in both positive and negative ways.
Granger et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	dyads	multi-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	Study 1 and 2: employees recruited online (Study 1: 301, Study 2: 492); Study 3 and 4: follower– leader dyads recruited through student nominations and in- person solicitations (Study 3: 187; Study 4: 130)	Canada	The authors developed and established a conceptualization and measurement of political knowledge as a follower's perceived understanding of the relationships, demands, resources, and preferences of their leader. Results showed a mediating role of political knowledge of one's leader in the relationship between follower political skill and political will with follower proactive behaviors.
Güntner et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	leaders	single-study report	quantitative (experimental)	86 working professionals from various professional backgrounds with leader position	German (91.9%)	Results showed that follower resistance increased destructive leader behavior and that this relationship was mediated through leaders' negative affect and moderated by leaders' Theory X schema.

Hoption (2016)	reversing the lens	dyads	multi-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	Study 1: 61 supervisor- subordinate dyads from various industries; Study 2: 125 subordinates and supervisors from various industries;	North America	Results showed that follower reports of providing help to leaders were positively related to leader relationship. Followers' involvement in leadership held consequences for leaders and those consequences differed between male and female leaders.
Howell et al. (2015)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	matched employee, peer, supervisor survey responses, and HR data for 693 participants at time 1, and 587 at time point 2 from 2 credit unions	USA	Findings indicate that recognition of employee voice by supervisors mediates the effects of voice expression and individual employee status onto performance evaluations 1 year later. Supervisors were, however, more likely to recognize voice from employees who had higher achieved status.
Huang & Zhang (2021)	reversing the lens	dyads	multi-study report	mixed methods (Study 1: qualitative and quantitative, cross-sectional; Study 2: quantitative, cross-sectional)	Study 1: 25 interviews with frontline staff members from three manufacturing and service companies; data of 297 employees from a manufacturing company; Study 2: 377 employees and their direct supervisors from three manufacturing companies	China	Findings indicate that followers with low-level perspective taking are less likely to engage in interaction avoidance behavior, even when perceiving leaders as busy. Moreover, interaction avoidance behavior of followers was positively related to counterproductive behavior evaluation of leaders, but negatively related to conscientiousness behavior evaluation.
Huang et al. (2018)	reversing the lens	dyads	multi-study report	quantitative (Study 1: longitudinal/time- lagged; Study 2 and 3: longitudinal/time- lagged)	Study 1: 147 employees and 31 managers from a state-owned commercial bank; Study 2: 289 employees and 48 managers from a large information technology company; Study 3: 206 employees nested under 46 supervising managers from a large financial services company	China, USA	Findings indicate U-shaped relationships between the frequency of challenging voice and managers' ratings of voicers' promotability and their overall performance evaluations. Additionally, the content of challenging voice (prohibitive rather than promotive) and the level of LMX with managers affected these relationships.
---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	---	---	------------------	---
Ivanoska et al. (2019)	reversing the lens	leaders and followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	172 respondents (117 managers and 55 employees) from privately- and state- owned organizations	Serbia/Macedonia	Results indicate that there is no statistically significant relation in the preferred followership styles between managers and employees from the two former Yugoslav countries Serbia and Macedonia. Most of the respondents were active followers, followed by pragmatist followers, conformist followers and alienated followers.
Jiang et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	teams	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	205 valid subjects from 58 self- managing student teams at three large American business schools;	USA	Results suggest that when an individual receives a high level of effective followership from team members at the beginning of teamwork, this person is encouraged to develop leadership self- identity and to present leadership behaviors in the team process.
Jin et al. (2018)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	692 faculty members from a public university	USA	Results showed that active followership behavior was associated with a significant increase in job satisfaction. In addition, faculty members with higher perceived person- organization fit demonstrated greater followership behavior, which increased their job satisfaction, which in turn lowered their intentions to turnover.
Jin et al. (2019)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	692 faculty members from a public university	USA	Results showed that higher levels of public service motivation were associated with greater followership behavior, which, in turn, increased positive perceptions of person–organization fit through greater leader support.

Junker et al. (2016)	other	leaders and followers	multi-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	Study 1: 127 participants (73 psychology students and 54 employees, thereof 41 working as a supervisor); Study 2: 250 employees from different industries; Study 3: 279 psychology students with (at least part-time) work experience; Study 4: 201 leaders that were recruited through a German leader panel	Germany	The authors developed and tested a new scale of ideal and counter-ideal followership types.
Kang et al. (2016)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	544 employees from service encounters at various luxury hotels	Korea	Findings revealed that factors of followership lowered occupational burnout and job stress. High occupational burnout increased job stress and high job stress decreased customer orientation.
Khan et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	506 respondents of the telecom sector in Pakistan	Pakistan	Results show that two followership dimensions (active engagement and independent critical thinking) were positively related to transformational leadership. Trust in leadership partially mediated the direct relationship between followership dimensions and transformational leadership.
Kim & Schachter (2015)	reversing the lens	followers	multi-study report	mixed methods (Study 1: quantitative, cross-sectional; Study 2: qualitative)	Study 1: 212,223 responses from a randomly selected public employee sample of the Federal Human Capital Survey 2008 by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management; Study 2: 92 responses to written interviews	USA	Findings show that followership significantly affected the relationship between participative leadership and organizational performance. Best followership was associated with active engagement, communication, the provision of ideas and constructive suggestions, while worst followership involved no participation, no communication, no ownership, and no commitment.

Klotz et al. (2018)	reversing the lens	leaders	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal)	574 valid daily observations of 75 midlevel managers employed at a large, publicly listed software corporation	China	Results indicate a significant within-person variance in employees' use of supervisor-focused impression management tactics and that the use of ingratiation, but not self-promotion, depletes employees' self-control resources. For integration, this depletion was positively associated with employee deviance, and the indirect effect was stronger among employees with low political skill.
Knoll et al. (2017)	reversing the lens	followers	multi-study report	quantitative (experimental)	Study 1: 187 students; Study 2: 165 employees from different industries	Germany	Results revealed that the Implicit Followership Theory (IFT) "good citizen" increased and the IFT "insubordination" decreased followers' tendencies to contribute to unethical leadership.
Kosasih et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	leaders	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	223 leaders from a manufacturing company	Indonesia	Results showed that authentic followership, ambidextrous organization and change readiness were positively related to innovative performance. Authentic followership and ambidextrous organization were positively related to change readiness and authentic followership was also positively related to ambidextrous organization.
Kudek et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	243 employees that were recruited through an online platform	Romania	While extraversion, agreeableness, openness, and conscientiousness were positively related to followers' active engagement (AE) and independent, critical thinking (ICT), neurosis was negatively related to AE and ICT.
Lapalme et al. (2017)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	217 agency worker- supervisor dyads from the banking sector	Canada	Results revealed that boss-relationship building and feedback seeking were indirectly and positively related to performance via LMX. Information-seeking behavior had a negative indirect effect on performance through role clarity, and performance evaluation was positively related to the supervisor's willingness to rehire the worker.
Larsson & Nielsen (2021)	co-construction	teams	single-study report	qualitative	interaction sequences from 52 audio- and video-recorded business meetings in eight organizations	Denmark, Sweden	By utilizing conversation analysis, the study shows that followership is crucial for the construction and accomplishment of influence effects. The authors worked out risks and challenges of claiming a follower identity (i.e., for instance, the challenge to identify a leader identity at play and creating an appropriate follower identity).
Leung & Sy (2018)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	202 followers and 101 leaders from a wide range of industries	USA	Findings indicate a top-down relationship between negative group implicit followership theories (GIFTs) and follower performance through self-efficacy and effort.

Li, Zhao et al., (2020)	other	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	185 respondents from 23 Chinese organizations ranging from small startup companies to global enterprises	China	The authors developed a new model of followership with four dimensions (i.e., more responsibility, collaboration, responsibility fulfillment, necessary communication) and established a questionnaire. By testing the questionnaire, the results show that leadership had more influence on followership than followership on leadership.
Li, Zheng et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	334 employees from 13 firms	China	Results show that subordinate moqi was positively related to empowerment. Trust-in-supervisor mediated the relationships between subordinate moqi and empowerment, and subordinates' power distance orientation moderated the subordinate moqi-leader empowerment relationship.
Liu & Dong (2020)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	matched data from 213 employees and their supervisors from an e-commerce company	China	Results indicate a positive indirect relationship between perspective taking and voice solicitation through supervisor- subordinate goal congruence, while the assumed moderating role of information sharing was not supported.
Lu et al. (2019)	reversing the lens	dyads	multi-study report	mixed methods (Study 1: quantitative, longitudinal/time- lagged; Study 2: experimental)	Study 1: 192 employees and 54 supervisors from a video game and animation company; Study 2: 294 undergraduate students with work experience	China, USA	When employees actively enacted their creative ideas and used upward influence tactics, these actions interacted to positively affect supervisors' assessment of the ideas.
Manning & Robertson (2016)	other	leaders	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	a mixed group of managers, mainly from the public sector	UK	The authors developed a three-factor model of effective follower behavior, with each meta-category consisting of five behavior sets and each set made up of four specific behaviors.
Mao (2022)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	187 employees from various occupations	Taiwan	Inquiry feedback-seeking behavior was negatively related to the perception of abusive supervision, whereas monitoring feedback-seeking behavior was positively related to the perception of abusive supervision.
Metwally et al. (2018)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	103 senior nurses and their corresponding 309 subordinates working in nine hospitals	Egypt	Results show a significant positive relationship between the follower power profile and the social influence exerted over the leader. Follower's immediacy significantly moderated the relationship between follower's characteristics and social influence.

Peters & Haslam (2018)	reversing the lens	leaders and followers	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal)	68 male Royal Marine recruits belonging to troops that commenced their training in September or October of 2008	UK	Results show that those who identified as leaders received higher leadership ratings from their commanders, while recruits who identified – and were perceived – as followers emerged as leaders for their peers. The authors conclude that follower and leader identities underpin different aspects of leadership and that these are differentially recognized by others.
Peterson et al. (2020)	other	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	260 employees from the health-care industry	USA	The authors tested and refined Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire.
Petruș (2018)	other	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	269 Romanian employees from various industries	Romania	Findings indicate that ideal implicit leadership theories and implicit followership theories are two distinct constructs, which reflect actal interpretative schemas held by individuals.
Qian et al. (2018)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	197 employees and their immediate supervisors from 32 workgroups of a logistics company	China	Employees' feedback-seeking was positively related to task performance, taking charge, and voice. Employees' feedback- seeking mediated the positive relationships between empowering leadership and task performance, taking charge, and voice.
Redmond et al. (2016)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	242 full-time employees from a roofing company, a bank, and a national youth development organization	USA	The followers' integrating conflict management style was negatively related to both the threatening resignation and circumvention dissent tactics, whereas a dominating conflict management style predicted the use of threatening resignation, circumvention, and repetition, but not a prosocial upward dissent tactic. No relationship was found between the compromising conflict management style and the prosocial dissent tactic. In addition, findings suggest that a high-quality superior-subordinate relationship was related to the use of an integrating conflict management style, which in turn leads to the use of a prosocial dissent tactic.
Ren & Chen (2018)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	162 supervisor– subordinate dyads from four enterprises located	China	Group-level guanxi practice perception was positively related to supervisor-subordinate guanxi building behaviors (SSG). In addition, guanxi orientation was found to strengthen the positive effect of person-supervisor fit perception on subordinates' SSG-building behaviors.

Ren et al. (2022)	reversing the lens	dyads	multi-study report	mixed methods (Pilot Study: qualitative; Study 1: quantitative, cross-sectional; Study 2: quantitative, longitudinal/time- lagged)	Pilot Study: 68 experienced managers with different organizational backgrounds; Study 1: 227 and 213 employees with different occupational backgrounds; Study 2: 256 subordinates and 45 supervisors from one company	China	The authors developed and established a new instrument for "implicit voice delivery". Implicit voice delivery was associated with supervisors' favorable response in terms of voice endorsement.
Ribbat et al. (2021)	other	followers	multi-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	Study 1: a heterogeneous employee sample (N = 451); Study 2: another heterogeneous employee sample (N = 413)	Germany	The authors developed and tested a German version of Kelley's (1992) Followership Questionnaire. In addition, they extended the nomological network by exploring relations of followership behaviors with important organizational constructs while controlling for the influence of personality traits.
Schneider et al. (2014)	reversing the lens	leaders and followers	single-study report	quantitative (experimental)	student sample of a large Midwestern U.S. institution	USA	Results suggest that the identity of a passive follower elicits rather negative emotions (e.g., defiant, mad, shocked, alarmed, anxious) from leaders, whereas the active colleague identity generates rather positive emotions (e.g., pleased, delighted, glad, amused, thankful, relaxed, and serene).
Sessions et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	dyads	multi-study report	mixed methods (Study 1: quantitative, longitudinal/time- lagged; Study 2: experimental)	Study 1: 150 supervisors and 493 employees from a large university; Study 2: 135 undergraduate students	USA	Results revealed a negative indirect effects of group promotive voice on supervisor emotional exhaustion through challenge appraisals of group voice. Positive indirect effects of group prohibitive voice were found on supervisor emotional exhaustion through hindrance appraisals of group voice as well as conditional indirect effects of supervisors' personal sense of power.
Shen & Abe (2022)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	219 leader– follower dyads from high-tech manufacturing firms	China	Followers' active engagement (AE) and independent critical thinking (ICT) were positively related to perceived supervisor support (PSS) and PSS mediated the relationship between followership behaviors and job performance. Dyad tenure positively moderated the relationship between AE and PSS but negatively moderated the relationship between ICT and PSS.

Sibunruang et al. (2014)	reversing the lens	dyads	multi-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	Study 1: 92 matched subordinate– supervisor dyads; Study 2: 150 matched subordinate–peer– supervisor triads from a variety of business sectors;	Thailand	Followers' influence tactic "ingratiation" was positively related to promotability at high levels of organization-based self- esteem. The relationship between ingratiation and promotability was found to be significant and positive at high levels of political skill.
Stegmann et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	379 employees from various organizations in both the USA and Germany	USA, Germany	Results indicate that the better followers perceive the fit between their leaders' implicit followership theories and their own characteristics as a follower (IFT-fit), the better they rate the relationship quality with their leaders (LMX). Additionally, age had a negative effect on psychological health and job attitudes, which was mediated through IFT-fit and LMX.
St-Hilaire et al. (2019)	reversing the lens	leaders and followers	single-study report	qualitative	semi-structured interviews with 45 subordinates and 25 managers	Canada	The authors provide a taxonomy of subordinates' specific work practices (i.e., observable behaviors, grouped into key competencies) that relate to work environment stressors for managers and have the potential to promote managers' mental health at work.
Tessema & Florovito (2021)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	qualitative	context mapping interviews with 22 students and another 15 semi-structured interviews with employees of various positions	USA	Findings indicate that followers understand their power, agency, and contributions within the constraint of authority relations and the realms of workplace engagement possibilities. In most cases, followers engage in both routine and strategic enactments, which depend on contexts.
Van De Mieroop (2020)	co-construction	teams	single-study report	qualitative	two meetings that were video-recorded in one health-care context	Belgium	The analysis of how meeting participants may shift in and out of the construction of leader and follower identities in interaction revealed that meeting participants either actively co- constructed the superior's leader identity, or, by actively enacting their identities as followers, they projected a leader identity upon the superior.
Veestraeten et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	348 followers and 97 leaders from 45 medium-sized organizations	Belgium	Results indicate that when followers hold a high "industry" implicit followership theory but feel that their leader does not convey high expectations, their engagement at work suffers. In addition, the results show that a positive IFTI among leaders was e interpreted as high/positive expectations by followers who also hold a high/positive IFTI.

Vriend et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	followers	multi-study report	mixed methods (Study 1: experimental; Study 2: quantitative, longitudinal/time- lagged)	Study 1: 164 participants that were recruited trough internet platform; Study 2: 269 followers from different companies from various industries	USA, Netherlands	Findings suggest that high-quality LMX relationships motivate pro-leader unethical intention to satisfy positive reciprocity motives and that low-quality LMX relationships motivate pro- self unethical intention to satisfy negative reciprocity motives. While positive reciprocity motive was negatively related to pro- self unethical behavior in Study 1, this relationship was found to be positive in Study 2.
Wang & Peng (2016)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	241 leader–follower dyads from four family firms in food industry	China	Benevolent leadership was higher when leader's implicit positive followership prototype (PFP) was congruent with follower's explicit positive followership trait (PFT) as compared to when they were incongruent. In cases of congruence, benevolent leadership was higher when leader PFP and follower PFT were both high rather than low.
Wen et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	323 matched supervisor- subordinate dyads from 323 employees and 70 supervisors of various enterprises	China	Subordinates' moqi mediated the positive relationship between authentic leadership (AL) and employees' taking charge behavior. In addition, employees' perspective taking positively moderated the positive relationship between AL and subordinates' moqi and the mediating effect of subordinates' moqi in the relationship between AL and taking charge behavior.
Xu et al. (2014)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	140 students from USA and 207 students from China	USA, China	Across the two samples, the authors found that subordinate emotional masking was negatively related to LMX quality and job satisfaction, and that LMX mediated the relationships between emotional masking and the work-related outcomes of affective wellbeing, job satisfaction, and turnover intention. Some levels of inconsistency concerning the relationship between emotional masking and affective wellbeing, and between emotional masking and turnover intentions were found between the American and Chinese samples.
Xu, Yang et al. (2019)	reversing the lens	leaders and followers	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	1643 employees and supervisors from various organizations	China	Promotion behavior was positively related to task and situational performance, whereas prevention behavior was positively to task performance and negatively related to situational performance. These relationships were moderated by interdependent self-construction.

Xu et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	dyads	multi-study report	mixed methods (Study 1: quantitative, longitudinal/time- lagged; Study 2: experimental)	Study 1: 289 frontline employees and their direct leaders in two hotels; Study 2: 211 leaders working in various organizations	China	Results show that constructive voice provided both information and affect resources to the leader. Leaders with an originality cognitive style were more likely to recognize employee constructive voice as a source of information and affect resources. Leaders with high originality developed high-quality relationships with those who engaged in constructive voice because of their perceptions of affect rather than of information resource.
Yang et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	followers	multi-study report	mixed methods (Study 1: qualitative and quantitative, cross-sectional; Study 2: experimental; Study 3: quantitative, cross-sectional)	Study 1: 527 employees; Study 2: 30 employees of one company; Study 3: 216 employees	China	The authors explored the structure of followers' implicit followership theories in Chinese culture and revealed two dimensions: positive followership prototypes and negative followership prototypes. In addition, positive followership prototypes were positively related to the quality of collegial relationships, whereas negative follower prototypes were negatively related to the quality of collegial relationships.
Yang et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged, 2 time points with a time- lag of 10 weeks)	590 Chinese employees nested in 75 work teams from seven organizations	China	Results indicate that subordinates can improve their relationships with their supervisors by engaging in deep acting, whereas surface acting tended to harm this relationship. Perceived supervisor support mediated the opposing indirect effects of surface and deep acting on LMX.
Yang et al. (2022)	reversing the lens	leaders and followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	659 employees from state-owned, private and joint-venture enterprises	China	Results revealed three profiles of followership: exemplary followers, passive followers, and complicated followers. Exemplary followers were employees with high probability of followership items, passive followers had low probability of followership items and complicated followers were employees who considered themselves high on enthusiasm, medium on industry, and low on good citizenship.
Yousaf et al. (2019)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	297 employees from a telecommunication company	Pakistan	Thriving at work and ethical leadership were positively related to employee psychological well-being. Employee voice behavior mediated the relationship between thriving at work, ethical leadership and employee well-being.
Zhang & Wang (2021)	reversing the lens	followers	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	384 new employees in organizations (defined as employees staying at an organization for less than 3 years)	China	Findings suggest that new employees' positive and negative implicit followership significantly affects perceived supervisor support. Perceived supervisor support was found in a mediating role between the relationships of implicit followership theories and perceived self-efficacy.

Zhang (2020)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (cross-sectional)	102 employees and their 66 supervisors from a four-star hotel	Netherlands	The influence tactic "exchange" positively predicted and the ingratiation tactic negatively predicted promotability. Hard tactics were found to interact with rational tactics in predicting promotability.
Zhang et al. (2020)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	353 supervisor- subordinate paired data from information technology companies	China	Leaders were found to respond more receptively to promotive voice than prohibitive voice. While the relationship between promotive voice and leader receptivity was stronger when employee expertise or authentic leadership was high rather than low. The relationship between prohibitive voice and leader receptivity was significant only when authentic leadership or employee expertise was high.
Zheng et al. (2019)	reversing the lens	dyads	multi-study report	mixed methods (Study 1: qualitative and quantitative, cross-sectional; Study 2: quantitative, longitudinal/time- lagged)	Study 1: 80 full-time employees, another 200 full-time employees recruited from 10 organizations, another 174 full-time employees, and 334 matched subordinate- supervisor dyads from part-time master of business administration students; Study 2: matched supervisor- coworker-employee triads from 206 employees, 140 coworkers, and 55 supervisors from 54 unique firms	China	Subordinates' implicit and explicit feedback seeking were positively related to their subsequent perceptions of moqi with a supervisor and the relationship between implicit feedback seeking and subordinate moqi was enhanced by higher subordinate power distance orientation and face consciousness. Subordinate moqi was found to affect task performance and reward recommendations for subordinates via the mediation of increased goal clarity.
Zhong et al. (2021)	reversing the lens	dyads	single-study report	quantitative (longitudinal/time- lagged)	315 followers and their 88 team leaders from a larger company	China	Follower moqi was found to decreases knowledge hiding. Follower moqi mediated the relationship between leader humility and knowledge hiding such that leader humility was negatively related to knowledge hiding via increased follower moqi.

Note. UK = *United Kingdom; USA* = *United States of America.*

Hiermit versichere ich **schriftlich** und **eidesstattlich** gemäß § 11 Abs. 2 PromO v. 08.02.2011/08.05.2013:

1. Die von mir vorgelegte Dissertation ist selbstständig verfasst und alle in Anspruch genommenen Quellen und Hilfen sind in der Dissertation vermerkt worden.

2. Die von mir eingereichte Dissertation ist weder in der gegenwärtigen noch in einer anderen Fassung an der Technischen Universität Dortmund oder an einer anderen Hochschule im Zusammenhang mit einer staatlichen oder akademischen Prüfung vorgelegt worden.

Ort, Datum

Unterschrift

3. Weiterhin erkläre ich **schriftlich** und **eidesstattlich**, dass mir der "Ratgeber zur Verhinderung von Plagiaten" und die "Regeln guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis der Technischen Universität Dortmund" bekannt und von mir in der vorgelegten Dissertation befolgt worden sind (der Text ist auf der Homepage der TU Dortmund hinterlegt).

Ort, Datum

Unterschrift