Building a Leader-Follower Culture: The Nexus Between Transformational Leadership and Effective Followership Behaviors

Ibukun D. Alegbeleye
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA, USA
ibukun@vt.edu

Eric K. Kaufman
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA, USA
ekaufman@vt.edu

Abstract

In this paper, we proposed four hypotheses that predicted positive relationships between transformational leadership behaviors and effective followership behaviors. We collected data from 100 middle managers across the United States. Multiple regression results showed significant positive relationships between transformational leadership behaviors and effective followership behaviors, after we had controlled for age, gender, race, educational level, tenure with current organization, and tenure with current supervisor. However, the transformational leadership behavior of *Idealized Influence* was not significantly related to the effective followership behavior of *Building Trust*, after controlling for demographics. The findings have important implications for leaders, followers, leadership educators, organizations, and researchers.

Introduction

For too long, leadership studies have been leader-centered with little attention paid to the roles of followers in the leadership process. While the term 'leader' has been glamorized, the term 'follower' has been associated with passiveness, subservience, and lack of imagination (Agho, 2009). However, follower-centric leadership scholars have argued that while leader-follower roles are distinct, leaders and followers constantly switch between these roles (Chaleff, 2008; Kellerman, 2013). Consistent with this sentiment, Agho (2009) suggests that many employees, especially middle-management employees, often switch between leader-follower behaviors. In a study of the relationship between leader and follower characteristics at healthcare organizations in the United States, Baker, Mathis, and Stites-Doe (2011) found significant relationships between selected exemplary leadership behaviors and effective followership behaviors. However, there appears to be a gap in the literature with regards to the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and effective followership behaviors, hence, the justification for this study. Moreover, Baker and colleagues (2011) studied only those followership and leadership behaviors that are performance-based, while leaving out relationship-based behaviors.

Consequently, this paper aims to study the relationship between middle managers' effective followership behaviors and transformational leadership behaviors. This study explores both performance and relationship-based followership and leadership behaviors.

Literature Review/Theoretical Framework

To effectively approach and frame this study, it is important to consider prior literature on the key variables: effective followership behaviors and transformational leadership behaviors.

Effective Followership Behaviors

The first theory on followership has been attributed to Kelley (1988), who conceptualized followership style and/or behaviors along two major dimensions: (1) engagement, and (2) dependence and critical thinking. Along these two dimensions, Kelley (1988) classified followers into five styles:

- Passive followers: those who engage passively, think uncritically, and depend on leaders;
- Alienated followers: those who engage passively, while thinking independently and critically;
- Conformist followers: those who engage actively, but think uncritically and depend on leaders;
- Exemplary followers: those who engage actively, and at the same time think independently and critically; and
- Pragmatist followers: those that can switch between behaviors to match leaders' expectations.

According to Kelley (1988), only exemplary followers could be considered effective followers. They make their leaders better by contributing innovative ideas and actively questioning leaders' rationale in decision making; they are not scared to oppose their leaders' views and are motivated by their desire to be effective followers (Kelley, 1992). Many studies have adapted this model to measure followership behaviors (Gatti, Ghislieri, & Cortese, 2017; Zhu, Avolio, & Walumbwa, 2009). Since Kelley's (1988) theory, emerging theories and conceptual models on followership have been sparse. Among the prominent few include Chaleff's (1995) courageous leadership conceptual model that identifies five dimensions of courageous followership behaviors. These courageous followership behaviors include: courage to assume responsibility, courage to serve, courage to challenge, courage to participate in transformation, and courage to take moral action (Chaleff, 1995). Chaleff (1995) challenged the notion that followers are 'subordinates' who are passive and always under their leader (Dixon & Westbrook, 2003). Consequently, many follower-centric researchers have chosen to describe followers in more active terms, such as 'collaborators' and 'partners' (Crossman & Crossman, 2008; Uhl-Bien, 2006).

Going beyond semantics, Pittman, Rosenbach, and Potter (1998) developed a conceptual model that is based on the idea of increased responsibility and participation of followers. According to the model, followers can operate in one of four styles: subordinate, politician, contributor, and partner. Among these four styles, only 'partner' is considered an effective followership style. Moreover, Pittman and colleagues (1998) identified eight effective followership behaviors that could be classified along two dimensions: performance and relationship. Four of these behaviors are related to work performance while the other four behaviors are connected to building relationships with others. The four followership behaviors under the performance dimension include: doing the job, embracing change, self as a resource, and working with others. On the other end, the relationship dimension includes four followership behaviors: building trust, courageous communication, identifying with the leader, and negotiating differences.

In this study, we selected four effective followership behaviors that we hypothesized would correlate with transformational leadership behaviors. These four behaviors comprise two performance-related behaviors (embracing change and working with others) and two relationship-related behaviors (building trust and identifying with leaders).

Transformational Leadership Behaviors

Bass (1985) conceptualized leadership as consisting of six behaviors: charismatic–inspirational leadership, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception, and laissez-faire leadership. With several colleagues (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Yammarino & Bass, 1990), Bass later developed 'The full range leadership model' (FRLM). The FRLM comprises three components: (a) laissez-faire, (b) transactional, and (c) transformational leadership. Laissez-faire leadership is a hands-off approach to leadership and has been tagged by many as 'no-leadership.' Transactional leadership is based on meeting performance expectation and receiving a reward. Transactional leadership behaviors include: passive management by exception, active management by exception, and contingent rewards (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). The third component of the FRLM is transformational leadership. According to Avolio and colleagues (1999), a leader transforms followers through the behaviors of: individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence.

Relationship Between Effective Followership and Leadership Behaviors

Leader-follower roles are flexible: one can operate as a leader as well as a follower at the same time (Baker, 2007; Chaleff, 2008; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2009; Kellerman, 2013). Employees, especially middle-management staff, often switch between leader-follower roles in organizations (Baker et al., 2011; Nielsen & Cleal, 2011). Baker (2007) suggests the leadership and followership behaviors needed to perform leader-follower roles are distinct yet overlapping. To date, there has been little research published on the relationship between an individual's leadership and followership behaviors. One exception is Baker and colleagues' (2011) study of healthcare industry workers, which found a significant relationship between exemplary leadership behaviors and effective followership behaviors. Among other results, Baker and colleagues (2011) found that followers who reported having exemplary leadership behavior of 'challenging the process' also have effective followership behavior of 'doing the job.' Also, Baker found that followers who reported having leadership behavior of 'enabling others to act' also have followership behavior of 'working with others.' However, we are not aware of any other study that has examined the relationship between an individual's transformational leadership behaviors (as conceptualized by the full range leadership model) and effective followership behaviors. Consequently, there is a need to consider alignment with the full range leadership model.

Based on related literature, we posit four hypotheses.

Transformational Leaders and Effective Followers are Purpose-driven

According to Bass, Avolio, Jung, and Berson (2003), a transformational leader outlines a clear vision for followers through 'inspirational motivation.' A transformational leader is enthusiastic about the vision, purpose, and goals of the organization and presents them in a way that is compelling to followers. Furthermore, a transformational leader recognizes that a compelling vision is one that is shared by followers (Kouzes & Posner, 2006). While transformational leaders do not compromise their visions or goals, they are willing to accept followers' input, knowing fully well that followers would be more committed to a vision they help construct. This

motivates the follower to do work above and beyond what their job responsibilities require (Avolio et al., 1999).

Effective followers, on the other hand, identify with their leader by supporting the vision of the leader (Pittman et al., 1998); they support their leader's vision through devoted work engagements (Zhu et al., 2009). However, before executing a vision, effective followers ensure they have a clear understanding of the vision, offer alternative ideas when necessary, reconcile differences, and ultimately internalize the vision (Rosenbach, Pittman, & Potter, 1996). At this point, they are as committed as their leaders in achieving the vision; it is no longer the leader's vision but their vision. These followers see themselves as 'partners in vision' and are aware that their leader's success is also their success (Chaleff, 1995; Kelly, 1992; Pittman et al., 1998).

Hypothesis 1: Middle managers who report having the transformational leadership behavior of 'inspirational motivation' would be more likely to have the effective followership behavior of 'identifying with the leader.'

Transformational Leaders and Effective Followers Build Trust in Others

Bass and colleagues (2003) contend that transformational leaders have 'idealized influence' on followers. Transformational leaders lead with a higher purpose; they set high moral values for themselves and consider the ethical aspect of decisions, which makes them earn the respect and trust of their followers (Avolio & Bass, 1995; Avolio et al., 1999).

Similarly, effective followers' superior contributions and commitment to task naturally make them role models for their colleagues (Blanchard, Welbourne, Gilmore, & Bullock, 2009). They accept their roles as followers, act with integrity, and consistently look for opportunities to build the trust of their colleagues as well as their leaders (Pittman et al., 1998; Rosenbach et al., 1996).

Hypothesis 2: Middle managers who report having the transformational leadership behavior of 'idealized influence behavior' would be more likely to have the effective followership behavior of 'building trust.'

Transformational Leaders and Effective Followers Embrace Change

Transformational leaders use 'intellectual stimulation' to challenge followers to be innovative and creative (Bass et al., 2003; Sosik, 2006). They encourage followers to contribute to discussions and consider alternative ways of solving a problem (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

On the other hand, Kelly (1992) posits that effective followers are innovative and independent critical thinkers. However, with innovation comes uncertainty and change that many followers are not prepared for; in fact, many followers resist change and would rather stick with proven methods (Heifetz, 2009). Effective followers are antitheses of this – not only do they embrace change, but they also anticipate it and continually look for ways to improve (Rosenbach et al., 1996). They are also agents of change and usually spend time explaining to their colleagues why and how things could be done differently (Pittman et al., 1998; Rosenbach et al., 1996).

Hypothesis 3: *Middle managers who report having the transformational leadership behavior of 'intellectual stimulation' would be more likely to have the effective followership behavior of 'embracing change.'*

Transformational Leaders and Effective Followers Coach and Develop People

Transformational leaders apply 'individualized consideration' when working with followers, teaching and mentoring them (Bass et al., 2003). They realize that no two followers are the same in terms of needs and abilities, and accordingly align their efforts to followers' specific needs, in a bid to helping them solve their challenges.

Similarly, the ability and desire of effective followers to work cooperatively and collaboratively with colleagues make their colleagues come to them with their problems (Rosenbach et al., 1996). As a result, they know their colleagues on a personal level and are able to teach and coach them through their problems.

Hypothesis 4: *Middle managers who report having the transformational leadership behavior of 'individualized consideration' would be more likely to have the effective followership behavior of 'working with others.'*

Method

Procedures and Sample

To investigate these four hypotheses, we designed a cross-sectional study of transformational leadership and effective followership behaviors of middle management employees across the United States. Our inclusion criteria required participants to be: a middle management employee (i.e., employees that have at least one superior and one subordinate), currently employed in the US, and at least 18 years old. We identified this population because of their relationship to our hypotheses – we needed individuals whose job duties require them to switch between leader and follower behaviors in their organization. We recognize that middle-management employees fit this criterion, as they often switch between leader-follower roles in organizations (Baker et al., 2011). Qualtrics Reseach Service sourced, advertised, and recruited participants that fit the study criteria. As an exploratory study, participants in a Qualtrics panel of respondents is sufficient and places minimal burden on research subjects (since those individuals have expressed an interested in completing surveys). Nonetheless, we received Institutional Review Board approval before engaging in this study. Prior to completing this survey, participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity.

A total sample of 139 middle-level managers completed the survey; 37 survey responses were screened out because respondents had used less than the stipulated 5 minutes required to complete the survey, and 2 survey responses were removed due to missing data. The final sample included 100 middle management employees across the United States.

Our respondents reported an average age of 40.8 years, and they have been with their current organization for an average of 100.5 months (approximately 8 years). They reported being with

their current supervisor for an average of 49.2 months (approximately 4 years). Seventy-one percent reported they were females, while 29% reported they were males. Sixty-nine percent identified as White Americans; 10% as Black or African American; 8% as American Indian or Alaska Native; 8% as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino; and 5% as Asian American. Forty-seven percent reported having a bachelor's degree or more. The predominant areas of work include retail trade (18%), health care or social assistance (15%), educational services (8%), construction (7%), and finance or insurance (7%).

Measures

Transformational leadership behaviors instrument. To measure transformational leadership behaviors, we used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) developed by Avolio and Bass (1995). Sixteen items were used from the MLQ-5X to measure 4 transformational leadership behaviors (i.e., Idealized Influence Behavior, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration). Sample items rated by participants include: "As a leader, I talk optimistically about the future" and "As a leader, I spend time teaching and coaching." The MLQ-5X instrument uses a five-point scale ranging from 0 ('not at all') to 4 ('frequently, if not always'). In prior research, the MLQ-5X yielded a Cronbach's alpha above 0.70 for all the scales (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999), and the instrument has also been well validated in the literature (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Muenjohn, & Armstrong, 2008). Nonetheless, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS 25 software to confirm the factor structure of the MLQ-5X. The initial CFA result was not satisfactory. As per the modification indices, we deleted one redundant item from *intellectual stimulation* scale to improve the fit indices. The final CFA result from the remaining 15 items suggest a satisfactory fit (χ^2 = 135.85, p < .01, df = 83, comparative fit index [CFI] = .93, Tucker-Lewis index [TLI] = .91, standardized root mean square residual [SRMR] = .06)

Effective followership behaviors instrument. To measure effective followership behaviors, we used the Performance and Relationship Questionnaire (PRQ) developed by Rosenbach and colleagues (1996). In this study, we used four effective followership behavior scales, which include: building trust, identifying with leaders, embracing change, and working with others. Sample items include: "Has a clear sense of what is important from the leader's perspectives," and "I easily adapt to change to meet new challenges." Initially, each scale was measured with 5 items (making a total of 20 items) using a five-point scale ranging from 1 ('almost never') to 5 ('always'). Baker (2006) validated the PRQ and reported Cronbach's alphas ranging from 0.56 to 0.66. We conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS 25 software to confirm how well the model fits our data. Initial CFA result suggests model fit was not satisfactory. To improve the model, we deleted items that had very low or negative factor loadings: two items were deleted from the *embracing change* scale, one item from *working with others,* and one item from *identifying with the leader*. The items deleted were similar to those removed by Baker (2006) in their modified version of the PRQ. Moreover, as per the modification indices, we deleted one redundant item from *embracing change* scale to improve the fit indices. The final CFA results from the remaining 15 items suggest a satisfactory fit (χ^2 = 134.44, p < .01, df = 83, comparative fit index [CFI] = .93, Tucker-Lewis index [TLI] = .91, standardized root mean square residual [SRMR] = .06).

Control variables. Research on the relationship between gender and leadership behaviors has intensified in the extant literature. While many leadership scholars argue that gender has little (if any) association with leadership behaviors (Powell, 1990), there is support for the notion that women exhibit more transformational leadership behaviors than men (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). Boatwright and Forest (2000) found other demographic variables such as age, educational level, and organizational tenure to be related to follower's preference for leadership behaviors. Tenure with supervisor and race/ethnicity have also been identified as important variables to control for in leadership research (Baker et al., 2011; Gatti et al., 2017). Baker and colleagues (2011) suggested these variables might be as important to followership as followership is to leadership, since followership and leadership exist together in the same space. In this study, we controlled for demographic variables of age, gender, race, educational level, tenure with the current organization, and tenure with current supervisor.

Analysis

To begin with, a confirmatory factor analysis, using AMOS 25 software, was conducted to provide support for the model fit of the PRQ and MLQ-5X. Afterward, a Pearson product-moment correlation, using SPSS 25, was conducted to test the relationships between all variables. A multiple regression analysis, using SPSS 25, was conducted to test the hypotheses of the current study. A multiple regression analysis was chosen because of its ability to: 1) control for demographic variables, and 2) account for the proportion of variance caused in the dependent variable. The dependent variables included four effective followership behaviors: identifying with the leader, building trust, embracing change, and working with others. The independent variables included four transformational leadership behaviors: inspirational motivation, idealized influence behavior, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Common Method Variance

Since we collected ratings of followership and leadership behaviors from the same source (i.e., middle managers), there was the possibility of common source variance. To reduce the likelihood of a common source variance, we adopted Harman's single factor test to see if a one-factor solution would explain a significant proportion of the variance in our data (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). To do this, we first conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using SPSS 25, to see if a single factor would emerge. The EFA result shows that a one-factor solution is inadequate, as a one-factor solution only explains only 33% of the variance in our data. To further test if a single-factor model would fit our data, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS 25. The CFA result suggested a poor fit (χ^2 = 1130.45, $p < .01$, df = 405, comparative fit index [CFI] = .53, Tucker-Lewis index [TLI] = .50, standardized root mean square residual [SRMR] = .16), which indicates that our data was likely not affected by common source variance.

Results

As shown in Table 1, there was a significant negative relationship between gender and effective followership behavior of *Building Trust* (r = -0.25, $p < 0.05$). This suggests females exhibit significantly higher followership behavior of *Building Trust* than males. To further explore this,

we conducted an independent sample t-test, which showed females (M = 4.37, SD = 0.53) reported significantly higher followership behavior of *Building Trust* than males (M = 3.99, SD = 0.93), t(98) = 2.06, p < 0.05.

In addition, there was a significant negative relationship between the gender and effective follower behavior of *Working with Others* (r = -0.37, p < 0.01), which suggests females demonstrate significantly higher levels of this behavior than males. To compare the mean differences, we conducted an independent sample t-test, which showed females (M = 4.36, SD = 0.56) reported significantly higher followership behavior of *Working with Others* than males (M = 3.80, SD = 0.82), t(98) = 3.36, p < 0.01.

Other demographic variables were not correlated with transformational leadership and effective followership behaviors. While there were correlations among some control variables, we did not interpret these correlations as they were not the focus of this study.

Table 1.

Summary of Intercorrelations, Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities of Variables

VAR[a]	Age	Race	Gen	Edu	Emp	Ten	IM	IIB	IS	IC	IL	BT	EC	WO
Age														
Race	0.02													
Gen	0.16	.25*												
Edu	0.14	-0.03	0.09											
Emp	.42**	0.04	0.15	0.08										
Ten	.25*	0.04	0.13	0.08	.41**									
IM	-0.04	0.12	-0.07	0.18	0.05	-0.06								
IIB	0.06	0.09	-0.07	0.19	0.13	-0.01	.73**							
IS	-0.04	0.06	-0.14	0.04	0.05	-0.05	.72**	.68**						
IC	-0.02	0.08	-0.15	0.15	0.09	-0.08	.76**	.66**	.77**					
IL	0.01	-0.04	-0.16	0.18	0.08	-0.12	.34**	.24*	.25*	.23*				
BT	-0.07	-0.03	-.25*	0.13	0.05	-0.06	.36**	.22*	.31**	.28**	.74**			
EC	-0.13	-0.01	-0.07	0.07	0.01	0.04	.19	.04	.29**	.23*	.52**	.62**		
WO	-0.07	.043	-0.37**	0.07	0.05	-0.03	.34**	.21*	.35**	.37**	.63*	.77**	.66**	
Mean	40.82	2.33	1.29	4.10	100.46	49.22	4.10	4.05	4.13	4.30	3.96	4.26	4.07	4.20
S.D.	12.01	0.92	0.46	1.51	83.31	47.00	0.76	0.76	0.70	0.70	0.72	0.69	0.74	0.69
α							0.79	0.71	0.74	0.79	0.78	0.82	0.67	0.80

Note. n = 100. **p < 0.01. *p < 0.05 level.
[a]VAR = Variables; Age = Age in Months; Race =Race/ethnicity; Gen = Gender; Edu = Educational Level; Emp = Employment Tenure with Organization in Months; Ten = Tenure with Supervisor in Months; IM = Inspirational Motivation; IIB = Individualized Influence Behavior; IS = Intellectual Stimulation; IC = Individualized Consideration; IL = Identifying with Leader; BT = Building Trust; EC = Embracing Change; WO = Working with Others; α = Cronbach Alpha.
[a]Coding was as follows: Gender: 1 = "Female," 2 = "Male," Education: 1 = "Less than high school degree," 2 = "High school graduate," 3 = "Some college but no degree," 4 = "Associate degree in college (2-year)," 5 = "Bachelor's degree in college (4-year)," 6 = " Master's degree," 7 = "Doctoral degree;" Race/Ethnicity: 1 = "Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino," 2 = "White American," 3 = "Black or African American," 4 = "American Indian or Alaska Native," 5 = "Asian American," 6 = "Native Hawaiian."

Hypotheses Tests

Hypothesis 1 predicted middle managers who report having the transformational leadership behavior (TLB) of *Inspirational Motivation* would be more likely to have the effective followership behavior (EFB) of *Identifying with the Leader*. As shown in Table 2, the TLB of *Inspirational Motivation* ($\beta = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$) was positively related to the EFB of *Identifying with the Leader*, after controlling for age, gender, race, educational level, tenure with the current organization, and tenure with current supervisor. This provides support for Hypothesis 1. Moreover, the TLB of *Inspirational Motivation* explained a significant proportion of variance in the EFB of *Identifying with the Leader,* $R^2 = 0.11$, $F(1, 98) = 2.94$, $p < 0.01$.

Table 2.
Summary of Linear Regression Weights, Standard Error, and T-value of Transformational Leadership and Effective followership Behaviors

Hypotheses	Standardized Coefficient (β)	SE	t-value	Conclusion
H$_1$: Inspirational Motivation ▶ Identifying with the Leader	0.290**	0.104	2.944	Supported
H$_2$: Idealized Influence Behavior ⟶ Building Trust	0.163	0.092	1.606	Unsupported
H$_3$: Intellectual Stimulation ⟶ Embracing Change	0.283**	0.107	2.819	Supported
H$_4$: Individualized Consideration ⟶ Working with Others	0.285**	0.093	3.017	Supported

Note. $n = 100$. ** $p < 0.01$. * $p < 0.05$ level (2-tailed).

Hypothesis 2 predicted middle managers who report having the transformational leadership behavior of *Idealized Influence Behavior* would be more likely to have the effective followership behavior of *Building Trust*. As shown in Table 2, the TLB of *Idealized Influence Behavior* ($\beta = 0.163$, $p > 0.05$) was not significantly related to the EFB of *Building Trust*, after controlling for age, gender, race/ethnicity, educational level, tenure with the current organization, and tenure with current supervisor. Thus, our analysis failed to provide support for Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3 predicted middle managers who report having the transformational leadership behavior of *Intellectual Stimulation* would be more likely to have the effective followership behavior of *Embracing Change*. As shown in Table 2, the TLB of *Intellectual Stimulation* ($\beta = 0.283$, $p < 0.01$) was positively related to the EFB of *Embracing Change*, after controlling for age, gender, race/ethnicity, educational level, tenure with the current organization, and tenure with current supervisor. This provides support for Hypothesis 3. Moreover, the TLB of *Intellectual Stimulation* explained a significant proportion of variance in the EFB of *Embracing Change,* $R^2 = 0.09$, $F(1, 98) = 2.82$, $p < 0.01$.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that middle management employees who report having the leadership behavior *Individualized Consideration* would be more likely to have the followership behavior

Working with Others. As shown in Table 2, the TLB of *Individualized Consideration* ($\beta = 0.285$, $p < 0.01$) is positively related to the EFB of *Working with Others,* while controlling for age, gender, race/ethnicity, educational level, tenure with the current organization, and tenure with current supervisor. This provides support for Hypothesis 4. Leadership behavior *Individualized Consideration* also explained a significant proportion of variance in followership behavior *Working with Others,* $R^2 = 0.13$, $F(1, 98) = 3.02$, $p < 0.01$.

Conclusions and Implications

We proposed four hypotheses that predicted positive relationships between selected transformational leadership behaviors and effective followership behaviors of middle-management employees in the United States. Multiple regression results showed support for three out of four hypotheses proposed. Specifically, after we have controlled for age, gender, race, educational level, tenure with the current organization, and tenure with current supervisor, there were significant positive relationships between the following variables:

- transformational leadership behavior of *Inspirational Motivation* and effective followership behavior of *Identifying with the Leader;*
- the transformational leadership behavior of *Intellectual Stimulation* and effective followership behavior of *Embracing Change*; and
- the transformational leadership behavior of *Individualized Consideration* and effective followership behavior of *Working with Others.*

These findings suggest effective (transformational) leaders may also be effective as followers and vice-versa. This provides support for conceptual and theoretical models that suggest leadership and followership roles overlap and can be shared (Baker et al., 2011; Kellerman, 2013). Moreover, similarities between leadership and followership behaviors may help destigmatize followership, while simultaneously fostering teamwork between leaders and followers in organizations. This, we believe, may help organizations get more from their employees in terms of creativity and effectiveness.

However, the relationship between the transformational leadership behavior of *Idealized Influence Behavior* and the effective followership behavior of *Building Trust* was not found to be statistically significant. This might suggest that, although leader-follower roles can be said to overlap, they are distinct and may sometimes require unique behaviors which may not be transferable. For example, leaders might use to good effects some of their learned transformational leadership behaviors when following; however, when faced with certain situations, they may soon realize they lack the full range of behaviors that are required for effective followership. These findings may be useful to leadership educators and those involved in leadership development interventions to know that while leadership behaviors could be transferred to followership, they do not replace them. This may provide support for follower-centric scholars who recommend that leadership development programs develop a curriculum that is particularly designed for followership development (Dixon & Westbrook, 2003; Kellerman, 2013).

In all, we believe this study has helped broaden our understanding of leadership and followership, especially the overlap that exists between leader-follower behaviors and leader-follower roles in organizations.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

One potential limitation of this study is the common source bias since ratings of transformational leadership behavior and effective followership behavior were self-reported by respondents. Although we showed a single-factor solution was inadequate, thereby reducing the likelihood of a common source affecting our results (Podsakoff et al., 2003), we nonetheless recommend future studies collect ratings of transformational leadership behavior and effective followership behavior from different sources.

Moreover, this is a cross-sectional study, which means it is inappropriate to make causal claims with the findings. Therefore, we recommend future studies adopt a longitudinal approach to explore the relationship between transformational leadership behavior and effective followership behavior over time.

Another potential weakness of this study is the relatively small sample size which may not adequately represent the population (i.e., United States workforce). Consequently, we recommend caution in extrapolating findings.

Lastly, we recommend future research explore other leader-follower roles that were not examined in this study. Also, the relationship between other positive forms of leadership (such as authentic leadership) and effective followership behaviors should be studied.

References

Agho, A. O. (2009). Perspectives of senior-level executives on effective followership and leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 16(2), 159-166. http://doi.org/10.1177/1548051809335360

Avolio, B. J. & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 6* (2), 199–218. http://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90035-7

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72*(4), 441-462. http://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166789

Baker, S. D. (2006). The effect of leader-follower agreement on team effectiveness (Doctoral dissertation, George Washington University).

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

Baker, S. D., Mathis, C. J., & Stites-Doe, S. (2011). An exploratory study investigating leader and follower characteristics at U.S. healthcare Organizations. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 23(3), 341-363. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23209120

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

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(2), 207-218. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207

Blanchard, A. L., Welbourne, J., Gilmore, D., & Bullock, A. (2009). Followership styles and employee attachment to the organization. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, *12*(2), 111-131. http://doi.org/10.1080/10887150902888718

Boatwright, K. J., & Forrest, L. (2000). Leadership preferences: The influence of gender and needs for connection on workers' ideal preferences for leadership behaviors. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(2), 18-34. http://doi.org/10.1177/107179190000700202

Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D. & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass' conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 468–478. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.4.468

Chaleff, I. (1995). *The courageous follower: Standing up to & for our Leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Chaleff, I. (2008) *Creating new ways of following. The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Crossman, B., & Crossman, J. (2011). Conceptualising followership: A review of the literature. *Leadership*, 7(4), 481-497. http://doi.org/10.1177/1742715011416891

Dixon, G., & Westbrook, J. (2003) Followers revealed. *Engineering Management Journal*, *15*(1), 19-26. http://doi.org/10.1080/10429247.2003.11415192

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 569-591. http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569

Gatti, P., Ghislieri, C., & Cortese, C. G. (2017). Relationships between followers' behaviors and job satisfaction in a sample of nurses. *PloS one*, *12*(10), 1-16. http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185905

Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). Leadership in a (permanent) crisis. *Harvard Business Review*, *87*(7/8), 62-69.

Hurwitz, M. and Hurwitz, S. (2009). The romance of the follower: Part 2. *Industrial and Commercial Training* 41(2), 80-86. http://doi.org/10.1108/00197850910939117

Kellerman, B. (2013). Leading questions: The end of leadership–redux. *Leadership*, *9*(1), 135-139. http://doi.org/10.1177/1742715012455132

Kelley, R. E. (1988). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business Review*, 66(6), 142-148.

Kelley, R. (1992). *The power of followership*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006). *The leadership challenge* (Vol. 3). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Muenjohn, N., & Armstrong, A. (2008). Evaluating the structural validity of the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ), capturing the leadership factors of transformational-transactional leadership. *Contemporary Management Research*, 4(1), 3-14. https://doi.org/10.7903/cmr.704

Nielsen, K., & Cleal, B. (2011). Under which conditions do middle managers exhibit transformational leadership behaviors?—An experience sampling method study on the predictors of transformational leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(2), 344-352. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.02.009

Pittman, T. S., Rosenbach, W. E., & Potter III, E. H. (1998). Followers as partners: Taking the initiative for action. In W. E. Rosenbach and R. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in leadership (4th ed.*, pp. 107-120). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. L., & 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. http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Powell, G. N. (1990). One more time: Do female and male managers differ? *The Executive*, 4(3), 68-75. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1990.4274684

Rosenbach, W. E., Pittman, T. S., & Potter III, E. H. (1996). Performance and relationship questionnaire [Questionnaire]. Unpublished instrument. Retrieved from: http://www.leadingandfollowing.com/documents /PRQSample.pdf

Sosik, J. J. (2006). Full range leadership: Model, research, extensions and training. In Burke, R. J. & Cooper, C. (Eds.), *Inspiring leaders* (pp. 49-82). New York, NY: Routledge.

Uhl-Bien, M. (2006) Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *Leadership Quarterly, 17*(6), 654–676. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.007

Yammarino, F. J. & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership at multiple levels of analysis. *Human Relations*, *43*(10), 975–995. http://doi.org/10.1177/001872679004301003

Zhu, W., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2009). Moderating role of follower characteristics with transformational leadership and follower work engagement. *Group & Organization Management*, *34*(5), 590-619. http://doi.org/10.1177/1059601108331242