Article

A Review of the Literature of the Followership Since 2008: The Importance of Relationships and Emotional Intelligence[*]

Richard Martin[1]

Abstract

Followership continues to be a field of study in the larger field of leadership. In 2008, Ricketson offered an in-depth analysis of the relationship between the variables of leadership styles and courageous followership. Since then, the research has continued to accumulate in attempts to offer new insight on the topic. This article explores the empirical research that has been conducted since Ricketson's dissertation to determine what new information has been offered and what new conclusions can be reached in this area. In particular, there is widespread agreement on the importance of building the leader–follower relationship in developing effective followers and leaders. This leads to the conclusion that emotional intelligence (EI) plays an important role in the creation of both as it facilitates the establishment of the leader–follower relationship. Future research suggestions are offered as well.

Keywords

leadership, organizational behavior, management, social sciences, supervision, organizational studies, policies, criminology, business administration, human resource development, human resources

In 2002, Fineman concluded that leaders and followers are bound together in a complex emotional web and are thus interdependent. The concept of followership continues to grow in the research fields, which continue to offer greater data that serve not only to help us to understand the construct but also to guide further research. In 2008, Ricketson offered a study, "An Exploration on the Relationship of Leadership Styles and Dimensions of Courageous Followership." It is apparent from that study, and those prior to Ricketson, that it is difficult to consider either the leadership construct or the followership construct absent the other. Since Ricketson's work, the research on this relationship has continued to build and thus bears exploration.

Foundation of the Courageous Follower Concept

Chaleff (1995) defined a courageous follower in terms of five characteristics that such a person would possess. According to Chaleff, a courageous follower would have the courage to (a) assume responsibility, (b) serve, (c) challenge, (d) participate in transformation, and (e) take moral action. Leadership is about relationships (Martin, 2013; Winston, 2012), and Chaleff (1995), Kelley (1992), and Kellerman (2009) all concurred that the antecedent to courageous or effective followership is a

relationship between the follower and leader that is based on mutual trust (Harvard CPL, 2009). The dynamics between leaders and followers may have changed since Kelley first introduced the concept, though. In today's complex world, the concept of the leader becomes less relevant and the follower concept more so as information is readily available to almost everyone, and the highly technical world creates environments where the leader is no longer the sole keeper of knowledge in an organization (Kellerman, 2009). According to Kellerman, what results is that followers simply ignore, discount, or circumvent the leader in many instances.

It would stand to reason, then, that followership is a concept that bears continued study. The leader–follower dyad is crucial to organizations as they struggle to thrive in the competitive and complex world. The line between leader and follower has become increasingly blurred as leaders become increasingly reliant upon the knowledge and expertise of the followers, and

---

[1]Keuka College, Keuka Park, NY, USA

Corresponding Author:
Richard Martin, Assistant Professor, Keuka College, 1 Keuka Business Park, Keuka Park, NY 14478, USA.
Email: rmartin@keuka.edu

the followers are increasingly used as leaders (Offerman & Scuderi, 2007). Thus, the foundation has been established as we progress on to the latest research into the relationship between leadership styles and courageous followers.

Empirical Research Since 2008

Binney, Wilke, and Williams (2009) stated that leadership and followership are processes that occur between people. Thus, we can begin from the premise that these processes affect all working relationships. Many of the various leadership theories or styles have, as their foundation, certain traits that the leader exudes that affect these processes. For example, in transformational leadership, the leader exudes trustworthiness which aids in increasing the effectiveness of the leader and which was identified earlier in this article as an antecedent to courageous followership. Hoffman, Woehr, Maldagen-Youngjohn, and Lyons (2011) conducted research into the relationship of seven of the individual differences necessary for effective leadership identified by Locke's research which, according to the authors, had not been "subject to systematic summary" (p. 350). In particular, the relationship between a person's ambition, initiative, energy, need for power, honesty/integrity, creativity, and self-monitoring and their leadership effectiveness was explored. Considering that leader effectiveness would involve those traits of the courageous follower, the study essentially examined the relationship between those individual differences and courageous followership.

As a component of courageous followership, the follower's courage to take moral action is a concept explored by Hannah, Avolio, and Walumbwa (2011). Sekerka and Bagozzi (2007) defined moral courage as "the ability to use inner principles to do what is good for others, regardless of threat to self" (p. 135). It is a concept that goes beyond knowing the right thing to do and involves the act of doing the right thing even in the face of a threat to oneself.

Lester, Vogelgesang, Hannah, and Kimmey (2010) opined that leadership can be a powerful force in encouraging followers' moral courage when leaders serve as role models. When leaders exhibit the moral courage that they expect from their followers, Lester et al. concluded that such modeling influences the followers' thoughts and behaviors. Brown and Mitchell (2010) found that influences occur in transformational and charismatic leadership styles where the followers perceived the leaders to be trustworthy and fair. Groves and LaRoca (2011) reached similar conclusions and will be discussed later.

Employees' perception seemed to be a recurring theme in the research reviewed, and a modeling of behaviors can result in coinciding leader and follower behaviors. In essence, the research shows that there exists a correlation between leader behavior and follower behavior (Brown & Mitchell, 2010; Groves & LaRoca, 2011; Lester et al., 2010). Bertlett, Johansson, and Arvidsson, (2011) conducted a study into the congruence of behaviors between the leader and follower and concluded that such congruence "expands leadership beyond the traditional conceptions of formal leadership and subordination" (p. iv). Bertlett et al., (2011) found that, where congruence occurs, there is an enhanced psychological climate in the organization where the follower has a more positive perception of the organizational climate. In another study that examined leader behavior, Mayfield and Mayfield (2009) explored whether there was a link between what the leader communicated and what he or she did and follower performance and job satisfaction. The study utilized the Leader–Member exchange (LMX) model to explore this relation and concluded that congruence between leader speech and action fully mediated the relationship between leader and follower performance and satisfaction.

Authentic Leadership

Focusing the morality construct within the frame of a specific leadership theory, authentic leadership directly involves leader morality. One of the four dimensions of authentic leadership is having an internalized moral perspective and consistent display of it through leader behaviors and is seen to affect the moral courage of followers (Hannah et al., 2011). Another component of authentic leadership, relational transparency, which entails the leader sharing information and disclosing his or her thoughts and feelings, was also shown to have an impact on follower behaviors and attitudes.

In addition, leader balanced processing, or the willingness to "openly and objectively analyz[e] available relevant information before coming to a conclusion or decision" (Hannah et al., 2011, p. 562), which is another of the four dimensions of the authentic leader, was linked to the courageous follower attributes. Specifically, it is linked to the third characteristic of the courageous follower, possessing the courage to challenge the leader when his or her decision is wrong (Chaleff, 1995). Authentic leadership would lend itself to developing this trait in the follower as the leaders would solicit information and opinions from the followers during the information gathering process.

In a separate study, Peus, Wesche, Streicher, Braun, and Frey (2011) studied the antecedents of authentic leadership and both individual- and group-level outcomes of its application. Their study was based on the premise established in earlier research that proposed that to act authentically, one has to first "know oneself" (Harter, 2002) and act "in accordance with one's true self" (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005). Peus and colleagues concluded that leader self-knowledge regarding his or her values and convictions as well as self-consistency in their values, beliefs, and actions were both antecedents of authentic leadership.

Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Authentic Leadership (AL)

Because life within any organization is essentially a process of emotional management (Van Maanen & Kunda, 1989) and

leadership is an intrinsically emotional process (Humphrey, 2002), EI plays a part in the development of the authentic leader and follower. Tee, Paulsen, and Ashkanasy (2013) suggested that followers can look to the leaders as "a point of reference on which to assess the appropriateness of their emotions within group contexts" (p. 907). To that point, Reicher, Haslam, and Hopkins (2005) suggested that leaders are "entrepreneurs of identity," who are able to shape group identity through emotions.

Although several definitions of EI have come about over the years since the concept was first proposed, all of the definitions "center on a mix of emotional and cognitive abilities" (Thor & Johnson, 2011, p. 18). Goleman (2000) pointed out that all of the identified models of EI revolve around the ability to recognize and regulate emotions in ourselves and others. Mayer and Salovey (1997) defined EI as a set of interrelated skills concerning the "ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth" (p. 10). Cooperation, trust, and flexibility in decision making and change are three of the five essential components of EI, and emotionally intelligent people have been found to exhibit advanced cognitive abilities as well as emotional and moral development (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

As mentioned, relationship is a core concept in effective leadership (Martin, 2013; Winston, 2012), and the link between relationships and effective followership can be assumed as relationships are two-way exchanges between leader and follower. Goleman's (1998) model of EI consists of four domains: self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management. The relationship management domain consists of developing others, influence, conflict management, inspirational leadership, change catalyst, and teamwork and collaboration (Wolff, 2005). As a construct, then, EI can aid in developing or enhancing relationships. Lopes, Salovey, and Straus (2005) also reached this conclusion in their study as they observed a correlation between EI and quality of social interactions that leads to developing or enhancing relationships.

Therefore, we can begin to create the chain that links all of the constructs of courageous follower development as EI serves to facilitate the knowing of oneself, greater cognitive ability, and moral and emotional development that authentic leadership requires. Then, the authentic leader will facilitate the establishment of the relationship between the leader and follower based on trust that, as mentioned prior, is a critical antecedent of courageous followership.

Humility

Owens and Hekman (2012) concluded that humble leaders "model how to grow their followers" (p. 801). Their case

study approach to examining the construct of humility in leadership determined that humble leaders were generally of a high moral character, possessed a unique kind of courage, and had an underlying belief in their own as well as the followers' ability to be molded. In essence, humble leaders engaged in the dual processes of both learning (leader) and growing (followers; Owens & Hekman, 2012, p. 801). In addition, it was determined that three core behaviors were exhibited by humble leaders: acknowledging mistakes and limitations, spotlighting follower strengths, and modeling teachability. These behaviors were not only observed to coincide but also foster one another (Owens & Hekman, 2012).

What was discovered was that leaders who exhibited such traits in their behavior led to follower "psychological freedom and engagement" through legitimizing the followers' own attempts at developing themselves and "catalyzed a development oriented relational identity" (Owens & Hekman, 2012, p. 802). It made an environment wherein mistakes would be tolerated as part of the learning process, thus freeing them from the psychological fear of imperfection. Essentially, leaders were interested in the development of the followers rather than simply in performance.

The result of humble leadership in many instances was an increase in the followers' performance, engagement, and motivation. Rather than attempting to meet performance measures, followers of humble leaders indicated an intrinsic drive to learn and perform to their own internal standard. Respondents reported reacting to simple and minute stimuli from the leaders. It was also noted that strong leader stimuli (i.e., yelling) had a demotivating effect on the followers. It seemed to the researchers that humility "unlocked and amplified" follower intrinsic motivations (Owens & Hekman, 2012, p. 804). Leaders were able to capitalize on this motivation further by matching the aptitudes of the followers to areas within the organization that would best utilize those skills which then enhanced follower motivation even more.

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

As mentioned, humble leaders possess a special type of courage (Owens & Hekman, 2012), and leadership can be a powerful force in encouraging followers' moral courage (Lester et al., 2010). Ethical behavior can be linked to the moral development of a person and, thus, speaks to the importance of development of their EI. In an empirical study of ethics, Groves and LaRoca (2011) explored how ethics related to followers' CSR and the application of ethics to either transformational or transactional leadership styles. They separated ethics according to deontology and teleology to explore whether either is applicable to one leadership style over the other. The results showed that deontological values, such as altruism and universal rights, were associated with transformational leadership, whereas the teleological values, such as utilitarianism, were associated more with transactional leadership. Furthermore, they concluded that only transformational

Table 1. Structural Components and Subcomponents of IFTs.

Factors	Item variables		
Industry:	Hardworking	Productive	Goes above and beyond
Incompetence:	Uneducated	Slow	Inexperienced
Conformity:	Easily influenced	Follows trends	Soft spoken
Enthusiasm:	Excited	Outgoing	Happy
Insubordination:	Arrogant	Rude	Bad tempered
Good citizen:	Loyal	Reliable	Team player

Source. Whiteley, Sy, and Johnson (2012).
Note. IFTs = implicit followership theories.

leadership style affected follower CSR, which coincides with prior research of social learning theory and follower self-concept. Groves and LaRoca offer that it is through vicarious learning and role modeling mechanisms that transformational leaders are able to influence their followers to engage in CSR in their respective work units. In addition, it is the concept of the future self that serves to promote the engagement in CSR.

Mentoring and Learning

The leader–follower relationship can take the form of mentor–mentee or mimetic relationship where the leader seeks to develop the follower and the follower seeks to learn. Several studies on mentoring have observed the value of the developmental relationships used in mentoring at every career stage (i.e., Kram, 1988, 1996; Thomas, 1990, 1993). In addition, developmental relationships such as mentoring have been linked to the development of EI, which was linked earlier in this article to the development and enhancement of relationships in general that are the foundation upon which effective followership is based.

Maroosis (2008) concluded that when follows and leaders operate without selfish ambition and ego (selfless leadership and followership), it models a discovery process in which the teacher leads the student to be able to learn for himself or herself. In other words, the leader "does not think for them but lets their thinking and learning manifest itself in and through the way they respond to situations" (Maroosis, 2008, p. 23). Furthermore, Maroosis discovered that a disciplined follower can become so interested in learning that they are very forthcoming with their doubts, fears, and apprehension. Essentially, their job is to let the leader know what they need to learn. That allows the leader to focus on being able to address these issues rather than have to identify them first.

Implicit Followership Theories (IFTs)

Defined as an individual's personal assumptions about the traits and behaviors that characterize followers (Sy, 2010), IFTs have, as their central components, "prototypes or abstract composites of the most representative member of the most commonly shared attributes of a particular category" (Lord,

Foti, & Phillips, as cited in Sy, 2010, p. 74). Sy's research focused on common taxonomic follower prototypes (i.e., how followers are). People (leaders) will inherently compare their IFT against what they observe with a specific person (a follower). Based on the level that a person's IFT is aligned with what they observe in the other person, the resulting impression will serve to determine how the first person behaves toward the observed person.

Continuing with the exploration of the antecedents of courageous followership, IFTs have been found to be antecedents of leader and follower behaviors, affect, and cognitions (Lord & Maher, 1991). Sy's (2010) study resulted with the identification of a first-order six-factor structure of IFTs consisting of three item variables per factor (see Table 1). In addition, a second-order, two-factor structure was identified—followership prototype (industry, enthusiasm, and good citizen) and followership antiprototype (conformity, insubordination, and incompetence)—and thus established a preliminary nomological network of IFTs.

Sy's (2010) study sought to relate leader's IFTs to both follower outcomes (liking for leaders, relationship quality with leaders, trust in leaders, and job satisfaction) and leader outcomes (liking for followers and relationship quality with followers). When Sy evaluated followership prototypes and antiprototypes against follower outcomes, it was concluded that the followership prototype was positively related to all of the follower outcomes whereas antiprototypes were negatively related to all follower outcomes. The implications of IFTs come in the realm of leader evaluations of followers. A leader may more easily recognize potential in followers who fit their implicit theories of followership prototype and miss the same potential in another who does not fit. The result could be more punitive evaluations from the leader (Sy, 2010).

Here again, we see the advantage of the emotionally intelligent authentic leader. Such leaders will have the self-awareness to recognize that their IFTs can affect their judgment in such a fashion, and such awareness can be all that is needed to avoid such pitfalls. Indeed, IFTs can serve to enhance the performance of the follower as positive leader IFTs can lead to a naturally occurring Pygmalion effect whereby the expectation by the leader of increased follower performance has the self-fulfilling effect of actually increasing the performance

(Whiteley, Sy, & Johnson, 2012). Emotionally intelligent, authentic followers who have an established relationship with the leader that is based on trust will respond to this challenge through increased performance as well as increased satisfaction (Wong & Law, 2002).

LMX

Reaffirming again that the relationship between the leader and follower is at the core of effective leadership (Martin, 2013; Winston, 2012), relationship is a key component of the LMX theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Dienesch and Liden (1986) identified affect, loyalty, and contribution as dimensions of LMX, and all three would seem to be connected to the building of the relationships that have been continuously linked to creating or enhancing courageous followership. However, certain factors can influence the ability of the leader to form a relationship with his or her follower.

Whiteley et al. (2012) concluded from their research that a leader whose positive conception of the traits and behaviors of the followers can enhance the leader–follower relationship, and their finding is congruent with the results of the IFT studies discussed earlier. Schyns, Maslyn, and van Valdhoven (2010) conducted as study that specifically focused on the relation between leader–follower relationships and span-of-control. Schyns and colleagues prefaced their research with the application of attachment theory to the leader–follower relationship, offering that the security of such a relationship is associated with prosocial styles of leadership. Totterdell, Holman, and Hukin (2008) had previously concluded through their research that extraversion relates to the ability to connect with other people, an obvious part of building relationships. It is no grand surprise then that the research of Schyns et al. showed that span-of-control was less a factor in building the leader–follower relationships for extroverted and conscientious leaders.

Mayfield and Mayfield's (2009) study mentioned earlier focused on LMX and the leader's communications and actions. Their study found support for several hypotheses, particularly, that LMX is directly and positively related to (a) follower performance, (b) job satisfaction, and (c) leader motivating, and that (d) LMX mediates the relationship between motivating language used by the leader and the performance and job satisfaction of the followers. The researchers concluded that "leader-follower communication occurs within the context of a given leader-follower relationship—not simply as an independent process of leader information transmission" (p. 75). When leader communication is aligned with his or her behaviors, then motivating language/communication is effective, and an emotionally intelligent leader will exhibit moral behavior and act in a manner that considers the welfare and perspectives of the follower.

All of these studies seem to confirm what so much of the other research is telling us: that relationship is a crucial element of effective leadership, that EI is critical to the establishment of

this relationship, and that both are antecedents to followership development. But, Mayfield and Mayfield's (2009) study also offered that bad leadership behavior can neutralize good leader communication, emphasizing that good leader communication cannot occur absent a good leader–follower relationship.

Bad Leaders

Schyns and Schilling (2013) challenged the notion that leadership, as a construct, implies a positive dimension and studied the effects of bad leaders. Their look into the realm of destructive leadership focused on leader aspects or behaviors that were meant to exude a follower-targeted influence. The premise was based on Yukl's (2010) prior conclusion that leadership is not necessarily only good influence stating simply that leadership is a "process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people" (p. 2), which implies that it can be either bad or good influence.

Their results showed the expected correlation between destructive leadership and such constructs as follower outcomes and behaviors, resistance toward the leader, retention/turnover, and attitudes. Based on their study, the greatest effect on the follower was in the area of attitude, which led Schyns and Schilling (2013) to conclude that destructive leadership directly influences how the followers feel about the leader. Destructive leadership resulted in negative follower behaviors where followers not only were less productive but outright resistive toward the leader's intentions. What they observed was that followers of destructive leaders engaged in behaviors that were counterproductive to the leader's intent. Kusy and Holloway (2009) suggested that the organizational culture can foster destructive leadership (or hinder it depending on the context). Both the system dynamics and values will influence which type of leadership develops in any organization.

In a separate study, Thoroughgood, Hunter, and Sawyer (2011) utilized the toxic triangle theory (Padilla, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2007, as cited in Thoroughgood et al., 2011) to examine the effects of organizational climate, financial performance, and leader gender on follower perceptions of and reactions to a form of destructive leadership, aversive leadership. Using vignettes, the study's participants were asked to project themselves into the scenarios where they were subordinate to an aversive leader. Their findings showed a greater intolerance of aversive leaders in organizations that were financially unstable and also in those situations where the aversive leader was female. Thoroughgood and colleagues did not find support for the hypothesis that aversive leaders would be perceived as more or less so in the context of the organizational climate. Nor did organization performance influence follower perception as leaders of positively performing organizations were not perceived as more or less aversive than leaders in nonperforming organizations. From this, they concluded that destructive leadership is a "confluence of leader, follower, and environmental characteristics

consistent with the toxic triangle" (p. 661), a complex social-psychological process, and that follower perceptions and reactions to aversive leadership are not simply explained due to these complexities.

Shared and Participative Leadership and Empowerment

While the exclusion of follower-targeted influence, or the willingness to allow followers to participate in the leadership of the group or organization, was an aspect of bad leadership, shared and participative leadership styles are the opposite. They are essentially the antithesis of traditional hierarchical rank structure. As the term suggests, shared leadership allows team members to share in the leadership of the group rather than having it concentrated in the higher levels. Similar to shared leadership, participative leadership embodies the collective decision making in groups where influence is shared among followers (Koopman & Wierdsma, 1998). Shared leadership theory and participative leadership theory are relative newcomers on the scene of leadership research. Shared leadership suggests that leadership is a "dynamic, interactive influence process among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals" (Pearce & Conger, as cited in Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio, & Johnson, 2011, p. 1176). One can see quickly how, as with so many other leadership concepts, relationship plays a key role in the effectiveness of such leadership styles.

Empowerment is a concept within shared leadership (Carson, Tesluk, & Marrone, 2007) and participative leadership (Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989). Recent studies on participative leadership, in particular, have shown consistent results. Participative leadership can be motivational where the increase in follower performance is based on an increase in motivation gained through greater participation in decision making (Sashkin, 1976). There is also the exchange-based model where increased work performance is a result of the positive reciprocal relationship between the participative leader and the followers. The relationship is positive as it is generally based on trust (Blau, 1964).

Engaging in a participative leadership style, and particularly empowering followers, requires that the leader has a high level of EI that allows for the development of trust in the followers and, thus, the development of the leader–follower relationship. Huang, Iun, Liu, and Gong (2010) examined the effects of participative leadership on empowerment and trust of the followers. The study utilized follower task performance and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) to measure any potential effect of a leader's engagement in participative leadership style and attempted to determine whether any observed performance increase was due to motivational or an exchange-based participative leadership. What they found was that psychological empowerment of the followers fully mediated the link between participative leadership and follower task performance and OCB. In addition, they observed that performance and OCB was mediated by follower trust in the leader in nonmanagerial followers, which continues to support the contention offered earlier that leadership is about relationships.

A separate study on participative leadership conducted by van Dierendonck and Dijkstra (2012) seemed to reinforce the conclusions of Huang et al. (2010). Psychological empowerment played a role in the study by van Dierendonck and Dijkstra as it did in Huang et al., as their study also sought to examine the effects of empowering leaders on the performance of the followers. Their study took place at two points of time using a longitudinal study model with the same research population and evaluated follower performance and psychological empowerment at both times. They concluded that follower empowerment is related to leader empowering behaviors over time. Interestingly, though, their study also found that the influence of follower empowerment on the leader was greater than that of the leader's empowerment and therefore found no evidence of a reciprocal relation between leaders empowering behaviors and follower empowerment.

Directions for Future Research

At the end of 2011, Hernandez et al. sought to evaluate their hypothesis that all of the proposed leadership theories over the past 100 years had something to offer the field of leadership studies to form a comprehensive leadership system. They concluded that each leadership theory that they reviewed sought to answer two fundamental questions: "Where does leadership come from?" and "How is leadership transmitted?" (p. 1155). In addition, they offered that two dimensions could be used to classify all of the theories: locus and mechanism. The classification system allowed them to observe significant gaps that existed within the research in several areas: development of the follower, collective and context loci, and the affective mechanism of leadership. They concluded that, to fully understand the construct of leadership, all five identified sources of leadership (loci: leader, follower, leader–follower dyad, collective, and context) and four mechanisms (the means by which leadership is enacted: traits, behaviors, cognition, and affect) needed to be considered simultaneously. They use the illustration of the noun/subject of a sentence being the loci and the verb being the mechanism to aid in their explanation.

In looking at leadership in such a holistic manner, Hernandez et al. (2011) offered several suggestions with regard to their loci and mechanism approach to leadership. One such recommendation was using transformational leadership as the foundation of the leader–follower dyad to possibly enhance other theories of leadership such as shared leadership. For example, Hernandez and colleagues suggest that an important contributor to shared leadership could be in the development of the loci of the leader–follower relationship as transformational leadership suggests, but do so to the

point that the followers actually take charge and exhibit leadership behaviors while also challenging their leaders as the courageous follower is supposed to do.

Regarding the mechanisms of leadership, Hernandez et al. (2011) posited that the mechanism of cognition could also enhance the study, understanding, and development of the field of leadership. In shared leadership, each member should possess the knowledge, skills, and behaviors that are needed to accomplish the group and/or organizational goals to affect leadership. Thus, the success of the shared leadership role is dependent upon the level that each group member has attained in each of the listed categories, in other words, how much they have developed shared mental models.

So, while there has been considerable research conducted since Ricketson's study in 2008, there is still much research left to be done. In addition to the suggestions of Hernandez and colleagues, the studies by Schyns and Schilling (2013) and Thoroughgood et al. (2011) both suggest that continued research works to develop a comprehensive theoretical model of destructive leadership. Previous calls for additional research emphasize the need to explore leadership as multiple contextual influences rather than through a single construct or simply as a dyadic relationship (Avolio, 2007) and the empirical research post-Ricketson still calls for it (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). A plethora of additional aspects come into play in the leadership dynamic and need to be considered in future studies (follower characteristics, external contingencies, internal contingencies, cultural context, organizational structure, and social/physical distance; Groves & LaRoca, 2011).

In 2009, Avolio et al. offered suggestions for future research regarding several different leadership theories. For example, they posit that future research regarding authentic leadership theory needs to "demonstrate how authentic leadership relates to other constructs within its nomological network" (Avolio et al., 2009, p. 424). In addition, Avolio and colleagues suggest that future research examines how a leader's self-concept and/or identity is formed, is changed, and how it influences behavior (as EI seems to be such an important element of developing that self-concept, it would also seem prudent to continue to expand the research of this construct). Additionally, they suggest the focus for future leadership studies be on the cognitive processes, particularly in linking self-concept and meta-cognitive theories to leadership research. They feel that the psychological and cognitive areas of study hold much value, especially in further exploration of both charismatic and transformational leadership, and that further studies need to be conducted on the "psychological processes, mechanisms, and conditions through which charismatic and transformational leaders motivate followers to higher levels of motivation and performance" (Avolio et al., 2009, p. 429), which again seems to relate to the concept of EI.

Avolio et al. (2009) offered many additional suggestions for future research across such theories as LMX, shared leadership, complex leadership, spirituality, and leadership. With so much study having been done, it seems that leadership is still a major construct that lacks significant understanding. In the complex and integrated world of today, the cultural component adds to this need for continued study. Again, Avolio and colleagues offer suggestions in this area as well. They suggest continuation of such comprehensive cross-cultural leadership studies as Project Global Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness (GLOBE) . Because, as Avolio et al. opine, culture itself is a complex set of constructs, the future studies need to focus on levels of analysis as applied to the development of "explicitly cross-level theoretical models" (p. 439).

In any research that involves leadership, there should also be the consideration of the follower as the one cannot exist without the other. Conceivably, the more we understand one, the more we will understand the other. But research should not neglect one to focus solely on the other. Thus, there is still much work to be done to reach a true and thorough understanding of leadership.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

References

Avolio, B. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychology*, *62*, 25-33.

Avolio, B., Walumbwa, F., & Weber, T. J. (2009). *Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions* (University of Nebraska—Lincoln Management Department Faculty Publications, Paper 37). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/managementfacpub/37

Bertlett, J., Johansson, C. R., & Arvidsson, M. (2011). Employeeship concept: An interactive model of work relationships focused on leader and follower behaviors. In J. Bertlett (Ed.), *An employeeship model and its relation to psychological climate: A study of congruence in the behavior of leaders and followers* (pp. 65-85). Lund, Sweden: Department of Psychology, Lund University.

Binney, G., Wilke, G., & Williams, C. (2009). *Living leadership: A practical guide for ordinary heroes*. Harlow, UK: Prentice Hall.

Blau, P. M. (1964). Hierarchy of authority in organizations. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *73*, 453-467.

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

Carson, J. B., Tesluk, P. E., & Marrone, J. A. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*, 1217-1234.

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

Deci, E. L., Connell, J. P., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*, 580-590.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). What and why of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*, 227-268.

Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*, 527-539.

Fineman, S. (2002). *Emotion in organizations* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.

Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2005). Can you see the real me? A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *Leadership Quarterly*, *16*, 343-372.

Goleman, D. (1998, November-December). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, *76*(6), 93-102.

Goleman, D. (2000). Emotional intelligence: Issues in paradigm building. In D. Goleman & C. Cherniss (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations* (pp 13-26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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, 219-247.

Groves, K. S., & LaRoca, M. A. (2011). An empirical study of leader ethical values, transformational and transactional leadership, and follower attitudes toward corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *103*, 511-528.

Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2011). Relationships between authentic leadership, moral courage, and ethical and pro-social behaviors. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *21*, 555-578.

Harter, S. (2002). Authenticity. In C. R. Snyder & S. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 382-394). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Harvard CPL. (2009). *Barbara Kellerman on followership*. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kgLcAF5Lgq4&;feature=related

Hernandez, M., Eberly, M. B., Avolio, B. J., & Johnson, M. D. (2011). The loci and mechanisms of leadership: Exploring a more comprehensive view of leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*, 1165-1185.

Hoffman, B. J., Woehr, D. J., Maldagen-Youngjohn, R., & Lyons, B. D. (2011). Great man or great myth? A quantitative review of the relationship between individual differences and leader effectiveness. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *84*, 347-381.

Huang, X., Iun, J., Liu, A., & Gong, Y. (2010). Does participative leadership enhance work performance by inducing empowerment or trust? The differential effects on managerial and non-managerial subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*, 122-143.

Humphrey, R. H. (Ed.). (2002). Special issue on emotions and leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(5), 493-504.

Kellerman, B. (2009). *Followership: How followers are creating change and changing leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kelley, R. (1992). *The power of followership: How to create leaders people want to follower and follower who lead themselves*. New York, NY: Bantam Doubleday.

Koopman, P. L., & Wierdsma, A. F. M. (1998). Participative management. In P. J. D. Doentu, H. Thierry, & C. J. de Wolf (Eds.), *Personnel psychology: Handbook of work and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 297-324). Hove, UK: Psychology Press/Erlbaum.

Kram, K. E. (1988). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Kram, K. E. (1996). A relational approach to career development. In D. T. Hall & Associates (Eds.), *The career is dead: Long live the career* (pp. 132-157). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kusy, M., & Holloway, E. (2009). *Toxic workplace! Managing toxic personalities and their systems of power*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley.

Lester, P. B., Vogelgesang, G., Hannah, S. T., & Kimmey, T. (2010). Developing courage in followers: Theoretical and applied perspectives. In C. Pury & S. Lopez (Eds.), *The psychology of courage: Modern research on an ancient virtue* (pp. 210-245).Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., & Straus, R. (2005). Emotional intelligence, personality, and the perceived quality of social relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *35*, 641-658.

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. L. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions with performance*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.

Maroosis, J. (2008). Leadership: A partnership in reciprocal following. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff, & J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *The art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations* (pp. 17-24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Martin, R. (2013). Relationship as a core of effective leadership. *Law Enforcement Executive Forum*, 13(1), 76-88.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3-31). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Mayfield, M., & Mayfield, J. (2009). The role of leader-follower relationships in leader communication: A test using the LMX and motivating language models. *The Journal of Business Inquiry*, *8*, 65-82.

Offerman, L. R., & Scuderi, N. F. (2007). Sharing leadership. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. C. Bligh, & M. Uhl-Bein (Eds.), *Follower-centered perspectives on leadership* (pp 71-92). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Owens, B. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2012). Modeling how to grow: An inductive examination of humble leader behaviors, contingencies, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, *55*, 787-818.

Peus, C., Wesche, J. S., Streicher, B., Braun, S., & Frey, D. (2011). Authentic leadership: An empirical test of its antecedents, consequences, and mediating mechanisms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *107*, 331-348.

Reicher, S., Haslam, S. A., & Hopkins, N. (2005). Social identity and the dynamics of leadership: Leaders and followers as collaborative agents in the transformation of social reality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*, 547-568.

Ricketson, R. S. (2008). *An exploration of the relationship of leadership styles and dimensions of courageous followership* (Doctoral dissertation). Regent University, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

Sashkin, M. (1976). Changing toward participative management approaches: A model and methods. *Academy of Management Review*, *1*, 75-86.

Schyns, B., Maslyn, J. M., & van Valdhoven, P. M. (2010). Can some leaders have a good relationship with many followers? The role of personality in the relationship between leader-member exchange and span of control. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *33*, 594-606.

Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *24*, 138-158.

Sekerka, L. E., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2007). Moral courage in the workplace: Moving to and from the desire and decision to act. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, *16*, 132-149.

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*, 73-84.

Tee, E. Y. J., Paulsen, N., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2013). Revisiting followership through a social identity perspective: The role of collective follower emotion and action. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *24*, 902-918.

Thomas, D. (1990). The impact of race on managers' experiences of developmental relationships: An intra-organizational study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *11*, 479-492.

Thomas, D. (1993). Racial dynamics in cross-race developmental relationships. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *38*, 169-194.

Thor, S., & Johnson, C. (2011). Leadership, emotional intelligence and work engagement: A literature review. *Leadership & Organizational Management Journal*, *2011*, 18-58.

Thoroughgood, C. N., Hunter, S. T., & Sawyer, K. B. (2011). Bad apples, bad barrels, and broken followers? An empirical examination of contextual influences on follower perceptions and reactions to aversive leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *100*, 647-672.

Totterdell, P., Holman, D., & Hukin, A. (2008). Social networkers: Measuring and examining individual differences in propensity to connect with others. *Social Networks*, *30*, 283-296.

van Dierendonck, D., & Dijkstra, M. (2012). The role of the follower in the relationship between empowering leadership and empowerment: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *42*, E1-E20.

Van Maanen, J., & Kunda, G. (1989). Real feelings: Emotional expression and organizational culture. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *11*, 43-103.

Whiteley, P., Sy, T., & Johnson, S. K. (2012). Leaders' conceptions of followers: Implications for naturally occurring Pygmalion effects. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *23*, 822-834.

Winston, B. E. (2012). *Tabletalk: Foundations of biblical leadership* [CD]. Virginia Beach: The School of Global Leadership and Entrepreneurship, Regent University.

Wolff, S. B. (2005). *Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI): Technical manual*. Retrieved from http://www.eiconsortium.org/pdf/ECI_2_0_Technical_Manual_v2.pdf

Wong, C.-S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 243-274.

Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Author Biography

Richard Martin is an assistant professor of Criminal Justice at Keuka College in Upsate New York. He is a former police supervisor and trainer, earned his Masters in Criminal Justice from Boston University and is currently in the dissertation phase of his PhD in Organizational Leadership program at Regent University.