Developing and Validating a Measure of Transformational Followership

Noelle Baird,

Supervisor: Robertson, Jennifer L., The University of Western Ontario
Co-Supervisor: Benson, Alex J., The University of Western Ontario

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Psychology
© Noelle Baird 2023

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd

Recommended Citation
https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/9808

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact wlsadmin@uwo.ca.
Abstract

Leadership and followership are inherently interdependent, yet research has primarily focused on the unilateral influence of leaders. To advance a more balanced perspective and highlight how followers can positively contribute to the leadership process, I conceptualized and validated a measure of transformational followership. Transformational followership represents leaders’ perceptions of effective followership tendencies that enable productive, generative, and motivating engagements with and for their leader. After conducting a literature review of both followership and leadership research, I created an initial item pool which was then subjected to rigorous testing across three distinct phases. Phase 1 leveraged feedback from organizational leaders (Think Aloud Protocol; \(N = 8\)) and academics (Expert Panel Review; \(N = 8\)) to assess the content validity of this new construct. Phase 2 focused on establishing the structural validity of the transformational followership scale using two separate samples of leaders (\(N = 295\) and \(N = 327\)) recruited online through Prolific Academic. Finally, Phase 3 entailed a prospective design whereby leaders filled out the transformational followership scale with reference to one of their followers at three separate timepoints (\(N = 207\)). This third study assessed the temporal consistency of the new measure, aided in establishing an initial nomological network (i.e., follower proactivity, leader-member exchange, and leader attitudes), and tested several models positioning transformational followership as a mediator in the relation between follower behaviour and leader attitudes toward their own work. Cumulatively, these three phases of scale validation helped identify a three-factor model of transformational followership and provided strong evidence for the measurement quality of the new scale. Further, the results of Study 3 demonstrated that transformational followership acts as a link from follower proactivity to leader engagement and satisfaction. This work supports the advancement of followership research by demonstrating that followers can positively influence their leaders and provides a
psychometrically valid scale that can be used in future research aiming to capture the nature and impact of that influence.

Keywords: followership, leadership, leader-follower dynamics, scale validation
Summary for Lay Audience

Stories of leadership have captured our interest and permeated popular culture for decades. If asked to think of a famous leader, images of spellbinding orators and innovative entrepreneurs flood to the surface, and most people can easily identify a leader who has inspired them over the years. Unfortunately, followers do not receive the same recognition and their influence is grossly underestimated compared to leaders. This oversight is regrettable, as acts of both leading and following are needed for the success of any organization or team. To remedy this and achieve a more balanced perspective, the purpose of this research is to examine the positive influence of followers on leaders by conceptualizing and developing a new measure of effective followership called transformational followership.

Transformational followership represents leaders’ perceptions of followership tendencies that enable productive, generative, and motivating engagements with and for their leader. To capture this phenomenon in a scale, I first conducted a review of both the leadership and followership literature and wrote out an initial item set of 51 items. Then, I subjected this initial item pool to a series of tests that were designed to assess the degree to which the new scale adequately, accurately, and consistently captures transformational followership. With each test, items that were not strongly representative of the transformational followership concept or did not perform as intended were either revised or removed. Across three phases, the results of these tests provided robust evidence for the quality of the transformational followership measure. Additionally, the final study demonstrated that transformational followership is related to leadership outcomes such as leaders’ engagement and job satisfaction. These results support the idea that having followers who are more transformational can contribute to more positive attitudes towards leaders’ own work.
Overall, this work advances the narrative that followers are capable of influencing their leaders and enhancing their experiences at work. Further, by developing a valid, reliable scale of transformational followership, this research provides a tool for researchers and practitioners to continue to evaluate the positive impact of followers on their leaders and organizations.
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Chapter I: General Introduction

The topic of leadership has achieved perennial popularity among academics and practitioners alike (Barling et al., 2011). There are almost innumerable leadership books from which to choose, and the top five business schools in the world all include the word “leader” or “leadership” in their mission statements (Google search conducted on July 24, 2023). Further, recent academic work has highlighted the rich tradition of leadership studies, noting that scholarly interest in leadership theories has continued to grow in the new millennium (e.g., Barling, 2014; Dinh et al., 2014; Gardner et al., 2020; Lord et al., 2017). This interest in leadership is not altogether surprising, as leaders are often the powerholders in organizations. Additionally, leaders are typically tasked with managing the work of direct reports, meaning that their actions and choices at work can affect both the future of the organization and the career trajectories of their subordinates (Yukl, 2012). With this much responsibility resting on the shoulders of leaders, it is no wonder that scholars and practitioners have spent so many decades examining key questions pertinent to the selection, development, and effectiveness of organizational leaders (e.g., Day et al., 2014; Hiller et al., 2011).

Although the contributions of leaders to the success of organizations is not in question, it is important to recognize that leadership alone cannot drive the success of any enterprise. At the very least, leaders require the compliance of followers for their strategic visions to become a reality. Put simply, leadership cannot exist without followership (e.g., DeRue & Ashford, 2010). Moreover, as some organizations move toward flatter hierarchical structures and decision-making becomes increasingly complex, leaders frequently look to their followers for new insights and strategies (Latour & Rast, 2004). Taken together, the need to understand how leader-follower dynamics impact organizational life is clearly highlighted.
Unfortunately, whereas leadership research has enjoyed an illustrious tenure in organizational psychology, parallel research investigating the key contributions of followers and followership to the leadership process remains scarce (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Indeed, scholarly work has lamented the orthodoxy of leadership research, calling for an updated narrative that better represents the mutual influence of leaders and followers in the leadership process (Hughes, 2016). As such, my dissertation aims to develop a clearer understanding of how followers may contribute to the leadership process by introducing a specific form of effective followership: *transformational followership*. Transformational followership represents leaders’ perceptions of effective followership tendencies that enable productive, generative, and motivating engagements with and for their leader. It considers how followers effectively engage with their leaders and, as such, combines followership literature and theory with leadership research to contribute to a more holistic prospective on effective followership.
Chapter II: Support and Justification for the Transformational Followership Concept

The transformational followership concept hinges on the notion that followers are capable of positively influencing their leader\(^1\). In this way, it is aligned with the “reversing the lens” framework, which proposes that leaders are the recipients of a follower’s influence (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Although there has been extensive investigation into a leader’s capacity to influence their followers (e.g., through transformational behaviours), far less research attention has been given to the upward influence from the follower to the leader. Nevertheless, several scholars have championed the importance of followership in organizations and there has been a trend towards more inclusive approaches to leadership that acknowledges and encourages employee contributions (e.g., Chen et al., 2020). Among the first to champion the potential of followers to make a positive impact in organizations, Robert Kelley (1992) proposed that followers could demonstrate both independent critical thought and active engagement. These followers are effective in their role, require little direction from their leader, and do not shy away from providing constructive feedback for their leader when they feel it is needed (Kelley, 1992).

Not long after Kelley, Ira Chaleff (1995) created his courageous follower model, which similarly assumed that followers are not merely meant to serve leaders but to work with them to serve a common purpose. Courageous followership strikes a balance between taking calculated risks (e.g., challenging a leader and taking initiative) and supporting the success of the leader.

---

\(^1\) This dissertation will discuss topics related to leadership, followership, influence, authority, and power. Though these terms are related, they are conceptually distinct. First, I use the terms “leader” and “follower” to denote specific organizational roles, “leading/following” refers to separate sets of role-specific behaviours, and “leadership/followership” refers to the process of leaders and followers acting in relation to one another (see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Power is defined as disproportionate control over resources (Magee & Galinsky, 2008) whereas authority refers to the potential to influence based on position (Bennis et al., 1958). Thus, power has to do with comparative control over resources whereas authority has more to do with the legitimacy of one’s attempts to control those resources. Finally, influence refers to the ability to affect an outcome, behaviour, or state. In the case of leaders and followers, power and authority are directly related to the hierarchical role occupied by each party (i.e., leaders have more power and authority over followers). The degree to which a person is influential can be related to power and authority, however, influence is connected to an outcome and can be enacted by anyone.
These followers enthusiastically back the leader while critically assessing the leader’s decisions and providing honest feedback if they feel a costly mistake is eminent. According to Chaleff, the willingness to speak out when needed enhances followers’ instrumentality but may be riskier in terms of winning the leader’s favour compared to those who simply implement the leaders’ instructions. Therefore, followers must be careful to balance their challenges with high-support behaviours to reassure the leader that the follower has their leader’s best interests in mind.

**Evidence Supporting the Influence of Followers on Leaders**

Kelley and Chaleff’s work expanded our conceptions of the follower role and popularized a new way of thinking about followers as having the potential to partner and collaborate with their leaders. However, this work mostly served the purpose of defining and describing effective followership rather than proposing and empirically testing models of how or why this style of followership may influence leaders and organizations in a positive way. The following paragraphs summarize theoretical and empirical evidence supporting the capacity of followers to be influential in the leader-follower relationship, which provides a basis for conceptualizing and defining the nature and impact of transformational followers on leaders.

**Powers of Persuasion: Upward Influence Tactics**

Scholars have theorized that individual followers can enhance their influence in several ways, including a) increasing their personal power, b) reducing the perceived social distance between themselves and the leader, and c) engaging in persuasive or supportive behaviours (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). The notion of personal power relates to French and Raven’s (1959) concept of referent power, which describes the degree to which the leader is attracted to and identifies with the follower. Essentially, referent power reflects the followers’ interpersonal skills. Followers who possess the interpersonal skills to endear themselves to a leader and earn their
admiration (i.e., high personal power) are more likely to be influential than followers with lower personal power (Oc & Bashshur, 2013).

Social distance refers to the perceived differences in rank, social standing, and status. There is not much followers can do about their positional rank, but they can subjectively close the gap between themselves and the leader by helping the leader to see them on more equal grounds. The success of this influence strategy is undoubtedly impacted by a leader’s inclination to see their followers as collaborators, but followers may also have the power to affect a leader’s willingness to do so. In support of this, leaders are more willing to name members as “assistants” and share authority with their followers if those followers can demonstrate competence and dependability (e.g., Danserou et al., 1975).

Finally, persuasion tactics as well as support for the leader may affect the amount of social influence followers have over leaders. In this case, support refers to acceptance of another’s viewpoint, whereas persuasion refers to the tendency to challenge or attempt to change someone else’s position or actions (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). Strategies for persuading or otherwise influencing others at work are often classified using Kipnis and Schmidt’s (1982) taxonomy. The target of the influence attempt can be one’s subordinates (i.e., downward influence), coworkers (i.e., lateral influence), or supervisor (i.e., upward influence). Influence strategies can be broken down into six categories of behaviour: rationality (i.e., appealing to the person’s sense of reason), ingratiation (i.e., flattery or opinion conformity), exchange/bargaining (i.e., offering something in return for what is desired), assertiveness (i.e., direct attempts to overpower the target), coalition (i.e., enlisting the support of others), and upward appeal (i.e., making formal requests to higher-ups). Research evidence appears to support the effectiveness of using rational influence tactics when attempting to influence one’s supervisor (e.g., Thacker & Wayne, 1995; Yukl &
Tracey, 1992); however, consistent research evidence for the efficacy of the remaining categories in upward influence attempts is lacking. This may be because the power dynamics between leaders and followers make it such that upward influence attempts must be conducted with a delicate hand (Waldron, 1999).

Following this line of thought, an important caveat to consider is that followers’ attempts to gain influence may not always be received positively by the leader (e.g., Frese & Fay, 2001). In formal organizations, leader and follower roles are organized hierarchically such that the leader is positioned above the follower. By this account, leaders have a higher ranking, affording them greater decision-making power, authority, and access to rewards and information compared to followers (e.g., Katz & Khan, 1978). Followership inherently involves deference to a leader (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), and as a result, leaders hold the expectation that their followers will fulfill their directives and respect the authority structure that exists between them and their followers (Katz & Khan, 1978). As such, engaging in role-appropriate influence behaviours that will not be construed as threatening to the leader represents a key consideration for followers (Oc & Bashshur, 2013).

**Great Expectations: Implicit Followership Theories and Leader Perceptions of Followership**

The need for followers to strategically approach influence attempts in role-appropriate ways highlights the importance of considering how leaders expect their followers to behave. Implicit follower theories (IFTs; e.g., Sy, 2010) examine the integral role of leaders’ and followers’ perceptions of one another in the dyadic relationship. IFTs can be classified in terms of a follower prototype and antiprototype. The follower prototype reflects the image of a follower who is industrious, enthusiastic, and prosocial whereas the follower antiprototype describes a follower who is incompetent, insubordinate, and conformist. Research examining how leaders’
IFTs affect their perceptions of their actual followers has found that congruence between the leader’s prototypical IFT and their ratings of their actual follower relate to higher leader ratings of relationship quality and in-role performance (Goswami et al., 2020). Further, leaders who hold more positive IFTs are more likely to become mentors and engage in a productive way with their direct reports compared to leaders with less positive IFTs (Yip & Walker, 2021). Finally, research suggests that IFTs are not necessarily static, and that followers’ behaviour and personality affects their leader’s IFTs over time (Goswami et al., 2022). Taken together, there is evidence that the preconceptions leaders have about followership affect the way they interact with their followers depending on the degree to which follower behaviours and characteristics align with expectations.

**Holding up the Mirror: Followers as Indicators of Leadership Effectiveness**

Research on IFTs demonstrates that leaders evaluate follower behaviour against pre-established schemas. Scholars have also suggested that leaders use follower behaviours as a litmus test to judge their own effectiveness. Howell and Shamir (2005) posited that followers empower their leaders to be charismatic through their reactions to the leader’s behaviour. By endorsing the leader and providing their support and feedback, leaders are given the power to perform their role. Therefore, leaders are dependent on followers’ support and positive reactions to do their job (Hollander & Offerman, 1990). Because an important part of a leader’s role is managing the work of their direct reports, the way followers react to leader behaviour towards them serves as a form of performance feedback for leaders. Therefore, followers may be able to shape a leader’s behaviour through both positively endorsing a leader’s actions (Hollander & Offerman, 1990) and explicit feedback (Oc et al., 2015).
The notion that leaders may look to followers’ reactions to assess their own leadership effectiveness is reflective of the fundamental interdependence of leadership and followership. Put simply, leadership cannot exist without followership, and even one who thinks of themselves as a leader and who has a supervisory/managerial role in the organization cannot be considered a leader unless their claim to leadership is met with follower granting behaviors (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). That is, influence attempts by a leader must be met with deference and acceptance of that influence in order for “leadership” to occur. As such, when investigating the influence of leaders and/or followers, it is necessary to recognize how the interrelatedness of these roles impacts the influence they have on one another.

**Chosen Ones: The Role of Followers in Leader-Member Exchange Theory**

Scholars have investigated the dyadic exchange relationship that exists between leaders and follower in Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX). LMX has origins in vertical dyad linkage (VDL; Dansereau Jr et al., 1975; Liden & Graen, 1980) theory, which challenges the notion that all leaders use the same style regardless of the situation. Instead, VDL proposes a differentiated leadership model whereby the superior privileges certain members with increased responsibility and latitude (Dansereau Jr et al., 1975). In theory, those members who have been chosen by their superior to take on more extra-role duties and contribute to important unit outcomes will reciprocate by showing enhanced commitment to the unit and its success. Members are chosen based on their perceived dependability and their willingness to take on extra work (Liden & Graen, 1980). A leader will only invest their time and resources into followers that they can trust to take on extra responsibility.

The nature of the superior-member relationship as described by VDL is defined in terms of an exchange. Individuals in the “in-group” have a social exchange relationship with their
superior that is marked by mutual support and obligation, whereas the “out-group” has more of an economic exchange relationship with the superior that is characterized by the exchange of goods and services (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). With its roots in exchange theory, the VDL concept evolved into LMX which incorporates the same notions of differentiation and social exchange, but later evolved further to incorporate perceptions of relationship quality. LMX centers on the idea that the development and maintenance of mature leader-member relationships yields effective leadership and rewards for both parties. Further, high quality relationships are said to involve the exchange of valued resources and emotional support between leaders and members (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

In LMX theory, these relationships are developed by moving through a series of phases. In the initial stages of the relationships, leaders and members get to know one another in terms of personal characteristics. A leader will then give members assignments and use their assessment of how they handle the tasks to further inform their opinions of each member (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Research has shown that members who are highly capable and competent are more likely to form high-quality relationships with their leaders (e.g., Liden et al., 1997). Although member characteristics and behaviours play a role in determining relationship quality, a leader has the most control over how the relationship progresses. They need to perceive members favorably to feel comfortable giving them more latitude and responsibility (Dansereau Jr et al., 1975). Studies have focused less on leader characteristics that affect LMX development, but there is evidence of similarity or matching predicting LMX, such that leaders and members who perceive themselves as being similar report more liking and subsequently more LMX (e.g., Liden et al., 1997). Further, meta-analytic evidence suggests that leader expectations of a follower
explain the most variance in LMX quality, further underscoring the importance of leader perceptions in these exchange relationships (Dulebohn et al., 2012).

**Critiques and Caveats for LMX.** LMX is a relational leadership theory, meaning it recognizes leadership as a relational process that is co-created by both the leader and the follower (Fairhurst & Uhl-Bien, 2012). As such, research supporting this theory should provide evidence for the influence of leaders and followers in the development and maintenance of high-quality exchange relationships. However, LMX theory is still biased toward the leader as the primary driver of these relationships (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Specifically, the formation of the relationship is described as dependent on the leader’s willingness to form a relationship with each follower based on their time, resources, and perceptions of a follower’s utility (e.g., Dienesch & Liden, 1986). Although followers’ ability to demonstrate their competence and responsibility to a leader is theorized to play a part in which followers a leader chooses to form high-quality exchange relationships with (e.g., Liden et al., 1997), this perspective still casts the leader as the gatekeeper and the followers as those who must wait for an invitation to the “inner circle”. Furthermore, the majority of LMX studies focus almost exclusively on follower outcomes (e.g., member satisfaction, commitment, and turnover intentions; Dulebohn et al., 2012; Gerstner & Day, 1997).

Indeed, LMX theory has been scrutinized on conceptual and methodological grounds for its failure to accurately describe and represent the reciprocal nature of the leader-follower exchange relationship. Critics of the theory have pointed out that the concept lacks a clear definition, and its theoretical underpinnings in social exchange theory are questionable (Gottfredson et al., 2020). Further, as the most common measures of LMX focus on follower perceptions of the quality of their relationship with the leader, the measurement is not aligned with the dyadic
origins of the theory. Therefore, even though LMX purports to examine a mutual influence relationship where both parties engage in a social exchange, this perspective is not reflected in current measures of LMX.

There are still valuable insights to be gleaned from the LMX literature, particularly the early theorizing about how leader-member exchange relationships develop. The notion that leaders may develop high quality relationships with members that they like and who they perceive to be strong performers is a useful starting point for considering how followers may be able to influence both their leaders and their outcomes at work. There is evidence that followers who engage in self-promotion tactics (Dulebohn et al., 2012) and take charge in their roles (Xu et al., 2019) can positively influence the quality of the relationship they have with their leader. Further, followers who engage in supervisor-focused influence tactics (e.g., praise and favours) may be able to win over their supervisors and positively affect the quality of their exchange relationships with them (Wayne & Ferris, 1990). Therefore, it is clear from this literature that followers have the capacity to influence the perceived quality of their relationships, but our knowledge of how this influence works in the context of a mutual exchange relationship has been limited by primarily focusing on the follower’s perspective of their relationship quality.

Summarizing the above, followers can do things to actively influence their leader without overstepping the boundaries of the follower role. Further, this research supports the idea that leaders are paying attention to the social information they receive from followers and using it to adjust their behaviour towards and perceptions of those followers. Transformational followership builds on these ideas by examining the leader’s perceptions of followers’ effective tendencies as a driver of collaborative and generative work engagements.

**Justification for the Transformational Followership Concept**
Despite a robust collection of evidence to support the capability of followers to positively influence their leader, followership scholars have yet to systematically investigate how followers effectively engage with leaders (Carsten et al., 2018). Indeed, calls to advance a balanced perspective of the leadership process whereby leaders and followers act as co-creators have remained unanswered for decades (e.g., Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). This is troublesome for several reasons. First, studying leadership from a primarily leader-centric perspective misses out on meaningful variance that can only be accounted for by including the follower. Research has supported the benefits of measuring both leadership and followership when studying group dynamics. For example, team followership but not leadership acts as a buffer against team conflict states (Baird & Benson, 2022). Second, though it may seem somewhat counterintuitive at first, neglecting followership actually limits a true understanding of leadership. That is, as followership research examines the characteristics, behaviours and processes of individuals acting in relation to leaders, ignoring this perspective creates a blind spot in our understanding of how leaders perceive, respond to, and engage with their followers (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). This is especially concerning considering the fundamental interdependence of leadership and followership. Indeed, if leaders rely on their followers’ deference to enact their role (Howell & Shamir, 2005) and use followers’ reactions as performance feedback (Hollander & Offerman, 1990), then failing to understand how leaders appraise and subsequently act on the social information they receive from followers results in an incomplete understanding of leadership. Thus, my dissertation aims to fill in this gap by positioning followers as active contributors to the leadership process and examining the impact of those contributions on leaders’ experiences at work.
In addition to the lack of programmatic inquiry into how effective followers partner and engage with their leaders, a thorough search of the literature reveals that there are very few validated measures of followership (see Table 1). Further, the instrument most frequently used to measure followership styles in empirical research, the Kelley Followership Questionnaire (KFQ; Kelley, 1992), was originally designed to help followers determine their style for developmental purposes in organizations, and therefore, was not evaluated on the accepted standards of scale development (e.g., Hinkin, 1998). Indeed, the suspect reliability and validity of the measure has been noted in the literature (Ligon et al. 2019), calling to question the continued use of this questionnaire in psychological research.

Several scales for measuring employee attitudes and behaviours have been applied in a followership context (e.g., proactive personality has been used to measure proactive followership), but these were not derived from followership theory, nor were they designed with the intention of measuring followership specifically. In their definition of followership, Uhl-Bien and colleagues (2014) carefully distinguished between followership and employee behaviours, stating “followership is the characteristics, behaviors and processes of individuals acting in relation to leaders. It is not general employee behavior. This means that the term follower is not the same as employee” (p. 96). These theoretical boundaries should, therefore, be upheld in the conceptualization and measurement of any new followership constructs. Further, although insights can certainly be drawn from empirical work that examines employee behaviours at work, these studies cannot serve as a substitute for investigating followership. Indeed, scholars have posited that placing constructs designed to measure general employee behaviour in followership contexts (e.g., employee voice) may contribute to mixed research results, as such constructs fail to account for the nuances of engaging in these behaviours in relation to leaders
(Carsten et al., 2018). This distinction between employee behaviour and followership highlights the need to develop and empirically measure followership constructs that consider the relational context between leaders and followers.

The clear theoretical and empirical evidence for the influence of followers on their leaders, combined with the limited availability of validated followership measures, highlights the value of developing and validating a new followership measure. As such, through my dissertation I seek to: a) conceptualize a new type of effective followership, namely *transformational followership*, and therefore, offer a novel theory-driven approach to examine this style of followership; b) develop and validate a measure of transformational followership that can be used in future research and in practice by organizations, and; c) understand how transformational followership may impact leaders and the leadership process more broadly, thereby providing a more complete understanding of leader-follower dynamics.
Chapter III: Conceptualizing and Defining Transformational Followership

*Transformational followership* represents leaders’ perceptions of effective followership tendencies that enable productive, generative, and motivating engagements with and for their leader. To conceptualize this construct, I draw on the leadership process model (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). The leadership process model asserts that leadership is created through the interactions of leaders and followers with one another. That is, “leadership can only occur through combined acts of leading and following” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014; p. 99). As shown in Figure 1, leading and following behaviours intersect to form “leadership”. This product of their mutual efforts subsequently leads to other outcomes. The use of the suffix “-ing” (i.e., leading and following) is intentional to allow for the inclusion of individuals who are not in formal hierarchical roles, however, process-based approaches such as the leadership process model can be effectively combined with position-based views to make predictions about how patterns of leading and following work together to create a leadership relationship (Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018).

My dissertation takes this combined approach by recognizing leading and following as sets of behaviours that can be prescribed to formal hierarchical roles. This approach recognizes that to effectively co-produce leadership, a follower may need to contribute ideas and suggestions as well as potentially challenge the leader if needed. This need not be a claim to leadership and can be done in the context of a follower identity. This is important in developing the transformational followership concept, as it demonstrates that one can claim the follower role for themselves, grant the leader role to another, and still actively contribute to the process of leadership (Uhl-Bien & Carsten, 2018).

**Insights from Transformational Leadership Theory**
In conceptualizing transformational followership, I considered how the follower role might complement and augment the leader role to co-produce “leadership”, as outlined in the leadership process model. This notion is also aligned with the transforming leadership paradigm originated by Burns (1978), which described a form of leadership whereby leaders and followers elevate each other to higher levels of motivation and morality. Transformational leadership theory originated with Burns’ (1978) concept of transforming leadership but was extended to the organizational context by Bass (1985). Transformational leaders elevate and empower their followers to higher levels of achievement, consider their needs, and help them to develop into leaders themselves (Bass & Riggio, 2006). They do so by employing one or more of the following four components. Idealized influence describes the leader’s capacity to act as a role model for their followers. They may achieve this through personal qualities (attributes) and behaviours that followers wish to emulate. Inspirational motivation refers to the leader’s ability to energize their followers by enthusiastically communicating their vision. Through inspirational motivation, transformational leaders work to align follower efforts with organizational goals by fostering a sense of team spirit and purpose. Intellectual stimulation reflects the actions taken by the leader to challenge their followers to think differently and innovatively about problems. In giving followers the leeway to explore their creativity and find new solutions to old problems, transformational leaders help followers to realize their potential and grow as thinkers. Finally, transformational leaders demonstrate individualized consideration when they take the unique needs of their followers into account. This approach helps establish a mentor-mentee relationship between the transformational leader and their followers. Additionally, it helps followers to feel that they are being recognized and appreciated as individuals rather than a “cog in the machine” (Bass & Riggio, 2006).
It is through these four types of behaviours that transformational leaders are theorized to positively impact follower outcomes. Indeed, the literature robustly supports the transformational leadership-follower performance relation across a variety of contexts, including military (e.g., Dvir et al., 2002), sports (e.g., Charbonneau et al., 2001), and organizations (e.g., Breevaart et al., 2014). Moreover, transformational leadership has been linked to other positive follower outcomes, such as follower job satisfaction (Braun et al., 2013), psychological well-being (Arnold et al., 2007), and organizational commitment (Avolio et al., 2004). Research has also examined why transformational leadership behaviours are so effective at influencing follower outcomes. One possible explanation is that followers incorporate the transformational leader into their own identity (i.e., the identification mechanism; e.g., Kark et al., 2003), while others have suggested need fulfillment as a potential mechanism (Breevaart et al., 2014).

Despite recent conceptual and psychometric critiques of the theory (Van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013), transformational leadership has cemented its status as one of the most prominent and widely used leadership theories (e.g., Barling, 2014; Dinh et al., 2014; Gardner et al., 2020; Lord et al., 2017). Its popularity with both practitioners and academics is not surprising, as a core element of the theory is the notion that transformational leaders contribute above and beyond what would be considered “good leadership” (i.e., the augmentation hypothesis; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Given the cultural obsession with leaders, it makes sense that people would want to know what it takes to become an exceptional leader. Additionally, there is evidence to support the notion that transformational leadership can be taught (e.g., Barling et al., 1996), which only serves to enhance its popularity by making transformational leadership seemingly more accessible to the everyday leader. In other words, by learning to deploy behaviours pertinent to the four categories of transformational leadership, any leader can be transformational. In this
way, the theory departs from the so-called ‘Great Man’ theories of the past (e.g., Carlyle, 1907) by claiming that leaders can in fact be made (Barling et al., 2011), but it maintains the elevated status of the leader as a great and powerful figure at the helm of the ship.

Since followership researchers have yet to investigate the degree to which followers can be transformational (i.e., motivate their leaders to be better; improving their leader’s experience at work), I draw inspiration from the transformational leadership construct to help conceptualize the transformational followership construct. Specifically, I synthesized literature pertaining to leadership (i.e., transformational leadership and LMX) with followership research to determine which behaviours and characteristics enable the follower to be seen as transformational by their leader, and thereby open them up to being influenced by their follower. Further, as leadership and followership are distinct sets of role-specific tendencies, I draw on concepts from the leader process model to inform what considerations need to be made so that these behaviours are accepted by the leader as attempts to co-produce leadership outcomes and not as attempts to stray from the boundaries of the leader-follower power relationship.

I propose that leaders can be influenced by their followers in a way that empowers, elevates, and motivates them. The nature of this positive influence can be categorized into the following four dimensions.

**Idealized Influence**

Idealized influence describes a transformational leader’s ability to serve as a role model for their followers. This can be achieved by demonstrated high ethical standards and acting in the service of the organization and their team (Bass & Riggio, 2006). By observing the superior example set by their leader, followers seek to emulate those behaviours in their own work.
Further, these qualities and behaviours are said to engender trust and help transformational leaders earn the respect of colleagues and followers.

The concept of being a role model is more suited to the leader role than the follower role, as leaders are often seen as spokespeople for their organizations (Yukl, 2012). Moreover, followers often look to their leaders for guidance on how to act, making *idealized influence* an important leadership quality for developing followers who care about their organization and their team. Although it is unlikely that a leader would similarly view their followers as an example for how they should behave at work, followers can still model ideal behaviours. Leaders often set the tone and provide strategic direction for their unit or team, but they are reliant on their followers to work towards the collective goals they set (e.g., Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015; Morgeson et al., 2010). As such, having followers who exemplify collective values and embody a ‘team-player’ mindset is an asset for leaders (e.g., Benson et al., 2016), as such behaviours are critical for unit success. Further, having followers who role-model ideal behaviours for other followers may serve to establish or reinforce desirable behavioural norms.

Leaders may also admire and respect their followers for what they bring to the table. Research has shown that individuals can gain status and respect by demonstrating expertise in a valued domain (i.e., prestige; Cheng et al., 2013). Therefore, followers may be able to earn the admiration of their leaders by displaying a mastery of the skills required for their role. Indeed, competence is one of the most important characteristics of an effective follower (Agho, 2009), and has been shown to positively impact the exchange relationships followers develop with their leaders (e.g., Liden et al., 1997). Further, according to Sy’s (2010) IFT model, prototypical followership requires that the follower be hardworking, productive, and goes above and beyond
what is asked of them. As such, these qualities are likely to be important for a follower to establish themselves as a valuable contributor to the leadership process.

Although leaders value a competent follower, seeing their followers excel may be perceived as a threat to some leaders. As a result, followers must be cautious not to overstep the boundaries of their role when they are engaging in these mastery displays. To help mitigate concerns about “trying to take the leader’s place”, it is also necessary for followers to demonstrate their dedication to the leader, their team, and the organization. Scholarly work supports this claim, demonstrating that leaders prefer followers who are proactive in their roles but also seek to promote collective outcomes (Benson et al., 2016). This can be achieved through demonstrations of dependability (Agho, 2009) and loyalty (Sy, 2010), as well as contributing meaningfully to goals that benefit the group (Benson et al., 2016). This combination of individual mastery and endorsement of communal goals is likely to help followers effectively navigate a complex partnership with their leaders and earn a reputation for contributing positively to leadership and team objectives.

Thus, idealized influence describes the qualities and behaviours that make a leader want to work with a particular follower and perceive them as more transformational. The leader perceives them as competent in their role and admires them interpersonally.

**Partnership (Individualized Consideration in Transformational Leadership)**

Transformational leaders see each of their followers as individuals with their own set of needs and skills. This can help followers to feel recognized by their leader and is also related to the mentorship aspect of transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006). It is typical in formal organizations for leaders to have several followers whose work they manage (Katz & Khan, 1978), and therefore, when a leader takes the time to recognize the uniqueness of their
followers, it can leave a significant impression. The reverse is less impactful, given that followers likely report to one or perhaps two leaders on a regular basis. However, high-quality relationships (i.e., LMX) between leaders and followers should theoretically benefit both parties, although the outcomes are mainly studied from the follower perspective. Research has also shown that mentors experience personal and career-related benefits from their mentoring relationships (see Eby, 2011). Taken together, these perspectives suggest that leaders’ experiences at work can be positively affected by the relationships they have with their followers.

As with the previous section, followers wishing to develop these rewarding relationships with leaders likely must balance agentic and communal behaviours. In his taxonomy, Chaleff (1995) described followers who were able to effectively balance challenging and supporting their leader as “partners”. Building on this notion, followers who can speak up when needed but show that they are there for the leader may be more likely to build positive and collaborative relationships with their leaders. Such “partnerships” are also likely facilitated by positive interpersonal dynamics, such as mutual liking (e.g., Dulebohn et al., 2012). Following from this, partnership is characterized by establishing strong working and interpersonal relationships with their leader through open communication and collaboration.

**Intellectual Stimulation**

An important part of transformational leadership is building the critical thinking capacity of followers via *intellectual stimulation*. Transformational leaders who provide feedback and challenge their followers’ way of thinking are viewed as providing a developmental experience for their followers, however, the identical behaviour from the follower could easily be perceived as insubordination (Falbe & Yukl, 1992). Despite the risks associated with offering different
perspectives to the leader or providing constructive feedback, research has demonstrated that these behaviors can have positive effects if done correctly. For example, followers who engage in more voice behaviour and less upward delegation are viewed by the leader as positive contributors to both the leader’s own motivation and the goals of the group (Carsten et al., 2018). As stated previously, an important caveat to consider is the context in which these behaviours are enacted. Indeed, proactive behaviour is more likely to be rewarded when a leader believes themselves to be responsible for the constructive changes that result from these behaviours (Fuller et al., 2015).

Research has also shown that followers can prompt leaders to think about their own self-serving behaviour by providing candid feedback (Oc et al., 2015). Further, in one longitudinal study, leaders who received follower feedback that was not congruent with their self-ratings subsequently made improvements to reduce the discrepancy in ratings (Atwater et al., 1995). Collectively, this research demonstrates that leaders do take their followers’ suggestions into account when evaluating their own behaviour at work and that attempts to voice opinions may be accepted positively if they are perceived to help the group or to be in service of the leader.

As such, intellectual stimulation involves encouraging their leader to consider alternative viewpoints and providing suggestions that will help the leader/group. The follower adds value and insights the leader may not have previously thought of.

**Inspirational Motivation**

Inspirational motivation refers to the ability of transformational leaders to encourage collective action and commitment to shared goals. They do this by articulating a compelling vision for the future and fostering a sense of excitement and team spirit around these visions (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Although articulating a vision is strictly a leader behaviour, followers
may be able to motivate their leaders through alternative means. For example, Kelley’s (1992) typology includes a dimension that reflects active engagement whereas Sy’s IFTs (2010) include adjectives such as excited and outgoing. Although these qualities and behaviours have yet to be tested in the context of leader motivation, previous work has suggested that leaders use follower reactions to assess how they are doing as leaders, and this empowers leaders to become transformational (Howell & Shamir, 2005). As such, followers’ outward expressions of engagement and enthusiasm may serve to motivate the leader and help them to feel more confident performing in their own roles.

Thus, through inspirational motivation, leaders feel inspired and energized by their working relationship with their follower. The follower’s enthusiasm and personal investment in the work being done encourages the leader to work harder to achieve the objectives they work on with their follower. They want to be the best leader they can be because they feel the follower has given them their best.

Although the four dimensions of transformational followership were created to represent separate indicators of effectiveness, it is anticipated that the factors will be mutually reinforcing and are likely to co-occur in highly effective followers. This is aligned with research that has found high inter-factor correlations in measures of transformational leadership, leading many researchers to adopt a global approach to measuring transformational leadership (e.g., Rubin et al., 2005) and its extensions (e.g., Beauchamp et al., 2010; Robertson & Barling, 2013). As such, it is likely that transformational followership may also be appropriately represented as a global construct.

**Distinction from Transformational Leadership**
Although this construct was inspired by transformational leadership, it is *not* simply performing transformational leadership from a follower role. To elaborate on this distinction, consider the following points: First, leadership and followership serve different functions within the organization. For example, leaders in formal positions of power (e.g., someone in a supervisory or manager role) are responsible for planning, envisioning change, developing others, and making sure tasks are completed (Yukl, 2012). Followers, on the other hand, are responsible for fulfilling the tasks and duties specified by the leader and helping their leader to advance organizational initiatives (Agho, 2009). Conceptualizations of transformational leadership reflect the superior performance of some of the key leadership functions listed above (e.g., communicating a compelling strategic vision and mentoring direct reports), and therefore, transformational followership should reflect skillful execution of the unique set of followership functions (e.g., competently fulfilling directives and making meaningful contributions to help their leader).

Second, having a follower perform the same transformational behaviours as their leader is at best redundant and at worst detrimental to both parties. Leadership and followership represent complementary sets of behaviours. For example, leaders initiate structure whereas followers perform to the best of their ability within the framework set by the leader (e.g., Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2015). This hierarchical division of labour contributes to a more efficient and coordinated workflow by clarifying the expectations of each party (e.g., Halevy et al., 2011). Further, it has been suggested that redundancies in the skills and expertise of members of a work unit can create conflict (e.g., Aime et al., 2014) and reduce unit effectiveness (e.g., Groysberg et al., 2011). Taken together, it is not only necessary but ideal to conceptualize transformational leadership and followership as separate but complementary entities.
Transformational leaders help followers achieve their career goals and develop into leaders themselves through mentoring, providing opportunities for creative problem solving, communicating high expectations, and setting a positive example (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transformational followership similarly involves elevating the target’s performance and experiences at work; however, they achieve this through different means. For example, followers may do so by exceeding the expectations set by their leader, offering novel perspectives that may help the leader in their own role, showing confidence in the leaders’ decisions, and working to build a mutually beneficial rapport with their leader. These followership behaviours are predicted to mitigate leaders’ stress around having to manage one’s own workload and worrying about the behaviour-management of direct reports. In addition, transformational followership is hypothesized to help leaders feel greater confidence in and excitement about the potential of the initiatives they work on together because the leader feels confident in the work they do with that follower and values their contributions.

A Note on Endogeneity and Critiques of Transformational Leadership

In addition to taking pains to ensure conceptual distinctiveness of transformational leadership and followership, I also attempted to address the issue of endogeneity in the development of the new measure. Broadly, the endogeneity problem is said to occur when the independent (x) variable is driven by the same forces as the dependent (y) variables but is still treated theoretically as an exogenous predictor. This creates inaccuracy in the specification of cause-and-effect relationships, as any observed relations between x and y could be changed entirely if the unmodeled causes that affect both variables are subsequently factored in (Antinokas et al., 2014). For example, a researcher may observe a negative relation between employee satisfaction and turnover intentions and conclude that happier employees are less
likely to leave the organization. Though this argument seems sound on its face, it is likely that both satisfaction and turnover intentions could be affected by other variables such as employee disposition or relationships with one’s supervisor. If these factors were then included in the model where employee satisfaction predicts turnover intentions, the relationship could change, calling to question the validity of the original conclusion.

Clearly, the endogeneity problem poses a notable threat to organizational field research as many of the variables commonly used as predictors are likely not truly exogenous (i.e., independent and varying randomly). To address the issues that arise when erroneously labeling endogenous variables as independent predictors, I define transformational followership as an endogenous variable that captures the impact (i.e., perception of effectiveness) of the follower on their leader. Thus, this construct is not a measure of follower behaviour but rather an assessment of how followers’ behaviours and characteristics affect their leader. Clarifying the theoretical cause and effect relationship in my conceptualization of transformational followership is, in part, a response to critiques of charismatic-transformational leadership theory (e.g., van Knipenberg & Sitkin, 2013). Specifically, scholars have condemned charismatic-transformational leadership theory for confounding behavioural and attributional models of leadership, noting that such conflations muddy the construct and limit meaningful advancement of the theory. That is, measuring leader behaviours that are already assumed to be effective and then relating them to other effectiveness outcomes provides little useful information, according to van Knipenberg and Sitkin (2013). However, this does not necessarily mean that there is no value in measuring attributions of effectiveness. Both exogenous predictors and endogenous outcome variables are needed for the evaluation of different systems of variables in organizational research. As such, the key takeaway for future leadership and followership research is to be specific and clear on
where constructs fit within the causal chain and develop measures that are consistent with these theoretical definitions.

With this in mind, I categorize transformational followership as an attribution of effectiveness from the leader. Conceptualizing transformational followership in this way is aligned with Burns’ (1978) idea of transforming leadership, where “leaders and followers help each other to advance to a higher level of morale and motivation” (p. 20). That is, it is the arrival at a higher level of achievement that signifies a transformational leader/follower relation (i.e., the effect). The decision to focus on a measure of influence rather than defining specific behaviours is two-fold. First, and most importantly, the impetus for this dissertation was a desire to investigate the influence of followers on their leaders. For so long it has been assumed that only leaders can have a significant impact on their followers’ performance and attitudes at work. Not only does this one-sided evaluation of leader-follower dynamics limit our understanding of both parties, but it also fails to accurately represent the crucial role of followers in co-producing leadership. As such, the direct evaluation of this influence through the development of the transformational leadership scale is the primary goal of the current research. Second, although the current scale would have the advantage of being developed through the lens of followership theory, the development of a new behavioural measure is likely to be redundant with several existent behavioural measures that have been previously applied in a followership context (e.g., follower proactivity).
Chapter IV: Initial Development of the Transformational Followership Scale

My doctoral dissertation leverages guidance from Clark and Watson (2019) and Hinkin’s (1998) methods of scale development and validation. According to these guidelines, scale construction should begin with a comprehensive view of the literature. This step is arguably the most critical, as it lays the foundation for all subsequent stages. A thorough review of the literature is also necessary to ensure a strong theoretical understanding (Hinkin, 1998) and that the construct is well articulated and not already represented by other well-established scales (Clark & Watson, 2019). With these guidelines in mind, I conducted a thorough review of both the followership and leadership literature to accurately capture (a) the nature of the upward influence relationship between leaders and followers and (b) how the leader may perceive these influence attempts and use the information in their own leadership. This literature review then informed the generation of an initial item pool.

Item Pool Generation

Hinkin (1998) describes both deductive and inductive approaches to item generation. Deductive approaches are often used when a theoretical foundation already exists and can guide the generation of the item pool whereas inductive is more exploratory and is often used when relevant theory is lacking. Although transformational followership is not rooted in one well-defined theory, its conception was the product of synthesizing several theoretical perspectives with observations made in other literatures (e.g., upward influence). As such, an abductive approach was used to generate an initial pool of items. The abductive approach, which is grounded in the work of Charles S. Peirce (1934), is invoked when an observation cannot be explained by current theory, and thus, a new explanation must be generated. This approach has been adopted by qualitative researchers because it addresses many of the limitations of inductive reasoning. Rather than attempting to generalize from a collection of observations (i.e.,
induction), abduction is a more creative approach that allows the researcher to update existing theories when new or surprising information comes to light. In this way, theory-building becomes an iterative process that is generated from the interplay between observations and theory (Timmermans & Tavory, 2012).

The development of the item pool was informed by parent measures of transformational leadership (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 1990; Rubin et al., 2005), however, it was anticipated that the behaviours subsumed in these dimensions would differ in the context of a follower role due to their comparatively lower hierarchical rank. Therefore, it was important to search the literature for behaviours and strategies that were specific to followers and would be appropriate for someone in a lower hierarchical role. As such, a review of the leadership and followership literature was conducted to ensure complete coverage of followership tendencies that may fall in this domain.

The results of this initial stage of scale development rendered a four-factor measure of transformational followership. The first factor, idealized influence, describes personal qualities (e.g., “Models organizational values”) and behaviours (e.g., “Holds themselves accountable”) that make the leader want to work with the follower. The partnership dimension describes the measures the follower has taken to build an interpersonal relationship with the leader (e.g., “Communicates with me openly”). The third dimension, intellectual stimulation, describes efforts made by the follower to provide suggestions and alternate viewpoints (e.g., “Encourages me to challenge my usual way of thinking”). Finally, inspirational motivation describes the follower’s passion and enthusiasm for their work (e.g., “Shares their passion for our objectives with me”).
Both Hinkin (1998) and Clark and Watson (2019) suggest including more items than are needed for the final scale to make sure that the content domain is adequately covered. Specifically, it is recommended that the original item pool consists of twice as many items as desired for use in the questionnaire to be administered. With this in mind, an initial item pool of approximately 10 items per subscale (51 items total, as idealized influence contains both attributes and behaviours) was deemed appropriate moving into the scale validation studies. To rate these items, leaders will be asked to identify someone who reports to them directly or whose work they regularly supervise and respond to each item in reference to that individual on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Although respected leadership sales such as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1997) use frequency scales, an agreement scale is more appropriate in this context as the items reflect the degree to which the leader feels the statement accurately reflects their perceptions of that follower. The initial item stem begins with “My follower…” as a placeholder, however, this term will be auto-populated with the name or initials of the followers in the online surveys in studies 2a-3 to eliminate any negative association with the term follower (e.g., Hoption et al., 2015). This same process will be repeated for all followership measures used in this dissertation. The initial item pool can be found in Appendix A.

Overview of Studies and Scale Validation Approach

Once I developed the 51 items, I then subjected my scale to rigorous testing and refinement over the course of three phases. The face and content validity of the measure was assessed in Study 1a using the Think Aloud Protocol (e.g., Dietrich & Ehrlenspiel, 2010) and in Study 1b by administering the initial set of items to a panel of subject-matter experts (i.e., professors with expertise in leadership and followership). At this stage, items that did not fit
within the defined content domain were either revised or eliminated from the item pool. Next, in Phase 2, the construct validity and internal consistency of the measure was established using two separate online samples of leaders\(^2\) from a variety of industries. This is aligned with recommendations from Clark and Watson (2019), who suggest using two or three large samples \((N = 300)\) during the initial data collection stages (i.e., while the item pool is being finalized). In Study 2a and Study 2b, the scale was subjected to factor analysis to assess its structural properties and to quantitatively identify misfitting items. Further, tests of convergent and discriminant validity as well as criterion-related validity were also deployed. Finally, in Study 3, I supplemented the results from Studies 2a and 2b by testing the nomological net validity and the temporal stability of the measure using a prospective design.

\(^2\) For the purposes of this dissertation, participants were considered “leaders” if they managed the work of others in their current role. The followers being rated are the direct reports whose work they manage.
Chapter V: Content Validation

Study 1a: Think Aloud Protocol

I used a qualitative interview procedure known as the Think Aloud Protocol (e.g., Dietrich & Ehrleinspiel, 2010) to identify any strangely worded items and to ensure that the scale items were interpreted in the intended way. The interview is semi-structured, whereby participants provide verbal feedback about the questionnaire items. When responding to each item, the participant is asked to vocalize their thought process in terms of what the item means to them and how they interpret the question (Dietrich & Ehrleinspiel, 2010). To develop context around the interviews, participants were also asked to provide some background information on their leadership experience. This procedure was performed over Zoom and verbal comments were audio-recorded, and subsequently, transcribed verbatim.

I began by recruiting three participants from my professional network. I recruited participants who were at least 18 years of age and had at least one year of experience managing the work of others. After completing the first three interviews and reviewing the transcribed notes, I continued to recruit participants from my professional network one at a time until data saturation was reached, meaning that no new information is being learned through the interviews (e.g., Francis et al., 2010). In total, eight organizational leaders completed interviews for the study. Participants had a range of experience in leadership roles (three to 30 years of experience), and came from a variety of industries (e.g., human resources, technology, manufacturing, etc.).

After completing the interviews, I reviewed the transcribed notes to see if there were consistent concerns with any of the items. Overall, participants agreed that the wording of the items was clear, however, several participants had concerns over the use of the term “model” in the idealized influence items (e.g., “My follower models an ideal work ethic”) and “two-way” in one of the partnership items (“My follower and I have a two-way relationship”). As such, these
items were flagged for further review in conjunction with the quantitative data obtained from the expert panel review.

**Study 1b: Expert Panel Review**

Eight professors with expertise in the areas of leadership, followership and/or a related field (e.g., group dynamics) agreed to serve as expert panelists. Prior to completing the expert panel review, participants were emailed a pdf copy of the factor definitions for them to reference while filling out the survey. Participants were also presented with the definitions of each dimension again within the survey and asked to rate the extent to which they believed that each item fits each of the four definitions ($1 = \text{poor match}$ to $5 = \text{excellent match}$). There was also an option to write comments in an open-ended text box, if desired.

**Analysis Strategy**

Content validity was assessed using two criteria: Aiken’s $V$ (Aiken, 1985) and effect sizes from planned contrasts (Cohen’s $d$; Cohen, 1988). Aiken’s $V$ indicates the degree to which the expert raters agree in their judgements of an item’s content relevance. Statistical significance for a given value of $V$ can be determined using a right-tailed binomial probability table (Aiken, 1985, p. 134). Items were also evaluated on their distinctiveness from the dimensions for which they were not intended. To achieve this, three planned contrasts were performed by comparing the average score an item received on its intended dimension to the average score it received on each of the other dimensions. Effect sizes were then computed for each comparison, with larger effect sizes (Cohen’s $d \geq .80$) indicating that an item received a high score on its intended dimension and a low score on the unintended dimension. Items were retained if they met the criteria for a high validity index ($V$) given by the right-tailed binomial probability table and if they were determined to be conceptually distinct from other dimensions (i.e., Cohen’s $d \geq .80$).
**Results and Discussion**

Means, standard deviations, Aiken’s $V$ values and the results from the planned comparisons are all summarized in Table 2. Although the majority of the items for partnership, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation greatly exceeded the criteria for content relevance (Aiken’s $V$) and distinctiveness (Cohen’s $d > .80$), several items from the idealized influence dimension failed to meet these criteria. Indeed, only four of the 21 subscale items had significant Aiken’s $V$ values, indicating that raters did not perceive a strong match between the item and its intended dimension. The expert panelists also tended to provide similar ratings for these items across each of the dimensions, meaning these items could also be a match for one or more of the non-keyed dimensions. Finally, upon reviewing feedback from the open-ended text boxes associated with these items, it was noted by several panelists that this dimension appeared qualitatively different from the remaining three dimensions. Specifically, expert panelists expressed concern that this dimension describes an exogenous predictor variable (i.e., a description of ideal characteristics and behaviors) whereas the remaining dimensions describe the result of ideal follower behaviors.

Considering both the lack of conceptual clarity highlighted by the expert panel ratings (i.e., items failing one or both validity tests) and the qualitative feedback from the open-ended responses, I eliminated items intended to reflect the factor of “idealized influence”. As transformational followership was intended to reflect the *impact* of effective followership on leaders, it was imperative that the scale reflect leaders’ reactions to their followers’ behaviors and qualities rather than the behaviours and qualities themselves. Critiques of transformational leadership measures have pointed out the pitfalls of confounding behaviour with its effects (van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013). Specifically, failing to disentangle cause-and-effect components of
models leads to inconsistent theorizing and runs the risk of overlap between the focal variable and either the predictors or outcome variables in a study. As such, removing any intermixing of exogenous and endogenous factors from the measures was critical at this early stage of development.

Despite the elimination of “idealized influence”, measuring the specific behaviours and tendencies of followers that lead to transformational relationships between leaders and followers is undoubtedly an important line of work. Indeed, fleshing out the links between follower behaviour and transformational followership is a necessary step in the development of this construct and is revisited in Phase 3 of this dissertation. To acknowledge the impact of follower behaviours and characteristics on the leaders’ perceptions of transformational followership, the item stem was updated to state “My follower has characteristics and/or behaves in ways that…”. The updated stem also ensures that leaders’ ratings in the questionnaire are due to behaviours and qualities of the follower and not some other contextual factors. All retained items were also modified slightly to align with the new stem and reflect the effect of the follower. The refined scale contained 19 items across three factors (8 items for partnership, 5 items for intellectual stimulation; and 6 items for inspirational motivation; See Appendix B for the full item list).
Chapter VI: Assessing the Structural Properties of the Transformational Followership Scale

Study 2a: Establishing Construct Validity and Internal Consistency

As leaders typically have more than one follower (i.e., several followers are nested within one leader), it was necessary to develop the transformational followership measure using multilevel techniques. The leader-level results reflect the factor structure across leaders, whereas the follower-level results reflect leaders’ ratings of individual followers. As transformational followership is concerned with leaders’ perceptions of a particular follower, examining the factor structure across leaders is not central to the current research. However, using multilevel modeling allows us to partition out variance at the leader-level and account for the nested nature of the data when leaders report on multiple followers. Therefore, subsequent hypothesizing and interpretation of the results centers around the follower-level results (i.e., within leaders).

In this study, I examined the factor structure of the revised three-factor transformational followership scale using multilevel exploratory factor analysis (MEFA). Although the MEFA technique allows for a wide range of solutions, it is expected that the best-fitting result will be the model containing three factors at the follower level. As such, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 1.** The results of the MEFA will support the theoretical three factor structure at the follower-level.

Clark and Watson (2019) advise including comparison (“anchor”) scales in the initial data collection to determine whether the new construct relates in the expected ways to theoretically similar and dissimilar constructs (i.e., convergent and divergent validity). Further, it is also important to ensure that the new construct does not overlap too closely with existing scales that are purported to measure similar things. As such, a secondary goal of this study was to test relationships between transformational followership, transformational leadership, and
communal followership behaviours. Although the development of the item pool was informed by parent measures of transformational leadership (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 1990; Rubin et al., 2005), the scale was carefully constructed to be specific to the follower role. Thus, the two constructs may be related, however, the transformational followership scale should not measure leadership from the follower role and instead reflect the active contributions of followers to the leadership process. In a similar vein, transformational followership was designed to measure an elevated form of followership. At its core, followership involves deferring to a leader and dutifully fulfilling the directives the leader has set out for them. These other-focused tendencies are known as “communal” behaviours, as they primarily benefit the collective rather than the individual (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007). However, transformational followership represents a kind of followership that combines communion (e.g., encouraging and supporting the leader) with a dose of agency (e.g., stepping up and exerting their influence). In this way, the core of other-oriented focus is still present in transformational followership with the added focus on asserting themselves as a collaborative partner to the leader (i.e., establishing some agency). Therefore, it should be weakly related to, but distinct from, measures of followership that focus primarily on the communal aspects of following (i.e., dutifulness, cooperation, and support of the leader).

Thus, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 2.** Transformational leadership and transformational followership are related but empirically distinct constructs.

**Hypothesis 3.** Transformational followership will have a weak positive relation with communal followership.

*Sample and Procedure*
Clark and Watson (2019) recommend using two heterogeneous subsamples consisting of 300 respondents during a scale’s initial empirical development. Therefore, in this study a first subsample of leaders from various industries in the United States were recruited online from Prolific Academic and paid the equivalent of $2.50 USD\(^3\) to complete the survey. To ensure a large enough sample size, I oversampled by 15%, recruiting an initial sample of 345 participants. After data cleaning, 49 participants were excluded from the dataset due to careless responding (e.g., failed attention checks, clicking through the survey, or inconsistent responses to regular and reverse-keyed items) and one participant was excluded because they opened the survey but did not answer any questions. Thus, the final sample consisted of 295 leaders (\(M_{\text{age}} = 40.43\) years, \(SD = 11.64\); 58% identified as a Man; 87.5% White). On average, participants had approximately 10 years of leadership experience (\(M = 10.41\) years; \(SD = 8.42\)) and most of the sample classified their role as “middle management” (~55% middle managers, 30% lower-level managers, and 15% senior leaders).

Participants first filled out demographic information about themselves, then selected three direct reports and filled out the same series of questionnaires for all three direct reports\(^4\). Participants filled out the study questionnaires for three direct reports due to concerns that, if asked to pick one follower, leaders may choose to rate either their best or their worst follower. Doing so could have created issues of range restriction and limit the information that can be gained from the sample. As such, participants were encouraged in the instructions to choose three direct reports that vary in terms of their performance and professional relationship with them as a leader. Participants needed to have supervisory experience and currently manage the

---

\(^3\) Prolific Academic is operated out of the United Kingdom and pays participants in GBP, however, only U.S. participants were recruited for this study. Participants were paid the equivalent of $2.50 USD at the time of data collection.

\(^4\) Questionnaires were presented in their entirety in randomized order.
work of at least three direct reports to be eligible for the study. Leaders were not required to respond to the questionnaires in reference to the direct reports they are currently managing, however, this qualification ensures that all leaders who participated would be able to respond to all three sets of questionnaires. Participants were asked to provide the names or initials of the people they were rating, and this information was used to auto-populate the survey to keep track of which direct report was being rated. This was especially important as the order of the surveys and direct reports was randomized across surveys. Participants were also presented with two attention check questions to ensure high-quality responses.

**Measures**

Transformational Followership Scale (Appendix B). Leaders responded to the revised 19-item scale, which assesses three dimensions of transformational followership: partnership (e.g., My follower has characteristics and/or exhibits behaviours that…encourage open communication between us), intellectual stimulation (e.g., [Name of direct report] has characteristics and/or exhibits behaviours that…help me continue to evolve intellectually); and inspirational motivation (e.g., “[Name of direct report] has characteristics and/or exhibits behaviours that…make me excited about the future of our initiatives). Items were rated on a Likert scale from one (Strongly Disagree) to seven (Strongly Agree).

Transformational Leader Inventory (TLI; Podsakoff et al., 1990). Leaders rated their followers’ transformational leadership behaviour using Podsakoff and colleagues’ (1990) measure. This scale consists of 22 items assessing six key behaviours of transformational leaders (i.e., identifying and articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering acceptance of group goals, high performance expectations, providing individualized support, and intellectual stimulation) on a scale of one (Strongly Disagree) to seven (Strongly Agree). Sample items
include: “[Name of direct report] leads by example” (*providing an appropriate model*) and “[Name of direct report] inspires others with their plans for the future” (*articulating a vision*).

**Communal Followership Behaviour.** A validated measure of communal followership did not exist at the time this study took place, therefore, the 18-item Follower Motives scale (Baird et al., 2023) was adapted to reflect “good” communal followership behaviour and was rated on a 6-point scale (1 = *Strongly Agree*; 6 = *Strongly Disagree*). The measure consists of three subdimensions: dutifulness (e.g., “effectively follows my instructions”), support (e.g., “shows others that they support decisions made by me”), and cooperativeness (e.g., “puts the needs of others over their own self-interests”).

**Analytic Strategy**

As leaders filled out the questionnaires with reference to three different followers, multilevel modeling was used to account for nesting in the data (i.e., followers nested within leaders). The primary concern for this study is zeroing in on leaders’ ratings of individual followers. As such, there was an explicit focus on the follower-level (i.e., within-level) results when interpreting factor structures and relationships. The leader-level (i.e., between-level) results reflect the factor structure and correlations across leaders, which was not central to the current research. With this in mind, I first conducted an MEFA with a robust weighted least squares estimator using Mplus version 8.2 (Muthén & Muthén, 2017). The solution was allowed to range from one to three between- and within-level factors to correspond with the theorized factor structure of the revised set of items. Approximate goodness of fit indices (i.e., comparative fit index; CFI, Tucker-Lewis index; TLI, standardized root mean square residual; SRMR, and root mean square error of approximation; RMSEA) were used to determine which factor solution best fit the data. Hu and Bentler (1999) suggested criteria for acceptable model fit (i.e., CFI/TLI >
.95, RMSEA < .06, and SRMR < .08) that has been widely used in social science research. Despite the seemingly universal acceptance of these cut-off values, scholars have cautioned against broadly applying the Hu and Bentler (henceforth referred to as HB) criteria as a standalone test of model fit (e.g., Hu & Bentler, 1999; Marsh et al., 2004; McNeish et al., 2018). This is primarily because HB’s criteria were derived from Monte Carlo simulations where the strength of the standardized factor loadings was held constant at .70 across models. As such, the established criteria will provide the most accurate test of data-model fit under conditions that closely mirror the measurement quality of the simulated models (i.e., average factor loadings of around .70; McNeish et al., 2018). Further, researchers have noted that when measurement quality is high (e.g., standardized factor loadings of .90 or higher), approximate goodness of fit indices worsen slightly because the model is more sensitive to minor deviations in fit (Hancock & Mueller, 2011). Therefore, although poor fit indices may indicate a truly poor fitting model, adhering to the HB cut-off values without also considering measurement quality makes it more likely that a good-fitting model will be rejected. The solution to this is to use standardized factor loadings and model reliability (e.g., McDonald’s omega, which also uses standardized loadings to produce an estimate) to contextualize the goodness of fit indices when evaluating how well a model fits the data (McNeish et al., 2018).

To assess the relationships between the transformational followership, transformational leadership, and communal followership measures, I computed multilevel correlations to partition the leader-level variance from the relations at the follower level. I examined the correlation table to confirm that the variables were related in the expected ways and to check for signs of multicollinearity. As an additional goal of this study was to establish empirical distinctiveness between transformational followership and parent measures of transformational leadership, I
then adopted a multilevel confirmatory factor analysis (MCFA) approach to see if the transformational followership items could be subsumed under their related transformational leadership subscales (e.g., partnership would be subsumed under individual consideration). The MCFA approach was also conducted in MPlus version 8.2 (Muthén & Muthén, 2017). I ran two MCFAs, one with the TLI (Podsakoff et al., 1990) only, and a second model where the transformational followership items were added to their corresponding dimension from the parent measure. If the second model fit similarly or better to the first, this may point to conceptual overlap between the two constructs.

**Results**

Table 3 contains the model fit indices for all possible factor solutions from the MEFA. The results indicated that the best-fitting solution consisted of three factors at the follower level (RMSEA = .03; CFI = .95; TLI = .93 SRMR_{within/between} = .01/.13), which is consistent with the theorized factor structure. These results indicate that three distinct factors emerge when leaders rate their individual followers, providing support for Hypothesis 1. Further, the pattern of factor loadings (Table 4) indicated that items tended to load highly on their intended factors. After examining the factor loadings at the follower-level, I eliminated three items (one item from intellectual stimulation and two items from inspirational motivation; see Table 4) that either loaded poorly on their intended factor or loaded on multiple factors, resulting in a 16-item scale (8 items for partnership, 4 items for intellectual stimulation; and 4 items for inspirational motivation). For the 16 retained items, factor loadings ranged from .72-.94 and omega reliability coefficients ranged from .94 to .97 for the three subscales.

Table 5 displays the descriptive statistics and follower-level correlations for all study variables. The subscales of transformational followership were highly correlated with the transformational leadership subscales ($r = .47-.81$) and the communal followership subscales ($r = ...
.66-.85). These results partially support Hypotheses 2 and 3, as the relation between the constructs is in the expected direction but to a larger magnitude than anticipated.

The high correlations between the transformational followership and leadership measures necessitated the examination of the statistical distinction between these two constructs using the factor analytic approach described in the Analysis section. The first multilevel confirmatory factor analysis, which included the TLI (Podsakoff et al., 1990) only, revealed that the transformational leadership measure did not fit the data well. Specifically, the theorized factor structure of the TLI scale was not supported (the 6-factor solution did not converge, and the single-factor solution demonstrated poor model fit: RMSEA = .08; CFI = .42; TLI = .35; SRMR = .09 within/.15 between). Further, the larger MCFA with both transformational leadership and followership would not run, thus limiting my ability to empirically establish distinctiveness between transformational followership and leadership in this study.

Discussion

The results of this study supported the hypothesized three-factor structure of the transformational followership scale. As noted above, it is necessary to consider the measurement quality of a model when interpreting goodness-of-fit indices and, subsequently, drawing conclusions about whether the model is misspecified. Specifically, given the nature of approximate goodness-of-fit indices, values that are slightly worse than HB’s criteria (which, as a reminder, are based on factor loadings of .70) may be considered acceptable if the model has high standardized factor loadings (e.g., >.90). For example, McNeish and colleagues (2018) found that when a model had standardized factor loadings of .90, an RMSEA value of .20 discriminated correctly-specified models from misspecified models equally well compared to the HB criteria of .06. This is not to suggest that an RMSEA value of .20 should be treated as a new
cut-off for high quality models, but rather illustrates that strict adherence to the traditional HB standards may not be appropriate in all contexts. Moreover, this example points to the impact of factor loadings on fit indices and thus highlights the importance of considering this information in tandem with fit indices and model reliability.

In the case of the transformational followership measure, the pattern and magnitude of factor loadings from the MEFA tell a very compelling story. Items that were intended for the same factor tended to cluster together and load highly onto that dimension. Additionally, the MEFA results revealed very few misspecified items, and the few items (i.e., three) that did cross-load onto other factors were not retained for future iterations of the scale. The reliability estimates for the three subscales were also very high (.94 to .97). As scale development is an iterative process, these results can also be interpreted with reference to the expert panel results, which indicated high content validity of the items and pointed to the measurement of three distinct factors. Taken together, the high factor loadings, distinctiveness of the factors, and high internal reliability (i.e., $\omega$) evidence the superior measurement quality of the three-factor model and therefore provide confidence in concluding that the fit indices (which would have been considered excellent by HB’s standards) are also indicative of excellent data-model fit.

Although transformational followership strongly correlated with transformational leadership, the poor measurement quality of the TLI should also be considered in the interpretation of these results. Specifically, the poor measurement quality may indicate that the scale is not appropriate in a followership context. That is, as the TLI was designed to capture leadership behaviours, the items may not operate the same when applied to someone in a follower role. It should be noted that transformational leadership and followership were also highly correlated with communal followership, pointing to the potential influence of common
method bias. In the next study, I will build on these findings by (a) confirming the factor structure of my scale and testing new relationships with theoretically similar and dissimilar constructs; (b) investigating and diagnosing bias owing to method effects; and (c) revisiting the question of distinctiveness between transformational leadership and followership.

**Study 2b: Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Convergent/Discriminant Validity**

The primary goal of this study was to assess the factor structure and measurement properties of the updated transformational followership scale. Study 2a provided robust support for a three-factor model at the follower-level. To supplement the MEFA findings, I employed an MCFA approach in a second, independent sample of leaders, which I expected to provide additional psychometric support for a three-factor model at the follower-level. Thus:

**Hypothesis 4.** The transformational followership scale’s three-level factor structure at the follower-level produced in the MEFA will be replicated in the MCFA.

Despite convincing evidence supporting the measurement quality of the new measure from Study 2a (i.e., strong fit indices and high factor loadings for the three-factor model), the high correlations among the study variables raised concerns over the influence of common method bias. Method bias is defined as “systematic variation in an observed variable due to the method used” (Spector et al., 2019; p. 857). As the data in both Study 2a and the current study were collected cross-sectionally and from a single source, the correlations among the substantive variables may be artificially inflated due to the shared method used to measure them. To address these concerns, an ideal marker variable was included in this study. An ideal marker is a variable that is theoretically unrelated (i.e., orthogonal) to the substantive variables but is measured in the same way (e.g., Likert scale; Richardson et al., 2009). Ideal marker variables should also be perceptual in nature, so they are able to capture rater effects such as socially desirable
responding, affectivity, and/or response acquiescence (as described in Spector, 2006). The ideal marker variable was used in this study to detect common method variance in a post-hoc statistical procedure called the comprehensive CFA marker technique (e.g., Williams et al., 2010), which is described in more detail in the Analysis section. The results of this analysis provide information regarding the nature and impact of method variance on the measurement and factor structure of the transformational followership scale.

To follow up on the inconclusive results from Study 2a regarding the distinctiveness of the transformational leadership and followership measures, I also ran a series of factor analyses on a random subset of participants (i.e., one follower from each leader was chosen at random). A random subset of followers was chosen to lessen computational demands when running the CFAs. That is, as each leader is now only rating one follower, these analyses can be performed using single-level analysis. As described in Study 2a, the results of these analyses will help determine whether transformational leadership is an empirically distinct construct, or if it can be subsumed under the transformational leadership construct.

A secondary goal of this study was to test the construct validity of the measure by assessing the correlation between transformational followership and theoretically similar (i.e., convergent validity) and dissimilar (i.e., discriminant validity) constructs. As previously mentioned, there are not many established measures of followership available, presenting a challenge to tests of convergent and divergent validity. Sy’s measure of IFTs is organized according to “prototypical” and “antiprototypical” follower characteristics. As individuals who are rated highly on transformational followership are expected to possess many of the qualities of an ideal follower, this should positively relate to the prototypical IFTs from Sy’s model (e.g., hard-working, enthusiastic). Thus, I hypothesize:
**Hypothesis 5.** Transformational followership will have a moderate-to-strong positive relation with prototypical implicit follower theories.

In a similar vein, the positive nature of transformational followership should represent the polar opposite of an antiprototypical follower (e.g., insubordinate, arrogant; Sy, 2010). Further, it is important to recognize that some of the behaviours and tendencies that enable a follower to be viewed as transformational may occasionally be perceived as insubordinate by the leader if they are not able to effectively convey to the leader that their suggestions and constructive feedback are for the benefit of others (e.g., leader, team, or organization). Therefore, in order for the follower to be considered transformational, they need to be able to engage in these sometimes-risky behaviours in a way that still results in them being perceived positively by the leader. As such, leaders who perceive their followers as transformational are unlikely to perceive them in a way that is aligned with the negative characteristics of antiprototypical followership.

Consequently, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 6.** Transformational followership will have a moderate-to-strong negative relation with antiprototypical implicit follower theories.

**Sample and Procedure**

A second sample of organizational leaders from the United States were recruited online through Prolific Academic in exchange for the equivalent of $2.50 USD. The inclusion criteria and general procedure were the same as Study 2a (i.e., they must rate three followers on all measures). Participants who previously completed Study 2a were excluded from participating in this study. As in Study 2a, 345 participants were recruited to account for exclusions due to poor quality data. In total, 18 participants were excluded from the analysis due to careless responding (e.g., clicking through the survey, or inconsistent responses to regular and reverse-keyed items),
resulting in a final sample of 327 leaders ($M_{age} = 39.24$ years, $SD = 10.42$; 65% identified as a Man; 79% White). On average, participants had approximately 9 years of leadership experience ($M = 9.32$ years; $SD = 7.24$) and, as with Study 2a, most of the sample classified their role as “middle management” (~52% middle managers, 33% lower-level managers, and 15% senior leaders).

**Measures**

**Transformational Followership Scale** (Appendix C). The revised scale, containing 16 items across three factors (8 items for partnership, 4 items for intellectual stimulation, and 4 items for inspirational motivation), was used.

**Transformational Leader Inventory** (Podsakoff et al., 1990). I used the same 22-item measure from Study 2a to measure transformational leadership.

**Marker Variable.** Choosing an ideal marker variable is paramount for the effective detection of CMV using the comprehensive CFA marker technique (Williams et al., 2010), yet very few truly “ideal” markers exist in social science research (Miller & Simmering, 2023). To remedy this, researchers developed and validated a scale to act as a universal marker for organizational research called Attitude Towards the Colour Blue (ATCB; Miller & Chiodo, 2008; Miller & Simmering, 2023). The scale consists of seven items asking participants to report their feelings about the colour blue, rated on a 7-point Likert scale. Participants’ feelings about a colour are not theoretically expected to relate to any organizational variables. Further, the questions in the scale are innocuous enough not to produce an overly positive or negative reaction from participants. Finally, it is unlikely that participants have strong, previously established feelings toward the colour blue, meaning that their responses reflect their momentary perceptions which enhances susceptibility to rater effects (Miller & Simmering, 2023). Taken
together, the ATCB scale meets the criteria for an ideal marker variable, and thus, is appropriate for use in the comprehensive CFA marker technique for detecting CMV.

**Implicit Followership Theories.** The degree to which leaders feel the adjectives associated with prototypical and antiprototypical follower characteristics accurately represent their direct report was measured using Sy’s (2010) list of 18 adjectives (nine for prototypical and nine for anti-prototypical; see also Goswami et al., 2020). Leaders reported on how well they believed a list of 18 adjectives described each of their direct reports on a scale of 1 (*Not at All*) to 4 (*To a Great Extent*). Example adjectives include hardworking, loyal, and arrogant.

**Analytic Strategy**

I conducted an MCFA with a robust weighted least squares estimator using Mplus version 8.2 (Muthén & Muthén, 2017). Additionally, I compared the three-factor solution at the follower-level to alternative factor structures (e.g., one-factor solution) to ensure that the three-factor model fits the data best. As in Study 2a, I the strength of the standardized factor loadings and reliability (i.e., omega) in combination with the approximate goodness-of-fit indices (i.e., RMSEA, CFI, TLI, and SRMR) to draw conclusions about the measurement quality of the chosen solution and assess how well the data fit the specified model (e.g., McNeish et al., 2018).

**Comprehensive CFA Technique Using an Ideal Marker Variable.** Several post-hoc techniques for detecting CMV have been proposed (e.g., partial correlation approach; Lindell & Whitney, 2001), however, it is widely agreed that the CFA marker technique is the best available approach (Miller & Simmering, 2023; Williams et al., 2010; Williams & O’Boyle, 2015). The technique involves three phases for detecting and determining the nature of the influence of CMV on the measurement of substantive variables (see Williams et al., 2010).

**Phase 1: Model Comparisons.** The goal of phase 1 is to assess whether method effects
may be influencing the data and how. This is achieved through computing five different CFA models and comparing the models using a chi-square comparison test. For each model described below, I included the 16-item transformational followership scale and the 7-item marker variable (i.e., ATCB; Miller & Simmering, 2023). The three factors of the transformational followership scale (i.e., partnership, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation) will henceforth be referred to as the “substantive variables”.

In the first model, which is a standard CFA, each indicator was instructed to load onto its intended factor and the factor correlations were freely estimated. The purpose of this initial model is to (a) assess factor structure and model fit and (b) to obtain factor loadings for the marker variable to be used in future models. In Model 2 (i.e., the Baseline model), the substantive variables are allowed to correlate with one another but the relationship between the marker variable and the substantive variables is set to zero. This is aligned with the assumption that the marker is orthogonal to the study variables, and further highlights the importance of choosing an “ideal” marker when using this technique. Additionally, the factor loadings for the marker variable are fixed to the unstandardized values from the previous CFA model to preserve the meaning of the marker variable. Model 3 (i.e., Method-C Model) tests the assumption of equal (common/restricted) method variance by adding in secondary factor loadings from the latent marker variable to each of the substantive indicators and setting these pathways to be equivalent. This adds an additional source of method variance to the substantive items from the marker variable. If the chi-square comparison test is significant (i.e., Model 3 fits the data better than the Baseline model), this points to the influence of CMV on the measurement of the substantive variables.

Lindell and Whitney (2001) distinguished between restricted/common method variance
(CMV) and unrestricted method variance (UMV). An assumption of CMV is that the marker variable affects all substantive indicators equally. The UMV model loosens this restriction by allowing the secondary factor loadings to be freely estimated (i.e., the marker affects each substantive indicator uniquely). Therefore, Model 4 (i.e., Method-U Model) tests the assumption that method variance has unequal effects on the substantive indicators. This model is compared to Model 3 using another chi-square comparison test to determine the nature of the influence of method effects on the substantive variables. If Model 3 is the better fitting model, this indicates equal method effects (CMV). In contrast, if Model 4 fits the data best, we can conclude that the marker variable affects substantive items differently/unequally (UMV).

The model retained from the previous comparison is then tested against Model 5 (i.e., Method-R Model) to determine whether method variance is biasing the factor correlations among the substantive variables. This is achieved by constraining substantive factor correlations to their values from the baseline model (Model 2). If Model 5 fits the data better than either Model 3 or 4 (whichever was retained), this indicates biasing in the factor correlations from method effects.

Descriptions of each CFA model and set of model comparisons for Phase 1 are summarized in Tables 6 and 7.

**Phase 2: Reliability Decomposition.** An essential part of scale development is determining the reliability and internal consistency of the measure (e.g., Hinkin, 1998). Accordingly, it is important to determine whether method effects may be affecting our ability to reliably measure the construct of transformational followership. In this phase, I calculated the total reliability estimate for each variable (i.e., partnership, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and the marker) using the baseline estimates (Werts, Linn, & Joreskog, 1974) and parsed out the method reliability (formulae are summarized in Williams et al., 2010).
Decomposing the reliability in this way identifies what proportion of the reliability estimate is due to “true” substantive reliability and how much can be attributed to method effects. A small proportion of method variance indicates that method effects are not greatly biasing the measurement of the transformational followership scale factors.

**Phase 3: Sensitivity Analysis.** Finally, to test the robustness of the results from Phase 1, I conducted a sensitivity analysis whereby the method factor loadings are fixed to the values at the upper 95% (Method-S[.05]) and 99% (Method-S[.01]) confidence intervals from either Model 3 or Model 4 (whichever is retained). Using the upper end of the confidence intervals essentially overestimates the impact of method bias on the substantive indicators. Therefore, if the conclusions drawn from sensitivity analysis are similar to those of Phase 1, we can be more confident that these conclusions reflect the true influence of CMV and are not due to sampling error (Lindell & Whitney, 2001).

**Distinguishing Between Transformational Followership and Leadership.** To establish empirical distinctiveness between transformational leadership and followership, I first conducted traditional CFAs on both measures to obtain estimates of model fit (i.e., using approximate goodness-of-fit indices). Then, I ran three additional CFAs that included items from both scales. Model 1 specified six factors for the TLI and three factors for transformational followership. Model 2 included the transformational followership items in the transformational leadership scale under their “parent” dimension (e.g., partnership items were included in the individual consideration subscale). Model 3 included all items from both scales in a one-factor model. As a final analysis, I ran an EFA with both sets of items to visually assess the pattern of factor loadings and better identify misspecified items or cross-loadings.

**Assessing Convergent and Discriminant Validity Using Sy’s IFTs.** To assess
convergent and divergent relationships amongst the transformational followership scale and the other study variables, I examined the follower-level correlations and assessed whether the pattern of relationships is aligned with theory (i.e., transformational followership should be positively associated with prototypical followership and negatively associated with antiprototypical followership).

**Results**

The results from the MCFA show strong support for the hypothesized three-factor model. The MCFAs that specified three factors at the follower-level were the best fitting models (Table 8). Critically, for the three follower-level/one leader-level solution (the same solution from the MEFA in Study 2a), the scale items all loaded highly and significantly onto their intended subfactors (standardized loadings all above .87; Table 9) and each subscale had high omega reliability (.94-.97). With this in mind, the MCFA demonstrated good model fit (RMSEA = .05; CFI = .87; TLI = .85; SRMR = .02 within/.23 between). Taken together, these results support Hypothesis 4.

**Comprehensive CFA Marker Technique.** There was a significant correlation between the marker variable and transformational leadership and followership at the leader-level ($r = .21-.56$), indicating the potential influence of CMV. Because there is no theoretical overlap between the marker variable and the substantive variables, significant relationships between the marker variable and other study variables can be attributed to shared variance due the common method used to measure them (Richardson et al., 2009). The comprehensive CFA marker technique was used to diagnose the threat of CMV to the measurement of transformational followership.

The comparison between the Method-C model and the baseline model was significant ($\Delta \chi^2 = 31.88$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$), indicating the presence of CMV. The comparison between the
Method-C and Method-U model was also significant ($\Delta \chi^2 = 25.85$, $df = 15$, $p < .05$), meaning that the marker variable has unequal method effects on the substantive indicators (i.e., Method-U is a better representation of how the marker variable is influencing the substantive items).

However, the non-significant chi-square difference test between Method-U and Method-R ($\Delta \chi^2 = 0.12$, $df = 3$, n.s.) tells us that even though CMV is affecting the items, it does not bias our estimates of the factor correlations. Phase 1 results are summarized in Table 10.

Similarly, the results from the reliability decomposition (Table 11) indicate that method effects have a very small effect on reliability estimates for the transformational followership scale. Specifically, the marker variable only accounted for 1.89-3.08% of the reliability estimates for the transformational followership factors. Further, when decomposing the reliability estimates for each factor and removing method effects, all three reliability estimates remained above .90 (reliability estimates ranged from .93-.94). Finally, I did not find a significant difference in model fit from Method-U to Method-S(.05) and Method-S(.01), and the factor correlations stayed consistent across models ($\Delta r \leq .01$; see Table 12). Therefore, manipulating the method factor loadings did not significantly change the factor correlations among the subscales of the transformational followership scale. Taken together, we can confidently conclude that marker-based method variance has a minor impact on the measurement of and relationships between the subfactors of transformational followership.

**Distinguishing between Transformational Followership and Leadership.** Table 13 contains fit indices for each of the CFAs performed on the random subset of followers. Notably, both transformational followership and leadership demonstrated good model fit when examined in separate CFAs. Moreover, when both scales were included in the same model, the best fitting configuration was the nine-factor solution (i.e., Model 1: three factors for transformational
followership and six for transformational leadership; RMSEA = .06; CFI = .94; TLI = .93; SRMR = .05). However, the CFA where the transformational followership items are subsumed under the transformational leadership subscales (Model 2) also has acceptable model fit (RMSEA = .08; CFI = .87; TLI = .86; SRMR = .07); thus, further investigation is warranted. The CFA approach restricts our ability to investigate potentially misspecified items in these models. Accordingly, conducting an EFA with both sets of items provides a less restrictive approach to see how the items cluster together when they are not constrained to a predetermined factor structure. As illustrated in Table 14, the 9-factor EFA was the best fitting model (RMSEA = .07; CFI = .96; TLI = .92; SRMR = .01). Further examination of the pattern of factor loadings shows most of the items mapping neatly onto their anticipated factors (Table 15). This was especially true of the transformational followership items, which loaded highly onto the first three factors (.60-.97) and showed very little evidence of cross-loadings (all loadings for non-keyed factors ≤ .18).

Assessing Convergent and Discriminant Validity Using IFTs. The follower-level correlation matrix (Table 16) was also consistent with expectations, with each dimension of transformational followership relating positively to prototypical \( r = .60-.80 \) and negatively with antiprotypical followership \( r = -.45 \) to \(-.51 \), supporting Hypotheses 5 and 6. As in Study 2a, transformational followership correlated highly with transformational leadership at the follower-level \( r = .52-.80 \), however, the results from the CFA and EFA approaches described in the previous section indicate that we are measuring separate constructs.

Discussion

The results of this study support and extend the results from Study 2a. First, the MCFA results corroborate the three-factor solution found in the MEFA. Indeed, the three-factor solution
at the follower-level had superior fit indices to alternative solutions. Importantly, the standardized factor loadings all exceeded .87 and omega reliabilities for each subdimension were also high (.94-.97), providing strong support for the measurement quality of the transformational followership scale. Second, the results of the comprehensive CFA marker technique help to mitigate concerns over CMV biasing the measurement of transformational followership. Specifically, although there were significant correlations between the ideal marker and substantive variables and the initial model comparisons from the CFA marker technique pointed to the influence of method effects, these effects did not significantly bias the factor correlations or reliability of the measure. Although the comprehensive CFA marker technique yielded promising results, it is necessary to acknowledge the limitations of marker-based techniques. Using ideal marker variables to diagnose the impact of method effects can provide accurate information regarding the degree to which momentary affect-based sources of CMV affect rater tendencies (e.g., leniency bias and consistency motif; Miller & Simmering, 2023). However, it should be noted that this technique involves the indirect measure of these potential sources and therefore cannot specifically identify where the method effects are coming from (Williams & McGonagle, 2016). In order to assess the presumed source of method bias, researchers should also consider including variables designed to capture these sources directly (i.e., measured cause variables; Simmering et al., 2015) in addition to marker variables (Williams & McGonagle, 2016). Taken together, the use of the ATCB marker variable can provide general information about whether the response tendencies of the rater affected the relations among the study variables, but not what those sources of variance are or whether certain relations are affected by different and/or multiple sources of method bias. The results from the CFA marker technique used in this study should thus be considered as contributing to our confidence that the
measurement properties of the transformational followership scale are accurate and not the result of spurious associations or statistical artifacts.

Finally, the results of the CFA and EFA models run with both transformational followership and leadership point to the measurement of distinct constructs despite the high correlations between these variables in Study 2a and the present study. It was a key objective of this dissertation to quell concerns that, because the new measure was inspired by transformational leadership, it would be thought to represent transformational leadership from the follower role. Conceptually, this concern was addressed in the initial development of the item pool by ensuring that the items represent a follower-specific domain. The results of the CFA and EFA provide empirical support for this conceptual distinction, further highlighting the value of developing this measure.

Although it was a secondary goal of the study, establishing convergent and discriminant validity early in the scale development process is crucial for ensuring that the measure being developed is performing correctly (Clark & Watson, 2019) and provides valuable information for future scale iterations. As expected, transformational followership was positively related to prototypical followership (i.e., convergent validity) and negatively related to anti-prototypical followership (i.e., discriminant validity). This is aligned with theorizing that transformational followership represents an ideal type of followership whereby leaders feel empowered and elevated from working with that follower. Altogether, the results of the study provide robust support for the measurement quality and validity of the new measure.
Chapter VII: Assessing Temporal Stability and Nomological Network Validity

Study 3: Prospective Design

Tests of measurement invariance are important to establish confidence that the relationships observed using a scale are not fundamentally changed by sub-group membership or with the passage of time (i.e., longitudinal invariance). In my final study, I tested the transformational followership scale using longitudinal survey methodology to establish measurement invariance across time. It should be noted that evidence of longitudinal measurement invariance does not imply that mean scores cannot change over time. On the contrary, the passage of time is likely an important factor in the consideration of how transformational a follower is going to be perceived by their leader. Instead, passing the test of invariance tells us that the scale will uphold its fundamental structural properties across time, and that the meaning of the items or interpretation of the scale is not altered by time such that it represents a different construct entirely.

**Hypothesis 7.** The results of the test of longitudinal measurement invariance will demonstrate the temporal consistency of the transformational followership scale.

A secondary goal of this study is to establish the nomological network of transformational followership and propose a theoretical model using these criterion variables. As the three dimensions of transformational followership are highly correlated, it is expected that they will demonstrate a similar pattern of relationships with the criterion variables. For parsimony, the term “transformational followership” is used below to signify the three dimensions.

It is expected that taking charge behaviour (i.e., an extra-role behaviour whereby an employee takes voluntary action to affect their work environment; Morrison & Phelps, 1999),
voice (i.e., an extra-role behaviour whereby an employee makes constructive suggestions for change; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), and personal initiative (i.e., a self-starting behaviour whereby an employee takes action without being asked; Frese et al., 1997) will represent important elements of transformational followership’s nomological net because these three constructs represent examples of some of the agentic behaviours that transformational followers may engage in to partner with the leader and contribute positively to the leadership process. Each of these three constructs represent a form of follower proactivity (Urbach et al., 2021). As such, they were grouped in a hierarchical fashion to reflect the higher-order construct of proactivity in subsequent analyses. Thus, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 8.** Follower proactivity will have a positive relation with transformational followership.

Developing a collaborative partnership with their leader is essential to transformational followership. Thus, it is expected that leader-rated LMX will also represent a significant part of the nomological network. Specifically, leaders who see their followers as transformational are also likely to perceive their relationship to that follower as high-quality. As such, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 9.** Transformational followership will have a positive relation with leader-rated LMX.

Additionally, as transformational followership is anticipated to enhance leaders’ positive work experiences, it is necessary to examine how this construct relates to leader outcomes. Because transformational followers engage in behaviours that help the leader in their own roles, establish collaborative relationships, and let the leader know they can count on them to deliver on objectives, it is hypothesized that leaders of transformational followers will experience greater levels of engagement and satisfaction at work. Further, I predict that these factors may
also serve as a buffer against negative leader outcomes, namely psychological strain. Meta-analytic evidence supports the mitigating effects of social support (i.e., support from coworkers, supervisors, and “others” at work) on workplace strain (Viswesvaran et al., 1999). Further, the job demands-resources model positions both social support and team effectiveness as potential resources that can help offset the stress of job demands, thereby enhancing engagement and reducing burnout (e.g., Schaufeli, 2017). Although studies have not directly examined the role of followership in relation to these work attitudes, Carsten and colleagues (2018) found that when followers take an active role and assume responsibility at work, leaders perceived greater support from their follower and felt more motivated by that follower. Integrating these perspectives, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 10.** Transformational followership will have a positive relation with leaders’ self-reported work engagement.

**Hypothesis 11.** Transformational followership will have a positive relation with leaders’ self-reported job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 12.** Transformational followership will have a negative relation with leaders’ self-reported burnout.

Transformational followership has been conceptualized as an endogenous variable that stems from follower behaviours and is linked to leaders’ experiences at work. As such, to further establish the theoretical boundaries of this construct, I ran several mediation models with followers’ proactive behaviours (i.e., taking charge, initiative, and voice) as the exogenous predictor at time 1, the three dimensions of transformational followership as mediators at time 2, and leaders’ self-rated work experiences (i.e., engagement, satisfaction, and burnout) as outcome variables at time 3.
Hypothesis 13. Transformational followership will mediate the relation between follower proactivity and leaders’ self-reported work engagement.

Hypothesis 14. Transformational followership will mediate the relation between follower proactivity and leaders’ self-reported job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 15. Transformational followership will mediate the relation between follower proactivity and leaders’ self-reported burnout.

Sample and Procedure

In this prospective study, I recruited a sample of American leaders online through Prolific Academic. Participants were instructed to evaluate one of their followers on the transformational followership scale at three separate timepoints, spaced two weeks apart, to assess measurement invariance and temporal stability across time. Participants were compensated £2 for the first survey, £2.50 for the second survey, and £3 for the third survey. A secondary goal of this phase was to establish the scale’s nomological network validity. As such, participants also rated their follower on voice, taking charge, personal initiative behaviors, and LMX as well as leaders’ self-ratings of engagement, job satisfaction, and psychological strain across all three timepoints. Although all measures were rated by the same person in this final study, one way to address bias in same-source studies (i.e., common method variance) is to use collect data at multiple timepoints (e.g., Chang et al., 2010).

To be considered for the study, participants needed to be at least 18 years of age, currently have one direct report, and have managed the work of others for at least one year. Participants who previously completed Study 2a or 2b were excluded from participating in this study. With this inclusion criteria in mind, I recruited 400 participants to participate in the study. From this initial sample, nine participants were not invited to complete the second survey due to
failed attention checks. Of the 391 participants who were invited to complete the second survey, 345 participants returned their surveys (88% retention from Survey 1 to Survey 2). As with part one, we did not invite participants to complete the next survey if they failed the attention checks ($n_{rejected} = 3; n_{invited} = 342$). In total, 320 participants completed all three surveys (94% retention from Survey 2 to Survey 3). Overall, the retention rate from Survey 1 to Survey 3 was 80%.

As a primary goal of this study was to establish the temporal stability of the transformational followership measure, participants completed the followership questionnaires with reference to the same direct report each time. To ensure consistency in responding, participants were asked to include the first name or initials of their direct report in each survey. I also added a question in the second and third surveys asking participants if they rated the same person each time. Of the 320 participants who completed the study in its entirety, 145 named the same follower in all three surveys and thus were retained for the main analyses ($M_{age} = 41.09$ years, $SD = 11.61$; 63% identified as a Man; 76% White). On average, participants had approximately 10 years of leadership experience ($M = 10.07$ years; $SD = 8.59$) and most of the sample classified their role as “middle management” (~51% middle managers, 33% lower-level managers, and 16% senior leaders).

**Measures**

To align with the theoretical model of follower behaviour $\rightarrow$ transformational followership $\rightarrow$ leader outcomes, the following measures were temporally separated. Transformational followership was measured across all three timepoints to assess longitudinal invariance, however, only the measurement taken at Time 2 was used in the nomological network and mediation analyses.
Transformational Followership Scale (Appendix C). The revised scale contained 16 items across three factors (8 items for partnership, 4 items for intellectual stimulation, and 4 items for inspirational motivation).

Follower Proactivity (Time 1). As previously mentioned, follower proactivity was created as a higher-order latent construct with taking charge, voice, and initiative as indicators. Each of these constructs have been described in the literature as forms of follower proactivity (e.g., Urbach et al., 2021), and each construct definition describes similar elements of stepping up without being asked with the goal of positively influencing the organization or work environment in some way. Thus, combining the measures in this way is theoretically justified.

Followers’ Taking Charge Behaviour. The degree to which leaders feel that their followers take charge at work was measured using Morrison and Phelps’ (1999) 10-item measure. Leaders reported their agreement with each statement on a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 7 = Strongly Agree). Sample items include “This person often tries to adopt improved procedures for doing his or her job” and “This person often tries to change how his or her job is executed in order to be more effective”.

Followers’ Employee Voice. Using Van Dyne and Lepine’s (1998) six-item measure, leaders rated their direct reports’ voice behaviours on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 7 = Strongly Agree). Sample items include “[My direct report] develops and makes recommendations concerning issues that affect this work group” and “[My direct report] speaks up and encourages others in this group to get involved in issues that affect the group”.

Followers’ Personal Initiative. I used Frese et al.’s (1997) seven-item scale to assess the frequency with which the followers engage in personal initiative taking, as observed by the leader. Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Not at All; 5 = Very Often). Sample items
include “[My direct report] actively attacks problems” and “Whenever something goes wrong, [my direct report] searches for a solution immediately”.

**Ideal and Counterideal Followership (Time 1).** To replicate the findings from Study 2b, I included Junker and colleagues’ (2016) measure of implicit follower theories. The measure includes a list of 21 adjectives that describe either ideal (e.g., thinking ahead, educated, and engaged) or counterideal (e.g., aggressive, malicious, and uncooperative) followership. Leaders rate the degree to which adjective describes their follower on a scale of one (*Not Characteristic at All*) to five (*Very Characteristic*).

**Manager-Rated LMX (Time 2).** To assess leaders’ perceptions of their relationship to their follower, I used Uhl-Bien and colleagues’ (2022) nine-item measure. The scale measures three factors of LMX from the manager’s perspective: candor (e.g., “This employee openly questions me when he/she doesn’t think I’m right”), competence (e.g., “Managing this employee requires little effort on my part”), and shared goals (e.g., “This person has the best interests of the department in mind”). Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree*; 5 *Strongly Agree*).

**Leaders’ Engagement (Time 3).** The leader reported their own engagement at work using the nine-item short measure of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9; Schaufeli et al., 2006). The scale includes three dimensions of engagement: vigor (e.g., “At my work, I feel bursting with energy”), dedication (e.g., “I am enthusiastic about my job”), and absorption (e.g., “I am immersed in my work”). Items are rated in terms of frequency on a 7-point Likert scale (0 = *Never*; 6 = *Always/Every Day*).

**Leaders’ Job Satisfaction (Time 3).** Self-reported job satisfaction was measured using the Brief Index of Affective Job Satisfaction (Thompson & Phua, 2012). The scale consists of
four items scored on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strongly Agree*). Example items include “I find real enjoyment in my job” and “I like my job better than the average person”. As recommended by the scale authors, distractor items will be interspersed in between items such as “My job is time consuming”. These items will not be computed as part of the overall satisfaction score.

**Leaders’ Burnout (Time 3).** Leaders’ burnout was operationalized using a measure of psychological strain (The Irritation Scale, English version; Mohr et al., 2006). The eight-item scale measures cognitive (e.g., “Even at home I often think of my problems at work”) and emotional (“I get grumpy when others approach me”) irritation on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 7 = *Strongly Agree*).

**Analytic Strategy**

Measurement invariance was established using the recommendations summarized by Vandenberg and Lance (2000). First, a baseline model was estimated to see if the factor loadings conform to the same pattern across time (i.e., configural invariance). The baseline model is evaluated using typical model-fit indices of RMSEA, CFI, and TLI, with support for the baseline model indicating that the standard for configural invariance has been met. Once configural invariance is established, the model is subjected to tests of metric (i.e., factor loadings are approximately equal across time) and scalar (i.e., intercepts are invariant across time) invariance. At each step (i.e., from configural to metric and from metric to scalar invariance), invariance is established by observing changes in CFI ($\Delta$CFI < .01) and RMSEA ($\Delta$RMSEA < .015), as recommended by Chen (2007).

The scale’s nomological network validity was tested using correlational analyses to see if the criterion variables relate to transformational followership in the expected ways. Finally,
mediation analyses were conducted using the latent variable approach in Mplus version 8.2 (Muthén & Muthén, 2017). Taking charge, initiative, and voice were included as indicators of a higher-order construct of proactive follower behaviours in the mediation models. To increase the overall sample size for both the nomological network and mediation analyses, I modified the inclusion criteria to include participants who rated the same direct reports in the first two surveys only. As the variables from the third survey were self-ratings, the follower’s name in the third survey did not have to match the others. The final sample consisted of 207 participants. Sample characteristics were similar to the smaller sample used for measurement invariance testing ($M_{age} = 40.94$ years, $SD = 11.61$; 64% identified as a Man; 76% White; $M_{leader\_experience} = 10.05$ years; $SD = 8.54$; ~52% middle managers, 32% lower-level managers, and 15% senior leaders).

**Results**

The results for the measurement invariance testing are summarized in Table 17. The chi-square comparison tests between the configural and metric as well as the metric and scalar models were both non-significant. Further, the RMSEA and CFI values remained relatively stable across models (i.e., $\Delta$CFI < .01 and $\Delta$RMSEA < .015 for all comparisons). Taken together, the transformational followership scale meets Chen’s (2007) threshold criteria for invariance. These results provide evidence for the temporal stability of the measure, thus supporting Hypothesis 7.

**Nomological Network Validity.** Results from the nomological net analysis are summarized in Table 18. As expected, each of the three dimensions of transformational followership related positively to proactive follower behaviour. Thus, Hypothesis 8 was supported. Further, correlation coefficients ranged from $r = .63$ to $.77$, indicating that transformational followership is strongly related to proactivity. In support of Hypothesis 9,
transformational followership was positively related to manager-rated LMX. As with follower proactivity, the relationships between the TFF factors and manager-rated LMX were strong \((r = .66-.83)\). This suggests that those who are high in transformational followership also possess the ability to form high-quality relationships with their managers. Transformational followership was also positively related to leaders’ self-ratings of engagement \((r = .28-.46)\) and job satisfaction \((r = .30-.48)\), supporting Hypotheses 10 and 11. Thus, leaders who perceive their followers as more transformational also tend to be happier and more engaged at work. Finally, the correlation between transformational followership and burnout was significant and negative \((r = -.15 to -.19)\). Therefore, Hypothesis 12 was supported. Taken together, feeling encouraged and supported by your follower (i.e., inspirational motivation), having a collaborative personal relationship with them (i.e., partnership) and feeling challenged intellectually (i.e., intellectual stimulation) are likely to buffer against burnout.

**Mediation Analyses.** Table 19 summarizes the results of the latent mediation analyses, where transformational followership acts as a potential mechanism linking follower proactivity with leader outcomes.

**Partnership.** In line with the nomological net findings, there was a strong positive link between proactivity and partnership \((b = 0.77, SE = 0.14, p < .001)\). However, the path between partnership and the three leader outcomes was non-significant in the mediation models. Additionally, partnership did not mediate the relation between follower proactivity and leaders’ experiences at work. As such, Hypothesis 13 was not supported. There was a significant direct effect of proactivity on leaders’ engagement \((b = 0.51, SE = 0.51, p = .002)\) and leaders’ job satisfaction \((b = 0.40, SE = 0.14, p = .005)\). The direct effect from proactivity to burnout was not significant, but in the expected direction.
**Intellectual Stimulation.** The path from proactivity to intellectual stimulation was positive, significant, and very high in magnitude ($b = 0.98, SE = 0.13, p < .001$). There was also a significant positive link between intellectual stimulation and leaders’ engagement ($b = 0.40, SE = 0.12, p = .001$) and leaders’ job satisfaction ($b = 0.33, SE = 0.10, p = .002$), however, the link between intellectual stimulation and burnout was not significant. There was a significant indirect effect of proactivity on engagement ($b = 0.39, SE = 0.12, p = .001$) and job satisfaction ($b = 0.32, SE = 0.10, p = .001$), but the indirect effect of proactivity on burnout was not significant. Therefore, Hypothesis 14 was partially supported. The direct effects from proactivity to each of the outcomes were not significant.

**Inspirational Motivation.** Again, there was a strong positive relation between proactivity and inspirational motivation ($b = 0.85, SE = 0.12, p < .001$). Additionally, there was a significant positive link between inspirational motivation and leaders’ engagement ($b = 0.43, SE = 0.12, p < .001$) and leaders’ job satisfaction ($b = 0.35, SE = 0.11, p = .001$), whereas the path between inspirational motivation and burnout was not significant. None of the direct effects from proactivity to the three leader outcomes were significant. As with intellectual stimulation, there was a significant indirect effect of proactivity on engagement ($b = 0.36, SE = 0.11, p = .001$) and job satisfaction ($b = 0.30, SE = 0.09, p = .001$), but the indirect effect for burnout was not significant. Thus, Hypothesis 15 was partially supported.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to assess longitudinal invariance and situate the transformational followership scale within a nomological network and theoretical model involving follower behaviours and leader outcomes. The results of the measurement invariance test support a fully invariant model, meaning that the same construct is being measured at each timepoint. As it pertains to transformational followership, this is particularly important as the
leader-follower dynamic is likely to evolve over time and followers may perceived as more or less transformational with more familiarity or changing work conditions. Thus, establishing measurement invariance at this stage of scale development is a crucial first step in answering research questions regarding the trajectory, growth, and fluctuations in leaders’ perceptions of transformational leadership across time. Specifically, these results can give researchers confidence that any observed changes in mean values of the construct over time are due to true fluctuations and not inconsistencies in measurement.

The nomological network analysis identified predictor (i.e., proactivity at Time 1), covariate (i.e., manager-rated LMX at Time 2), and outcome (i.e., engagement, job satisfaction, and burnout at Time 3) variables and assessed their relation to transformational followership. The results of this analysis were consistent with the hypothesized relationships. These results help to paint a picture of where transformational followership is situated relative to criterion variables, thereby providing a basis for building and testing path models. To this end, I tested several mediation models positioning transformational followership as an explanatory variable in the relation between follower proactivity and leader outcomes. The results of the mediation analyses were mixed. Intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation both significantly mediated the relationship between follower proactivity and work engagement as well as job satisfaction. Thus, followers who are more proactive are also more likely to be perceived as contributing intellectually to the leader/group (i.e., intellectual stimulation) and act as a motivating presence to their leader (i.e., inspirational motivation), which subsequently enhances leader engagement and satisfaction at work. These results demonstrate that followers can have a positive impact on their leaders’ work attitudes. Further, as the direct effect from proactivity to
engagement and satisfaction was non-significant in these models, transformational followership is a key mechanism that enables proactive behaviours to be impactful in this way.

Surprisingly, partnership did not mediate the relation between proactivity and any of the leader outcomes. It should be noted, however, that there were significant zero-order correlations between partnership, leader engagement, job satisfaction, and burnout. Thus, establishing a strong partnership with one’s follower is connected to feeling more engaged and satisfied and less strained at work, but perhaps to a lesser degree than having a highly proactive follower. That is, follower proactivity accounts for more meaningful variance in the mediation models compared to partnerships for these outcomes. It is possible that, because partnership is a relationship-based factor, it has the most relevance for dyad-level outcomes rather than leader attitudes about their work generally. For example, partnership may be more strongly related to things like trust, liking, and satisfaction with the follower. Indeed, leaders’ trust in the follower, mutual liking, and perceived similarity have all been linked to the development of high-quality relationships between leaders and followers (i.e., LMX; Dulebohn et al., 2012), and thus will likely also play a role in the collaborative relationships that characterize the partnership dimension.

Finally, none of the mediation models with burnout were significant. Unlike engagement and job satisfaction, which can be classified as work attitudes, burnout (in this case, operationalized as workplace psychological strain) is a response to prolonged exposure to workplace stress (Maslach et al., 2001). As social support has been found to buffer against the deleterious effects of burnout, and transformational followership signifies a positive working relationships between a follower and their leader, it was theorized that transformational followership would mitigate workplace strain in leaders. It is possible that transformational
followership may provide benefits (i.e., resources and support) in contexts that directly involve the follower, but that these are not enough to overcome stress due to factors outside of the follower relationship (e.g., work overload, poor relationship with one’s own boss). Indeed, the stress process is a complex system involving dispositional and environmental factors across time (Griffin & Clarke, 2011), and therefore, may not be accurately represented by the current mediation model. As leader stress can have a negative impact on their well-being and behaviour (e.g., Byrne et al., 2013), examining the active role of followership in this process is a fruitful direction for future research. For example, researchers could examine the impact of having multiple followers who are rated high in transformational followership on burnout.

In conclusion, the results of this study support the use of the transformational followership scale in longitudinal research and proposed a new theoretical model positioning the new construct as a mediator between follower behaviour and leader workplace outcomes. The results suggest that intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation play a key role in linking follower proactivity to leaders’ engagement and job satisfaction.
Chapter VIII: General Discussion

Leaders and leadership studies enjoy a disproportionate amount of attention in organizational research. Although the value gained from decades of leadership research cannot be understated, the almost singular focus on leaders provides an incomplete understanding of the leadership process (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Leadership cannot exist without followership, and even individuals with positional power (e.g., managers and supervisors) cannot perform leadership if they fail to encourage deference and inspire action from their followers. Indeed, scholars have stated that followers are the ones who enable leaders to be charismatic by endorsing their leaders’ behaviour and reacting positively to their influence attempts (e.g., Hollander & Offerman, 1990). Taken together, followership is a crucial piece of the leadership process and followers play an important role in their leaders’ ability to perform their job. As such, it is necessary to examine the influence of followers on their leaders, how this shapes the leader-follower dynamic, and how leadership is co-produced between the two parties.

Despite recent theoretical advancement in the field of followership (e.g., Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), researchers have yet to define and empirically investigate the degree to which followers may elevate and empower their leaders at work. Through my dissertation, I conceptualized and validated a measure of transformational followership. Transformational followership represents leaders’ perceptions of effective followership tendencies that enable productive, generative, and motivating engagements with and for their leader. As such, items were generated to reflect the impact of the follower on their leader across four dimensions: idealized influence (i.e., ideal characteristics and behaviours that make the leader want to work with the follower), partnership (i.e., creating a collaborative working relationship with the leader), intellectual stimulation (i.e., added value and insights the leader may not have previously thought of), and inspirational
motivation (i.e., encouraging the leader to work harder to and motivating them to achieve the objectives they work on with their follower). Following a comprehensive literature review and adhering to guidelines from Hinkin (1998) and Clark and Watson (2019), I generated an initial item pool of 51 items. Next, I subjected the measure to rigorous testing across three distinct phases. In Phase 1, gauged feedback from organizational leaders (Think Aloud Protocol) and academics (Expert Panel Review) to determine the ways in which followers can be transformational and define the content domain of this new construct. The insights gleaned from this phase of my dissertation led to an adjustment in the theorized factor structure to align better with my conceptualization of transformational followership. Specifically, after Phase 1, the factor describing behaviours and characteristics of transformational followership (i.e., idealized influence) was dropped to maintain consistency with the notion that leaders’ ratings of transformational followership reflect an impact rather than the specific actions taken by followers. The item stem was also modified to state, “My follower has characteristics and/or behaves in ways that…”, to ensure leaders were responding to items based on their follower and not on other contextual factors.

Phase 2 focused on establishing the structural validity of the transformational followership scale. Using two separate samples of leaders recruited online through Prolific Academic, I found support for the three-factor solution established in Phase 1. Both the MEFA (Study 2a) and MCFA (Study 2b) demonstrated strong model fit and items loaded highly onto the intended dimensions. The scale also demonstrated high internal reliability (i.e., ω) across both studies. Additionally, this phase helped to establish statistical distinctiveness between transformational followership and transformational leadership. Although the two constructs were highly correlated across studies, the factor-analytic techniques employed in Study 2b showed
that they are most appropriately treated as separate constructs. In addition to this evidence of empirical distinctiveness, the results from the comprehensive CFA marker technique indicated that, in general, the measurement of transformational followership was not affected by momentary affect-based sources common method variance (e.g., leniency bias), instilling confidence in the conclusions drawn regarding the factor structure and factor correlations at this stage of scale development. Moreover, the transformational followership measure related positively to prototypical followership and negatively to anti-prototypical followership, supporting the convergent and discriminant validity of the measure, respectively. Taken together, the results from Phase 2 provided strong evidence for the measurement quality of the transformational followership scale.

Finally, Phase 3 entailed a prospective design whereby leaders filled out the transformational followership scale with reference to one of their followers at three separate timepoints. The results of this study demonstrate the temporal consistency of the new measure and aided in establishing an initial nomological network for transformational followership. Specifically, transformational followership relates positively to follower proactivity, LMX, and leader attitudes such as engagement and satisfaction. Conversely, transformational followership has a negative relation with leader burnout. Additional mediation analyses revealed strong links between follower proactivity at time 1 and transformational followership at time 2. Moreover, both intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation acted as mediating variables in the relation between follower proactivity and leader engagement and satisfaction.

**Theoretical Implications**

Overall, this work extends leadership and followership research by examining the active role of followers in the leadership process. Transformational followership considers how
followers effectively engage with their leaders and, as such, combines followership and leadership theory to contribute to a holistic prospective on the nature and impact of effective followership. Leader-follower relations are at the heart of the transformational followership concept, aligning transformational followership with the objectives of followership theory given by Uhl-Bien and colleagues (2014). Specifically, the construct was developed with a followership-specific context in mind, and therefore, is mindful of the power dynamics that exist between leaders and followers, and how followers may impact their leader in a way that is not perceived as overstepping the boundaries of the follower role.

With respect to the implications for followership research, the results of this dissertation provide robust support for the notion that followers can also be transformational in relation to their leaders. Scholars have recognized the tendency for leadership research to focus on the unidirectional influence of one individual (e.g., Hollander 1992; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). This narrative of a visionary leader at the helm of the ship acknowledges the important role leaders play in mobilizing their constituents to achieve organizational goals; however, it largely ignores the influence of followers and limits scholarly inquiry into the contributions of followership to the leadership process. By demonstrating that followers can influence both the engagement and satisfaction of their leaders, the current research helps to position followers as co-producers of leadership outcomes, answering calls from Shamir (2007) to take a more balanced perspective when considering the interplay of leadership and followership. Moreover, in addition to psychometric support for the transformational followership construct, the current research demonstrates that transformational followership has a downstream effect on leaders’ work attitudes (i.e., engagement and satisfaction) outside of the direct context of the leader-follower relationship. Followers’ success and work involvement have long been treated as an effect of
transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006). However, there is limited research investigating the potential for followers to affect leaders’ behaviour and attitudes at work (cf. Camps et al., 2020 examined the effect of hostile followership on abusive supervision). The results of Study 3 evidence the diffuse influence of transformational followership and demonstrate the widespread impact of positive leader-follower dynamics on leaders at work.

By understanding the degree to which followers can be perceived as transformational, and how this may have a downstream effect on leaders’ work attitudes, we also gain deeper insight into leadership. For example, when examining antecedents of leaders’ work engagement, we might consider characteristics of the job, dispositional factors, relationships with coworkers, etc. (Schleicher et al., 2011), yet we fail to consider the people who likely work the closest with leaders to fulfill organizational objectives (i.e., followers). Therefore, the current research enhances our understanding of factors that serve to enhance leader engagement at work.

Theoretically, this may point to followership as an important missing ingredient in understanding many leadership phenomena. Previous research supports the reconsideration of followership in traditional leadership theories and constructs (e.g., shared leadership; Baird & Benson, 2022).

Finally, beyond the enhanced conceptual understanding of leadership and followership, the development of a new follower measure will aid in the exploration of future research questions regarding the nature and impact of followers to the leadership process. As previously mentioned, the lack of validated followership measures limits researchers’ ability to empirically test models examining the role of followers in the leadership process. The current research helps close this gap by providing a psychometrically valid assessment of the impact of ideal followership (i.e., transformational followership) on leaders.

**Practical Implications**
In a practical sense, the notion that followers are able to positively influence leadership outcomes at work provides useful information for the development and execution of leadership training and development programs. Forbes estimated that leadership development was a $366 billion industry (Westfall, 2019), yet many experts have pointed out that these programs often fail to deliver on their objectives (e.g., Gurdjian et al., 2014; McKinsey Quarterly). Organizations may be doing themselves a disservice by romanticizing leadership and painting leaders as all-powerful orchestrators of organizational success (Meindl et al., 1985), as this does not accurately reflect the full picture of how leadership operates in organizations. Thus, including insights from followership research can give us a better understanding of leadership, thereby enhancing the teachable skills and recommendations we make to trainers. For example, the current research supports the idea that having such generative and motivating engagements with followers has a positive relation to leaders’ feelings of engagement in their own work. Thus, if organizations want to encourage leaders to become more involved and immersed in their work it would be wise to consider the impact of followers and incorporate this into leadership training programs.

Further, the results of this study highlight the potential benefits to the leader from adopting a more participative approach to leadership (e.g., Wang et al., 2022). As such, leaders should be encouraged to actively solicit feedback from their followers and encourage more employee involvement in decision-making.

In a similar vein, the positive impact of transformational followership on leader outcomes highlights the utility of encouraging employees to take an active role in the leadership process by engaging in collaborative, intellectually stimulating, and supportive working relationships with their leaders. Followership training programs could use this idea to help employees start to work on strategies that enable followers to form these kinds of relationships with their leaders.
Because transformational followership represents leaders’ perceptions of their follower, the degree to which a follower may be viewed as transformational will be dependent on the specific relationship between the leader and follower. As such, the results of this thesis cannot directly prescribe any universally effective followership behaviour, however, followers may develop their own strategies to approach communication with their leader (partnership) or learn to seek out opportunities to encourage the leader to consider another vantage point (intellectual stimulation). The results of such efforts can help followers get involved in a productive way that will also garner a positive response from the leader.

With regards to the use of the transformational followership scale itself, organizations might distribute the scale to leaders to get an overall sense of which leader-follower dyads are operating optimally from the leader’s perspective. Though the transformational followership scale is not a diagnostic tool or measure of performance, low scores may be an early warning sign of a mismatch in working styles between leader and follower or could present an opportunity for leaders to work on ways to grow their connection to their followers. To this end, because the scale captures leader perceptions, organizations who use the transformational followership scale to improve work outcomes for leaders and followers should always consider the perspective of the follower in addition to that of the leader.

Finally, the impact of this research extends beyond the scientific community in its contributions to the debunking of conventional knowledge that followers are merely passive recipients of a leader’s influence. Empirical evidence demonstrating that followers are influential and integral actors independent of leaders can serve to enhance the self-concept of followers and influence leader perceptions about the value of their subordinates, leading to more effective and collaborative organizations.
Limitations and Future Directions

My dissertation research synthesized leadership and followership theory to conceptualize a new kind of effective followership that considers the transformational capabilities of followers. The results of the study show promise for the future of followership research; however, a few limitations should be noted. First, the samples for Phases 2 and 3 were all collected using an online recruitment panel (i.e., Prolific) and the sample characteristics were similar across these studies. Although these samples provided high quality data and may be representative of the target group of interest (i.e., leaders with management experience), it is nevertheless important to test the measure using different sampling techniques. In particular, a field study where data is collected in organizations would be a fruitful area for further research.

Second, I used single-source data for each study. As transformational followership is intended to be reported from the leader’s perspective, the decision to use single-source data was warranted from a theoretical standpoint, however, this sampling technique does increase the risk of method effects biasing the observed relationships. I controlled for method effects statistically in Study 2b using the comprehensive CFA marker technique and methodologically in Study 3 using a prospective design. Nevertheless, the advancement of transformational followership will benefit greatly from studies using dyadic data. Leadership and followership are inherently interconnected, with leaders and followers working in tandem to create organizational outcomes. Future research should examine the dyadic interplay between different styles of leadership (e.g., transformational, laissez-faire, abusive supervision, etc.) and transformational followership and how this interaction shapes organizational outcomes over time.

Third, as scale development is an exploratory and iterative process, more data should be collected to further refine and establish the theoretical contributions of the measure. For
example, future research could examine a wider range of criterion variables to expand the
nomological network of transformational followership. For example, some antecedents of
transformational followership may include followers’ political skill and power distance values.
Researchers could also investigate alternative outcome variables such as leaders’ liking and trust
of the follower, shared goal pursuit, and performance. In a similar vein, the lack of validated
followership measures was a limitation for the construct and criterion validity tests. Indeed, the
absence of comparable followership measures made choosing variables for the convergent and
divergent validity tests challenging. Although a notable limitation, this does draw further
attention to the need to establish psychometrically valid followership measures in future
research. That is, future research would benefit from additional followership measures that cover
a wide range of follower behaviours and tendencies. Of particular relevance to the current
research, the items contained in the eliminated “idealized influence” factor will play an important
role in future studies when specifying causal pathways and determining predictors of leaders’
perceptions of transformational followership. Future research could also investigate negative
followership behaviours and contrast these effects with those of transformational followership.
For example, examining the positive influence of transformational followership against the
deleterious effects of shady strategic followership (Schyns et al., 2019).

Finally, leadership and followership are relational concepts (e.g., Hollander, 1992),
meaning that they are defined in relation to one another. As such, future investigations involving
leaders, followers, or the dyadic relationship should consider how these roles shape one another
and how this subsequently impacts the expectations and behaviors of each party. Indeed, recent
scholarly work has called for more integration of leader and follower theories, stating:
"Nevertheless, in light of the abundance of leadership theories, the way forward may not necessarily be the development of new theories of leadership and new theories of followership (Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014), but instead the generation of integrative analyses of leadership and followership" Steffens and Haslam (2020, p. 10). These future research endeavours may involve re-examining leadership constructs through a followership lens and/or developing new theoretical models that include both leading and following as central variables. As we move into the next century of leadership research, it behooves us to expand our thinking and challenge commonly held assumptions about the nature of leadership and continue to advance a narrative that centers the dynamic interplay between the leader, their followers, and their external environment. Along these lines of thinking, examining how different leaders and followers act in relation to each other is a necessary direction for future research. Specifically, some leaders will be more predisposed to seeing their followers as transformational, necessitating research examining the characteristics and qualities of leaders that may inhibit transformational followership (e.g., a narcissistic leader may be less likely to give subordinates credit). Moreover, it is possible that certain leaders (e.g., laissez-faire leaders) may gravitate towards transformational followership because it enables them to take a step back and allow the follower to help them with their own work. Though the leader may derive benefits from this arrangement, it is unlikely to foster growth in the follower and lead the relationship to sour over time. As such, future research would benefit from examining how various leadership styles combine with transformational followership and the long-term impacts of these pairings on both parties.

Conclusions
Followership and leadership are inherently intertwined, and yet, our investigation of the leader-follower dynamic has mostly focused on the leader. To investigate the active role of followers in the leadership process, I conceptualized and developed a scale of transformational followership. Across three phases, I found robust psychometric support for a three-factor model. Additionally, mediation analyses from the final study provided preliminary support for transformational followership as a link from follower proactivity to positive leader outcomes (i.e., work engagement and job satisfaction). This work advances leadership and followership research by offering a novel theory-driven approach to measure the positive impact of followers on their leaders that can be used in future research and in practice by organizations.
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### Table 1

**List of Followership Measures Used in Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Dimensionality</th>
<th>Designed to Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelley Followership Questionnaire (KFQ)</td>
<td>Kelley (1992)</td>
<td>2 dimensions: active engagement and independent critical thought</td>
<td>Respondents’ followership style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Follower Theories (IFT)</td>
<td>Sy (2010); Junker et al., 2016</td>
<td>2 higher-order factors: prototypical and antiprototypical</td>
<td>Respondents’ perceptions of typical followership based on a set of characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coproduction and Passive Orientation</td>
<td>Carsten &amp; Uhl-Bien (2015)</td>
<td>Each is measured using a single dimension</td>
<td>Coproduction measures the degree to which followers believe it is their duty to partner with the leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passive orientation measures the belief that followers should take a step back and wait for instruction from the leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table includes only measures of followership that were developed for the purpose of measuring followership and have been used in more than one study. The table excludes measures of employee behaviour/characteristics that were applied to followers as well as scales that were adapted or developed for the purpose of a single study.*
Table 2

*Validity Index Ratings and Planned Contrasts from Expert Panel Review*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Idealized Influence $M (SD)$</th>
<th>Partnership $M (SD)$</th>
<th>Intellectual Stimulation $M (SD)$</th>
<th>Inspirational Motivation $M (SD)$</th>
<th>Aiken’s $V$</th>
<th>Cohen’s $d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. II_1</td>
<td>3.5 (0.93)</td>
<td>1.5 (0.76)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.07)</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>II vs. P = 2.37 II vs. IS = 3.07 II vs. IM = 1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. II_2</td>
<td>3.13 (1.25)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.31)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>II vs. P = 2.18 II vs. IS = 1.99 II vs. IM = 0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. II_3</td>
<td>3.38 (1.30)</td>
<td>1.38 (1.06)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.75 (1.04)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>II vs. P = 1.68 II vs. IS = 2.17 II vs. IM = 1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. II_4</td>
<td>2.50 (1.85)</td>
<td>1.50 (0.76)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>2.75 (1.58)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>II vs. P = 0.71 II vs. IS = 0.93 II vs. IM = 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. II_5</td>
<td>3.25 (0.89)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.71)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>2.13 (1.13)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>II vs. P = 2.49 II vs. IS = 2.83 II vs. IM = 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. II_6</td>
<td>4.00 (0.53)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.71)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.75*</td>
<td>II vs. P = 4.38 II vs. IS = 5.50 II vs. IM = 5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. II_7</td>
<td>2.38 (1.19)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>3.25 (1.75)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>II vs. P = 1.43 II vs. IS = 1.25 II vs. IM = 0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. II_8</td>
<td>2.75 (1.16)</td>
<td>1.38 (1.06)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>2.63 (1.41)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>II vs. P = 1.23 II vs. IS = 1.89 II vs. IM = 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. II_9</td>
<td>3.00 (1.41)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.71)</td>
<td>1.14 (0.38)</td>
<td>1.63 (1.06)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>II vs. P = 1.57 II vs. IS = 1.79 II vs. IM = 1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. II_10</td>
<td>2.50 (1.20)</td>
<td>2.63 (1.60)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>II vs. P = 0.09 II vs. IS = 1.38 II vs. IM = 1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. II_11</td>
<td>2.88 (1.46)</td>
<td>2.25 (1.39)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>II vs. P = 0.44 II vs. IS = 1.65 II vs. IM = 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. II_12</td>
<td>4.25 (0.71)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.71)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>1.88 (0.99)</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td>II vs. P = 4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. II_13</td>
<td>1.75 (1.04)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>2.50 (1.60)</td>
<td>1.75 (1.39)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. II_14</td>
<td>2.75 (1.58)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.51)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.88 (1.13)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. II_15</td>
<td>1.88 (1.13)</td>
<td>3.25 (0.71)</td>
<td>1.50 (1.07)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. II_16</td>
<td>4.00 (1.41)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.31)</td>
<td>0.75*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. II_17</td>
<td>2.38 (1.69)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.50 (1.07)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. II_18</td>
<td>2.75 (1.39)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.71)</td>
<td>2.25 (1.39)</td>
<td>1.63 (1.06)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. II_19</td>
<td>2.63 (1.60)</td>
<td>1.88 (0.99)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>2.88 (1.81)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. II_20</td>
<td>4.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.71)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.63 (0.74)</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. II_21</td>
<td>3.38 (1.41)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.75 (1.04)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. P_1</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>2.88 (1.36)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.50 (0.76)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. P_2</td>
<td>1.13 (0.74)</td>
<td>5.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>1.50 (0.76)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. P_3</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>4.50 (1.07)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.52)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.88**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. P_4</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>4.75 (0.71)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.94**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. P_5</td>
<td>1.63 (0.92)</td>
<td>5.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. P_6</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>4.50 (0.53)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.88**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. P_7</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>4.13 (0.83)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.78*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. P_8</td>
<td>1.50 (1.07)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.07)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>1.75 (1.17)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. P_9</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>3.13 (1.73)</td>
<td>3.13 (1.81)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. P_10</td>
<td>1.38 (0.52)</td>
<td>4.75 (0.71)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.94**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. P_11</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>4.88 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. IS_1</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>4.88 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.50 (0.76)</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. IS_2</td>
<td>1.50 (1.07)</td>
<td>1.50 (0.76)</td>
<td>3.75 (1.16)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. IS_3</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.29 (0.49)</td>
<td>4.50 (1.07)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.88**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. IS_4</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>1.63 (0.74)</td>
<td>4.25 (0.71)</td>
<td>1.63 (1.41)</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. IS_5</td>
<td>1.29 (0.49)</td>
<td>1.43 (0.79)</td>
<td>4.71 (0.49)</td>
<td>1.29 (0.49)</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. IS_6</td>
<td>1.88 (1.25)</td>
<td>1.63 (0.92)</td>
<td>3.75 (1.58)</td>
<td>1.50 (1.07)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. IS_7</td>
<td>2.00 (1.41)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.07)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P vs. II = n/a
P vs. IS = n/a
P vs. IM = n/a
P vs. II = 7.45
P vs. IS = 7.45
P vs. IM = 7.45
P vs. II = 6.62
P vs. IS = 6.62
P vs. IM = 6.62
P vs. II = 0.47
P vs. IS = 0.68
P vs. IM = 0.22
P vs. II = 5.45
P vs. IS = 6.48
P vs. IM = 6.48
P vs. II = 8.80
P vs. IS = 10.61
P vs. IM = 10.61
IS vs. II = 10.61
IS vs. P = 6.01
IS vs. IM = 5.72
IS vs. II = 2.01
IS vs. P = 2.29
IS vs. IM = 2.42
IS vs. II = 3.95
IS vs. P = 3.87
IS vs. IM = 3.95
IS vs. II = 3.96
IS vs. P = 3.62
IS vs. IM = 2.36
IS vs. II = 7.02
IS vs. P = 5.02
IS vs. IM = 7.03
IS vs. II = 1.32
IS vs. P = 1.64
IS vs. IM = 1.67
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. IS_8</td>
<td>1.75 (1.49)</td>
<td>1.50 (0.93)</td>
<td>4.50 (0.53)</td>
<td>2.25 (1.39)</td>
<td>0.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. IS_9</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.63 (1.06)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.20)</td>
<td>1.75 (1.04)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. IM_1</td>
<td>1.75 (0.88)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.52)</td>
<td>1.75 (1.16)</td>
<td>4.00 (1.31)</td>
<td>0.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. IM_2</td>
<td>1.75 (1.16)</td>
<td>1.13 (0.35)</td>
<td>1.50 (1.07)</td>
<td>4.75 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. IM_3</td>
<td>1.63 (0.92)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>3.38 (1.51)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. IM_4</td>
<td>2.50 (1.41)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>1.50 (1.07)</td>
<td>4.38 (1.06)</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. IM_5</td>
<td>1.50 (1.07)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>4.38 (1.06)</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. IM_6</td>
<td>1.75 (1.16)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>4.63 (0.52)</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. IM_7</td>
<td>1.75 (1.16)</td>
<td>2.38 (1.69)</td>
<td>1.50 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.88 (1.46)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. IM_8</td>
<td>2.88 (1.36)</td>
<td>1.63 (0.92)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>2.88 (1.46)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. IM_9</td>
<td>1.75 (1.16)</td>
<td>1.50 (0.76)</td>
<td>1.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>4.38 (0.74)</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. IM_10</td>
<td>1.63 (0.92)</td>
<td>2.25 (1.16)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>3.75 (1.39)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items in boldface did not pass. M = Mean; SD = Standard deviation. II = Idealized Influence; P = Partnership; IS = Intellectual Stimulation; IM = Inspirational Motivation. *p < .05; ** p < .01.
### Table 3

**Study 2a Multilevel Exploratory Factor Analysis Fit Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR (W/B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 W/1 B</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.07/.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 W/1 B</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.04/.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 W/1 B</strong></td>
<td><strong>.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>.93</strong></td>
<td><strong>01/.13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 W/2 B</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.07/.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 W/2 B</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.04/.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 W/2 B</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.01/.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 W/3 B</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.07/.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 W/3 B</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.04/.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 W/3 B</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.01/.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: W = within-level of analysis; B = between-level of analysis. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. The best-fitting solution is highlighted in bold.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (intended dimension)</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Encourages open communication between us (P)</td>
<td>.93*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Help us establish a two-way relationship (P)</td>
<td>.93*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Show me we are a team (P)</td>
<td>.94*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilitate collaborative interactions between us (P)</td>
<td>.88*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Help us to establish a personal connection (P)</td>
<td>.87*</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Make it easy for us to maintain a consistent line of communication (P)</td>
<td>.90*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Contribute to a collaborative working relationship (P)</td>
<td>.90*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>-.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Allow us to have a strong partnership (P)</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Help me continue to evolve intellectually (IS)</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Encourage me to challenge my own way of thinking (IS)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.86*</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Positively contribute to my leadership decisions (IS)†</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Encourage me to consider alternative viewpoints (IS)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.91*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Help me incorporate new insights into my leadership (IS)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.89*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Make me excited about the future of our initiatives (IM)†</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Motivate me to work harder as a leader (IM)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Make me want to deliver my best work (IM)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Motivate me to feel more invested in my own work (IM)</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Inspire me to keep pushing myself as a leader (IM)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Make coming to work more enjoyable (IM)†</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.39*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: † Denotes items that were removed from the item pool. P = Partnership; IS = intellectual stimulation; IM = inspirational motivation. Bold text indicates groupings of items. *p < .05.
### Table 5

**Follower-Level Correlations Between Study 2a Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>1. Partner</td>
<td>(.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. IS</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>(&amp;94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. IM</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Vision</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Goals</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. IC</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Expect</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Model</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Stim</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Duty</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Coop</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Supp</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: n = 884; k = 295. TFF = Transformational Followership; TFL = Transformational Leadership; Behaviors = communal followership. Partner = Partnership; IS = intellectual stimulation; IM = inspirational motivation; Vision = identifying and articulating a vision; Goals = fostering acceptance of group goals; IC = providing individualized support; Expect = high performance expectations; Model = providing an appropriate model; Stim = intellectual stimulation (TFL); Duty = dutifulness; Coop = cooperation; Supp = Active support. M = Mean; SD = Standard deviation. Omega reliabilities for the follower-level are along the diagonal in bold (transformational leadership reliability could not be computed as the multilevel CFA did not converge, and thus the standardized factor loadings are unavailable). All correlations are significant at the p < .001 level.*
Table 6

**Summary of Models from Phase 1 of the Comprehensive CFA Marker Technique**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Description/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. CFA Model     | • Obtain correlations among the substantive latent variables and the marker latent variable  
                  • Determine acceptable fit of model  
                  • Need to run this model to get the factor loading and measurement error variance estimates for future models (see below for explanation)                                                  |
| 2. Baseline Model| • Allows substantive factors to be correlated with each other but has an orthogonal marker latent variable with its indicators having fixed factor loadings and error variances (from Model 1)   
                  • Using fixed values from the CFA model establishes the meaning of the marker latent variable → this is because marker variable is connected to substantive indicators via secondary factor loadings in subsequent models which would obscure its meaning if values were not fixed  
                  • Relationship between marker variable and substantive latent variables is set to 0 to reflect assumption that marker variable is unrelated (orthogonal) to the substantive variables  
                  • Relationship between substantive variables is freely estimated → this is repeated until Model 5, which tests the assumption that the marker variable affects these relationships |
| 3. Method-C Model| • Factor loadings from the latent marker variable (BLUE) to each of the substantive indicators are added into the model  
                  • Each path is set to be equivalent by labeling them the same in the input instructions  
                  • Substantive items now have an additional source of variance (error, substantive, and method)  
                  • Determines whether CMV affects the items equally                                                                                                                                 |
| 4. Method-U Model| • Changes the assumption about the equality of the method factor loadings (from Method-C) and allows them to be different  
                  • Factor loadings are unconstrained (hence Method “U”)  
                  • Three sources of variance as above  
                  • Tests if CMV affects substantive items differently/unequally (UMV)                                                                                          |
| 5. Method-R Model | • Use of restricted parameters to test for bias (Method “R”)  
|                   | • Investigates the potential biasing effect of marker variable method variance on factor correlations (or structural parameters)  
|                   | • Identical to Method-C and Method-U, except substantive factor correlations are constrained to their values from the baseline model  
|                   | • Tests if the factor correlations are different in this model compared to what was found in either the Method-C or Method-U model |
Table 7

Summary of Model Comparisons from Phase 1 of the Comprehensive CFA Marker Technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Description/Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Baseline vs. Method-C       | • Provides a test of the presence of equal method effects associated with the marker latent variable (i.e., evidence of CMV)  
                                 | • If the chi-square is significant, the marker variable has equal CMV influence on the substantive items |
| 2. Method-C vs. Method-U       | • Tests against the assumption of equal method effects and determines whether the assumptions of the Method-C or Method-U model best describes the nature of the effect of method variance on the substantive variables (i.e., is it equal or unequal?)  
                                 | • If the chi-square is significant, the marker variable has unequal influence on the substantive items → retain this model if the test is significant and Method-C if it’s not significant |
| 3. Method-U/C* vs. Method-R    | • Compared to whichever you retain from the previous test*  
                                 | • Provides a statistical test of whether factor correlations are biased by method effects  
<pre><code>                             | • If the model is significant, the marker variable substantially affected the factor correlations |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR (W/B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 W/1 B</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.07/.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 W/1 B</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.02/.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 W/3 B</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07/.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 W/3 B</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.02/.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* W = within-level of analysis; B = between-level of analysis. RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. The best-fitting solutions are highlighted in bold.
# Table 9

**Study 2b Follower-Level Item Factor Loadings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (Dimension)</th>
<th>Standardized Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Encourages open communication between us (P)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Help us establish a two-way relationship (P)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Show me we are a team (P)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilitate collaborative interactions between us (P)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Help us to establish a personal connection (P)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Make it easy for us to maintain a consistent line of communication (P)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Contribute to a collaborative working relationship (P)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Allow us to have a strong partnership (P)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Help me continue to evolve intellectually (IS)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Encourage me to challenge my own way of thinking (IS)</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Encourage me to consider alternative viewpoints (IS)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Help me incorporate new insights into my leadership (IS)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Motivate me to work harder as a leader (IM)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Make me want to deliver my best work (IM)</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Motivate me to feel more invested in my own work (IM)</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Inspire me to keep pushing myself as a leader (IM)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* P = Partnership; IS = intellectual stimulation; IM = inspirational motivation. Results are based on the 3 Within/1 Between-level solution. All factor loadings are significant at the $p < .001$ level.
Table 10

*Phase 1 Results for CMV Comprehensive Marker Technique*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CFA</td>
<td>691.05</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Baseline</td>
<td>701.62</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Method-C</td>
<td>678.85</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Method-U</td>
<td>649.02</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Method-R</td>
<td>646.23</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Model Comparison Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Δ Models</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ critical value; .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Baseline vs. Method-C</td>
<td>31.88***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Method-U vs. Method-R</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***$p < .001$; *$p < .05$
Table 11

*Phase 2 Reliability Decomposition for CMV Comprehensive Marker Technique*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>Reliability Baseline Model</th>
<th>Decomposed Reliability Method-U Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Reliability</td>
<td>Substantive Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Partner = partnership; IS = intellectual stimulation; IM = inspirational motivation; Marker = attitude toward the colour blue (marker variable). Total reliability was calculated using baseline estimates. Substantive and method reliability were calculated using estimates from the Method-U model.
Table 12

**Phase 3 Sensitivity Analysis for Comprehensive Marker Technique**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Correlations</th>
<th>CFA Model</th>
<th>Baseline Model</th>
<th>Method-U Model</th>
<th>Method-S(.05) Model</th>
<th>Method-S(.01) Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner-IS</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner-IM</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS-IM</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner-Marker</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS-Marker</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM-Marker</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Partner = partnership; IS = intellectual stimulation; IM = inspirational motivation; Marker = attitude toward the colour blue (marker variable). All factor correlations significant at the $p < .001$ level.*
Table 13

CFA Fit Indices for Study 2b Subset Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-factor model of TFF</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-factor model of TFL</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-factor model of TFL with 6-factor model of TFL</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 factors of TFF subsumed under corresponding factor of TFL</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor solution containing all TFF and TFL items</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TFF = Transformational Followership Scale; TFL = Transformational Leadership Inventory (Podsakoff et al. 1990); RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual.
Table 14

*EFA Fit Indices for Study 2b Subset Analyses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Factors</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>.07</strong></td>
<td><strong>.96</strong></td>
<td><strong>.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>.01</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. Best fitting solution is in boldface.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (intended dimension)</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
<th>Factor 7</th>
<th>Factor 8</th>
<th>Factor 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFF_1 (P)</td>
<td>.94*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_2 (P)</td>
<td>.97*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_3 (P)</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_4 (P)</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_5 (P)</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_6 (P)</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_7 (P)</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_8 (P)</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_9 (IS)</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_10 (IS)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.84*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_11 (IS)</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_12 (IS)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_13 (IM)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_14 (IM)</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_15 (IM)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.89*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFF_16 (IM)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_1 (V)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_2 (V)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_3 (V)</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_4 (V)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_5 (V)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.86*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_6 (G)</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_7 (G)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_8 (G)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_9 (G)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_10 (IC)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_11 (IC)</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_12 (IC)</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_13 (IC)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1.09*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_14 (E)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_15 (E)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.90*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_16 (E)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_17 (M)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_18 (M)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_19 (M)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_20 (M)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_21 (S)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL_22 (S)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TFF = items from the Transformational Followership Scale; TFL = items from the Transformational Leadership Inventory. P = Partnership; IS = intellectual stimulation; IM = inspirational motivation; V = identifying and articulating a vision; G = fostering acceptance of group goals; IC = providing individualized support; E = high performance expectations; M = providing an appropriate model; S = intellectual stimulation (TFL). Bolded numbers identify item groupings. All pattern matrix coefficients are based on a geomin rotation. * p < .05.
### Table 16

**Follower-Level Correlations Between Study 2b Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFF</td>
<td>1. Partner</td>
<td>(97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. IS</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. IM</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Vision</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Goals</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. IC</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Expect</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Model</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Stim</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors</td>
<td>10. Duty</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Coop</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>(93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Supp</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>(94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFT</td>
<td>13. Proto</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Anti</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | M        | 5.43 | 4.99 | 5.14 | 4.82 | 5.16 | 4.50 | 4.59 | 5.02 | 4.63 | 4.80 | 4.58 | 4.57 | 3.25 | 1.83 |
|       | SD       | 1.28 | 1.44 | 1.41 | 1.41 | 1.40 | 1.27 | 1.41 | 1.50 | 1.51 | 0.93 | 0.99 | 1.01 | 0.63 | 0.47 |

*Note: n = 979; k = 327. TFF = Transformational Followership; TFL = Transformational Leadership; Behaviors = communal followership. Partner = Partnership; IS = intellectual stimulation; IM = inspirational motivation; Vision = identifying and articulating a vision; Goals = fostering acceptance of group goals; IC = providing individualized support; Expect = high performance expectations; Model = providing an appropriate model; Stim = intellectual stimulation (TFL); Duty = dutifulness; Coop = cooperation; Supp = Active support. Proto = prototypical followership; Anti = antiprototypical followership. M = Mean; SD = Standard deviation. Omega reliabilities for the follower-level are along the diagonal in bold (transformational leadership reliability could not be computed as the multilevel CFA did not converge, and thus the standardized factor loadings are unavailable). All correlations are significant at the p < .001 level.*
Table 17

*Study 3 Measurement Invariance Testing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>#fp</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$ df</th>
<th>$\Delta$CFI</th>
<th>$\Delta$RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configural</td>
<td>362.20*</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>380.10*</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalar</td>
<td>403.75*</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: df = degrees of freedom; #fp = number of parameters estimated in each model; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; $\Delta \chi^2$, $\Delta \chi^2$ df, $\Delta$CFI and $\Delta$RMSEA = change in $\chi^2$, $\chi^2$ degrees of freedom, CFI, and RMSEA estimates, respectively, between successive invariance models. *p < .05*
Table 18

Correlations and Descriptive Statistics for Study 3 Latent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. IS</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IM</td>
<td>.78***</td>
<td>.90***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Proactive</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ideal</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.82***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Counter-ideal</td>
<td>-.60***</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.41***</td>
<td>-.47***</td>
<td>-.66***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MLMX</td>
<td>.83***</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.79***</td>
<td>-.56***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Engagement</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.91***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Burnout</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
<td>-.48***</td>
<td>-.54***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Partner = partnership; IS = intellectual stimulation; IM = inspirational motivation; Proactive = follower proactivity; ideal = ideal followership; counter-ideal = counter-ideal followership; MLMX = manager-rated leader-member exchange. Follower proactivity and ideal/counter-ideal followership were measured in the first survey. Partnership, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation were measured in the second survey. Engagement, job satisfaction, and burnout were measured in the third survey and reflect leaders’ self-ratings. M = mean; SD = standard deviation. Means and standard deviations are based on observed scores. Omega reliabilities are on the diagonal in boldface. *p < .05; **p < .01; *** p < .001.
### Table 19

**Study 3 Mediation Analyses Summary Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M = Partnership</th>
<th>Y = Engagement</th>
<th>Y = Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Y = Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>SE (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X on M (a)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M on Y (b)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Effect</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 ) of M</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 ) of Y</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M = IS</th>
<th>Y = Engagement</th>
<th>Y = Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Y = Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>SE (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X on M (a)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M on Y (b)</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Effect</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 ) of M</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 ) of Y</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M = IM</th>
<th>Y = Engagement</th>
<th>Y = Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Y = Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>SE (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X on M (a)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M on Y (b)</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Effect</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 ) of M</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 ) of Y</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** X = follower proactivity for all models; M = mediator; Y = leadership outcome. IS = intellectual stimulation; IM = inspirational motivation. \( \beta \) = standardized regression coefficient; B = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE = standard error.
Figure 1. The leadership process model (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014)
Appendix A

Transformational Followership Scale (Initial Item Pool)

For this questionnaire, we want you to think of someone who reports to you directly or whose work you regularly supervise and respond to each item in reference to that individual. (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree).

Idealized Influence

1. My follower is someone I admire
2. My follower cares about the quality of their work
3. My follower holds themselves accountable
4. My follower has skills I would like to emulate in my own leadership
5. My follower backs up their ideas with action
6. I view my followers’ skills and expertise as essential to the organization
7. My follower is willing to go beyond what is asked of them
8. My follower shows me that they care more about doing their job well than personal gain
9. My follower consistently accomplishes what is asked of them
10. My follower shows me that I can trust them
11. I consider my follower someone I can count on
12. My follower models a desirable work ethic
13. My follower demonstrates active independent thought
14. My follower is reliable
15. My follower is open to feedback
16. My follower models ideal behaviours within the organization
17. My follower knows who they are
18. My follower isn’t afraid to stand firm on tough issues
19. I am proud to work alongside my follower
20. My follower takes ownership over their work
21. My follower is indispensable to this organization

Partnership

22. I am comfortable being myself around my follower
23. My follower and I have open communication
24. My follower and I have a two-way relationship
25. My follower and I are a team
26. My interactions with my follower are very collaborative
27. My follower and I have a personal connection with one another
28. My follower and I check in with one another
29. My follower understands me as a leader
30. I consider my follower an intellectual partner
31. My follower and I have collaborative working relationship
32. My follower and I have a strong partnership
Intellectual Stimulation

33. My follower’s thought-provoking questions lead me to rethink how I do things
34. I incorporate my follower’s suggestions when making decisions
35. My follower encourages me to challenge my own way of thinking
36. My follower’s perspectives influence my decisions
37. My follower provides me with alternative viewpoints
38. My follower contributes to a more comprehensive strategic vision
39. My follower’s expertise makes me feel like a more well-rounded leader
40. My follower’s insights have helped me in my leadership
41. I feel more confident about the ideas I put forward with my follower

Inspirational Motivation

42. My follower makes me excited about the future of our initiatives
43. My follower motivates me to work harder as a leader
44. My follower is enthusiastic about the way I lead our group
45. Knowing my follower is invested in our work makes me want to deliver
46. My follower motivates me to feel more invested in my own work
47. My follower’s eagerness to achieve our objectives encourages me to keep pushing myself as a leader
48. My follower shares their passion for our objectives with me
49. My follower is engaged in our work
50. I benefit from the enthusiasm my follower brings to our work
51. My follower shows me they believe in me as a leader
Appendix B

Transformational Followership Scale (Revised Item Pool – Phase 1)

For this questionnaire, we want you to think of someone who reports to you directly or whose work you regularly supervise and respond to each item in reference to that individual. (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree).

My follower has characteristics and/or exhibits behaviours that…

**Partnership**

1. Encourages open communication between us
2. Help us establish a two-way relationship
3. Show me we are a team
4. Facilitate collaborative interactions between us
5. Help us to establish a personal connection
6. Make it easy for us to maintain a consistent line of communication
7. Contribute to a collaborative working relationship
8. Allow us to have a strong partnership

**Intellectual Stimulation**

9. Help me continue to evolve intellectually
10. Encourage me to challenge my own way of thinking
11. Positively contribute to my leadership decisions
12. Encourage me to consider alternative viewpoints
13. Help me incorporate new insights into my leadership

**Inspirational Motivation**

14. Make me excited about the future of our initiatives
15. Motivate me to work harder as a leader
16. Make me want to deliver my best work
17. Motivate me to feel more invested in my own work
18. Inspire me to keep pushing myself as a leader
19. Make coming to work more enjoyable
Appendix C

Transformational Followership Scale (Revised Item Pool – Phases 2&3)

For this questionnaire, we want you to think of someone who reports to you directly or whose work you regularly supervise and respond to each item in reference to that individual. (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree).

My follower has characteristics and/or exhibits behaviours that…

Partnership

1. Encourages open communication between us
2. Help us establish a two-way relationship
3. Show me we are a team
4. Facilitate collaborative interactions between us
5. Help us to establish a personal connection
6. Make it easy for us to maintain a consistent line of communication
7. Contribute to a collaborative working relationship
8. Allow us to have a strong partnership

Intellectual Stimulation

9. Help me continue to evolve intellectually
10. Encourage me to challenge my own way of thinking
11. Encourage me to consider alternative viewpoints
12. Help me incorporate new insights into my leadership

Inspirational Motivation

13. Motivate me to work harder as a leader
14. Make me want to deliver my best work
15. Motivate me to feel more invested in my own work
16. Inspire me to keep pushing myself as a leader
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