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ABSTRACT


Leadership research largely has ignored the extent to which followers influence leaders and the leadership process. Even fewer studies have examined the effect of Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTs) and Implicit Followership Theories (IFTs) on performance and affective outcomes. In prior research, there is an implicit assumption that ILTs and IFTs are compatible, but little research has examined the presence of incongruent ILTs and IFTs and potential effects incongruence might have on organizational outcomes. The current study examined the effect of ILT/IFT congruence on organizational outcomes (performance, satisfaction, and perceived leader effectiveness) in two different samples: a student sample ($N = 287$) and a work sample ($N = 250$). ILT/IFT congruence was unrelated to performance, course/job satisfaction, and perceived instructor/leader satisfaction. However, explicit measures of leadership (Consideration, Initiating Structure, Followership, and LMX) and cognitive dissonance were related to most of these outcomes. Although I did not find support for the expected relationships, my research highlighted several issues and future research directions relevant to ILT and IFT research, including how to measure and conceptualize ILT/IFT congruence, the influence
of congruence on organizational outcomes, and the role cognitive dissonance in organizational outcomes.
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Implicit Leadership and Followership Theories: Does Congruency Matter?

Substantial research has suggested that leaders can influence the attitudes and performance of followers, which subsequently affects the overall performance of an organization (e.g., Bass, 2008; Thomas, 1988). Numerous theories have described the explicit mechanisms through which leaders influence followers (e.g., Charismatic, Transformational), but implicit theories have gained popularity in recent decades (Lord & Maher, 1991). Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTs) are individuals’ schemas composed of attributes that characterize leaders (Eden & Leviatan, 1975). ILTs held by leaders and followers can influence a leader’s competence (Bass & Avolio, 1989), followers’ respect toward leaders (Van Quaquebeke, van Knippenberg, & Brodbeck, 2011), and employee well-being and satisfaction (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Junker, Schyns, van Dick, & Scheurer 2011). Recently, researchers have shown increased interest in Implicit Followership Theories (IFTs), which are individuals’ schemas composed of attributes that characterize followers (Sy, 2010). Fewer studies have examined the effects of follower categorization through IFTs, but Sy (2010) found that leader trust, leader satisfaction, and liking of the leader were all related to IFTs. Additionally, researchers have examined what might happen when actual leader behavior mismatches ILTs and actual follower behavior mismatches IFTs (Junker, Stegmann, Braun, & van Dick, 2014; Topaka, 2011). In this previous research, there is an implicit assumption that ILTs and IFTs are compatible. However, little research has considered the effects on employees’
affective outcomes and performance when ILTs and IFTs within one level (i.e., leaders or followers) are not congruent. Thus, the purpose of my research was to examine the effect that mismatched ILTs and IFTs in followers have on organizational outcomes experienced by the individual, such as performance, job satisfaction, and perceived leader effectiveness.

**Leader-Centered Leadership**

Leadership has been a widely researched topic for much of the last century largely because of the impact leaders can have on organizational performance (Bass, 2008; Thomas, 1988). Further, many proposed leadership theories have been leader-centric. Dating back to Taylor’s emphasis on the leader in Scientific Management (Taylor, 1911, 1934), leadership theories have centered on the importance of only the leader’s traits, behaviors, and influence in organizations. Even leadership theories widely accepted and researched today maintain a leader-centric perspective that either minimizes or completely ignores the role of the follower. Trait approaches to leadership have assumed that leaders possess specific, innate traits, such as extraversion, assertiveness, and conscientiousness, that set them apart from followers (Bass, 2008; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Stogdill, 1948). Behavioral approaches, such as the Michigan and Ohio State studies, have focused on task-oriented and relationship-oriented behaviors leaders use to motivate followers (Fleishman, 1953; Stogdill, 1950). These theories have focused only on leaders’ actions and ignore those of followers. Situational approaches to leadership (e.g., Fiedler, 1967; House, 1971) have focused on followers as an aspect of the situation, which determines what leadership style would be most effective given the situational factors.
Even two of the most popular modern theories of leadership have maintained a leader-centric perspective. Charismatic leadership theory has attributed leadership effectiveness to a leader’s charismatic confidence and inspirational vision (e.g., Conger & Kanugo, 1987; House, 1977) whereas transformational leadership theory posits that leaders inspire and motivate their followers to achieve more (e.g., Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Burns, 1978). Yet again, both of these theories fail to recognize any follower impact or responsibilities. Furthermore, society plays a large role in minimizing the importance of followers by using stigmatized labels, such as ‘subordinate’, to refer to followers in everyday language. Associations such as these imply that followers are subservient to those in the more glamorous and desired role of a leader.

**Implicit Leadership Theories**

Humans encounter a great deal of information every day. Cognitive psychological research has suggested that people rely on top-down cognition in the presence of overwhelming amounts of information (Galambos, Abelson, & Black, 1986). Specifically, people employ cognitive simplification, or schemas, to categorize and organize complex information into more manageable pieces (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Individuals can categorize information into schemas in any area of life, but these tools commonly are used in relation to organizations to classify people as ‘leaders’ and ‘followers’ (e.g., Engle & Lord, 1997; Lord, Foti, & Phillips, 1982). Leadership researchers have labeled these schemas of leaders and followers as implicit theories and have been using these theories to explain and interpret leader behavior since the 1970s (Eden & Leviatan, 1975). Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTs) are individuals’ schemas composed of the attributes that make up a leader (Lord & Maher, 1991). Similar to more
traditional explicit theories of leadership (i.e., Trait Theory, Charismatic Theory), implicit theories of leadership have focused on only the leader’s role in the leadership process. Individuals who hold a leadership role or a follower role can have these schemas. Research has suggested that people’s implicit theories about leaders begin forming at an early age. Keller (2003) posited that the foundation on which individuals base their leader-follower expectations stem from the relationship a child had with his or her parent(s) in infancy and the child’s attachment needs. From these parent-child relationships, ILTs continue to develop as individuals are exposed to more leader-follower experiences in adulthood (Ayman-Nolley & Ayman, 2005; Keller, 1999).

Lord et al. (1982) suggested that ILTs are ways for individuals to categorize cognitively the people in their environment as leaders and non-leaders. These categories can be at the superordinate level (e.g., leader), the basic level (e.g., business leader, sports leader), and the subordinate level (e.g., morning shift supervisor, evening shift supervisor). Categorization was once thought of as a complex, multi-step model (Green & Mitchell, 1979). However, Lord et al. (1982) suggested that people categorize targets through recognition-based processing. In recognition-based processing, a person creates prototypes of what a group member (leader or follower) might be. Those prototypes serve as a reference against which potential group members are compared. For example, if a target matches the prototype of a leader, that target will be categorized as a leader in the rater’s mind. Not all prototypes are the same, though. Prototypes can be represented on two dimensions: the norm of prototype and valence. On the norm of prototype dimension, prototypes are either typical or ideal (whichever is most representative of a particular individual’s prototype). For example, a typical student might attend most
classes, study for two hours a week, and receive B’s and C’s. An ideal student might attend every class, study for 10 or more hours a week, and receive all A’s. The valence dimension describes prototypes as positive, negative, or neutral. A prototype’s valence represents the average of all attributes (i.e., mostly positive, mostly negative). Positive prototypes represent ideal attributes (e.g., hard-working, intelligent, and attentive for students), negative prototypes represent undesired attributes (e.g., impolite and lazy), and neutral prototypes represent attributes that are irrelevant for group membership (e.g., being a good harmonica player).

The term ‘implicit’ in Implicit Leadership Theories does not imply that these schemas are inaccessible phenomena. Rather, implicit means that the categorization of leaders and non-leaders happens outside of conscious awareness. Implicit theories attempt to explain the subjective reality of leadership, which can change depending on the type and amount of information one receives. ILTs are assessed using indirect measures when an individual is unaware of his or her schemas. Indirect measures include lexical decision tasks (Meyer & Schvaneveldt, 1971), word fragment completion (Gilbert & Hixon, 1991), Implicit Association Tests (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998), or interpretation-based projective tests (Harms & Luthans, 2012; Sy, 2013). However, individuals can access their implicit categories using explicit methods in which participants rate a list of attributes characteristic of leaders (Lord & Maher, 1991; Offerman, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994). Initially, researchers treated ILTs as a source of bias in measuring leadership (Eden & Leviatan, 1975). Not until the 1990s and 2000s were ILTs addressed as a mechanism through which followers could interpret the
behavior of leaders and that leaders could use to guide their own behavior (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

One particular stream of ILT research has examined the congruency between actual leader behavior and ILTs. Researchers who have examined this effect have used absolute difference scores to calculate implicit-explicit leadership trait differences as recommended by Edwards (1994). For example, Epitropaki and Martin (2005) administered a 21-item ILT measure (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004) and asked participants to rate how characteristic each attribute was of a business leader. Then, they administered the same 21-items but asked participants to rate how the same attributes applied to their managers. Epitropaki and Martin (2005) analyzed the absolute differences of the ILT scores minus the ILT recognition scores, which is a common congruence index used to measure differences between perceived and desired attributes for job attitudes (e.g., Barrett, 1978) or subordinates (e.g., Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975).

Substantial research has examined how the extent to which leaders fit the category of a leader, according to others’ ILTs, can influence organizational outcomes. Compared to leaders who do not fit typical ILTs, leaders who fit ILTs are perceived to have higher performance (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1989), are attributed more technical competence (Sy et al., 2010), are more liked by followers (Nye & Forsyth, 1991), and garner more respect from followers (e.g., Van Quaquebeke & Brodbeck, 2008). Additionally, ILT fit positively predicts organizational commitment (Poole et al., 1989; Weick, 1995), job satisfaction (Ayman & Chemers, 1983), follower identification with the leader (Van
Quaquebeke et al., 2011), and better quality Leader-Member Exchange (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005).

**Followership**

Until late in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, followers were treated as passive recipients of leadership within the leadership literature, such as in the romance of leadership theory (Meindl, 1990) and Leader-Member Exchange (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Toward the beginning of the 2000s, researchers began placing more importance on followers and their impact on leaders (e.g., Carsten, Uhl-Bien, West, Patera, & McGregor, 2010; Uhl-Bien & Pillai, 2007). The term followership emerged from an examination of the impact followers have on the leadership process (Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Low, & Carsten, 2014). As a result, new explicit theories began to incorporate the idea of followership into the existing knowledge of leadership to produce role-based theories and constructionist theories of followership.

Researchers have examined followership as a role individuals can have or as a social construction between groups of people. Role theory approaches have focused on followership as a role, either formal or informal, that individuals can hold within an organization and how those individuals work with employees in leadership positions to achieve organizational outcomes (Carsten et al., 2010). Constructionist views of followership have given more power to the followers and treated the process of leadership as a social construction involving both the leader and follower. Under constructionist theories, individuals do not hold necessarily particular roles within a hierarchical structure but rather engage in social interactions with one another, and these interactions result in the behaviors and identities of leaders and followers (DeRue &
DeRue and Ashford (2010) posited that some employees within an organization will ‘claim’ the identity of either a leader or follower, and the other employees will ‘grant’ the prior that identity and claim the opposite role as their own to support the prior employee. Leadership and followership would not be constructed if a claim was not met with a reciprocal grant. Thus, the leadership process is subject to social construction in order to exist.

In light of this research on followership, the leadership field has shifted its focus to examine further the effects followers can have on leaders and the leadership process. Many researchers have called for increased integration of followership within the extant leadership literature rather than simply considering followers in the absence of leaders (e.g., Baker, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Without integration, followership research is subject to the same mistakes made in leadership research, i.e., only considering one half of the leadership dyad in a vacuum, free of the other half.

**Implicit Followership Theories**

In an effort to heed the call for integration of followers into the leadership literature, researchers have begun to examine Implicit Followership Theories (IFTs). IFTs are individuals’ schemas composed of the attributes that make up a follower (Sy, 2010). Similar to ILTs, IFTs are cognitive categorization strategies that classify people as followers or non-followers and can be held by both leaders and followers alike. Far fewer studies have examined IFTs, but Sy (2010) found that attributes typically included in implicit follower schemas involve being productive, interested in work, and a loyal team player. More specifically, a followership prototype would consist of both individual performance and team attributes. IFT research has begun to parallel ILT research in
examining outcomes associated with IFTs and the effects of congruence between actual follower behavior or attributes and IFTs. Research has shown that typical followership prototypes are positively related to job satisfaction and leader liking (Sy, 2010), ideal follower prototypes are positively related to higher performance (Whiteley, Sy, & Johnson, 2012), and fit with ideal IFTs is positively related to organizational citizenship behaviors (Junker et al., 2014).

**Corresponding ILTs and IFTs**

In research examining ILTs and IFTs, there is an implicit assumption that measuring ILTs subsumes followers and measuring IFTs subsumes leaders. That is, ILTs and IFTs will inherently correspond with each other. However, little research has examined these two implicit theories simultaneously. In many of the existing leadership theories (e.g., LMX, relational view, constructionist approaches, e.g., Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Lord & Brown 2001; DeRue & Ashford, 2010, respectively), there is an inherent assumption that the leader-follower relationship is complementary. That is, a leader might be expected to perform certain behaviors or possess certain attributes, and the follower is expected to perform complementary behaviors and exhibit complementary attributes. Lewin (1948) described three styles of leadership: autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire. An autocratic leader, according to Lewin, makes his or her own rules and controls his or her subordinates. A leader of this nature might be expected to be directive, forceful, and controlling. Implied by these expectations of the leader are expectations that followers demonstrate complementary actions of obedience or passive compliance. Alternatively, democratic leaders are characterized as giving guidance and encouraging participative decision making among his or her followers. According to this
theory, leaders must be influential, motivational, and encouraging. Implied by these expectations of the leader are expectations that followers demonstrate complementary actions related to being proactive and resilient. It is reasonable to assume that the expectations individuals have about leaders and followers (i.e., their ILTs and IFTs) would reflect complementary, or congruent, leader and follower behaviors and attributes also. For example, if an individual expects a leader to be helpful, dedicated, and hard working, that might indicate that the same individual expects a follower to be reliable, productive, and hard working.

One might question how an individual might develop ILTs and IFTs that are not complementary. Implicit theories of leadership and followers are simply the schemas one develops of what a leader or a follower should be. These schemas relate to an individual’s direct observations and experiences of past following experiences and interactions with leaders. Whereas one’s past experiences might lead to developing congruent expectations for leaders and followers, it is plausible to posit that past conflicting leader and follower experiences might result in what I am defining as ‘incongruent’ schemas for leaders and followers.

**Congruence Scores**

There are two primary ways to operationally define congruent implicit theories. Congruence between ILTs and IFTs could be defined as different attributes that complement each other or as similar attributes that complement each other. For example, congruent implicit theories might contain expectations for the leader to be directive, controlling, and manipulative and expectations for a follower to be loyal, soft spoken, and easily influenced. Leaders and followers would not be expected to have similar attributes
according to this definition of congruence but be complementary in that one member of 
the dyad fulfills the active role whereas the other fulfills a more passive role.

Alternatively, congruent implicit theories might contain expectations for the 
leader to be participative and encouraging and for a follower to be proactive and resilient. 
In this case, leaders and followers would be expected to have similar attributes that are 
complementary in that both members of the dyad fulfill active roles that complement 
each other. Indeed, a close examination of the explicit measures of ILTs (Epitropaki & 
Martin, 2004) and IFTs (Sy, 2010) has revealed that several attributes appear on both 
measures either identically or through attribute synonyms. Significant research has 
suggested that leaders and followers tend to share a greater number of similar 
characteristics than dissimilar ones (e.g., Felfe & Schyns, 2009; Schyns & Felfe, 2006; 
Tanoff & Barolow, 2002). Additionally, more modern leadership theories have posited 
that leaders are most effective when they are democratic or participative.

Classical theories of management, including Taylor’s (1911) Scientific 
Management, Fayol’s (1949) administrative theory, and Weber’s (1924) bureaucratic 
theory, treat leaders and followers as separate pieces of the leadership process that are 
more complementary than similar. More specifically, these classical theories treat 
leaders as active, autocratic enforcers of policy whereas followers are more passive 
workers who are expected to follow the orders of a leader. For example, Weber posited 
that an ‘ideal’ bureaucracy should have a firmly ordered hierarchy of subordination and 
should contain little human level interaction between managers and subordinates. 
Fayol’s administrative theory posited that managers should organize, command,
coordinate, and control subordinates in a given task. Many of these principles are no longer aligned with current managerial practices.

Neo-classical theories of management, including Mayo’s (1933) human behavior theory and McGregor’s (1957) Theory X/Theory Y, take a different view of leadership. These management theories emphasize the importance of communication and interaction between leaders and followers in a more democratic and personal way as opposed to the authoritarian ways of classical theories. For example, Mayo posited that positive management response and encouragement, teamwork, and organizational social systems would increase organizational productivity. McGregor used the term ‘Theory X’ to describe earlier management theories that assumed that workers are lazy, dislike working, and need threats of punishment to perform their jobs well. In contrast, McGregor’s ‘Theory Y’ posited that workers desire self-respect, self-development, and self-fulfillment in life. This management theory suggested that leaders need to help their employees realize these needs to maximize productivity. For these reasons, along with the above explanation, I defined congruent ILTs and IFTs as similar ratings on identical or synonymous attributes.

As stated above, negative consequences can arise when a leader’s actual behavior is incongruent with ILTs (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1989; Nye & Forsyth, 1991; Van Quaquebeke et al., 2011) and when actual follower behavior is incongruent with IFTs (e.g., Junker et al., 2014). The present research examined whether similar effects occur when the ILTs and IFTs of an individual (a follower, specifically) do not correspond with each other. Some of the most popular direct measures of ILTs (Offerman et al., 1994)
and IFTs (Sy, 2010) share many similar attributes used to describe leaders and followers (e.g., hard-working, dynamic, energetic).

I examined the extent to which followers rated these attributes similarly for both leaders and followers. For example, rating the attribute ‘hard-working’ highly on both the ILT and IFT measures indicated congruent ILTs and IFTs. This operationalization of congruence is similar to the use of absolute difference scores used in Epitropaki and Martin (2005) who utilized absolute difference scores to measure congruence between ILTs and actual leader attributes. Epitropaki and Martin (2005) administered a 21-item ILT scale (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004) twice. In the first administration, participants were asked to rate how characteristic each attribute was of a typical business leader, and in the second administration participants were asked to rate how characteristic each attribute was of their direct manager. The researchers assessed congruence by taking the absolute difference between ILTs and observed leader attributes. As there are no identical ILT and IFT measures currently, a researcher could create a congruence variable by counting the number of matches (i.e., similar ratings) participants display on conceptually similar attributes from Epitropaki and Martin’s (2004) ILT measure and Sy’s (2010) IFT measure.

Alternatively, researchers have measured congruence using polynomial regression and structural equation modeling methods. Edwards and Cable (2009) assessed participants’ values and organizational values as perceived by participants. They placed each variable in a polynomial regression and treated the interaction between individuals’ values and the perceived organizational values as the congruence variable. Cheung (2009) developed a structural equation modeling-based latent congruence model (LCM)
to measure congruence in organizational research. With this LCM approach, level and congruence are treated as second-order factors so measurement errors were accounted for when estimating other structural parameters.

**Cognitive Dissonance**

Regardless of the operational definition, if an individual’s ILTs and IFTs do *not* match, it is likely that that individual will experience some degree of cognitive dissonance. Cognitive dissonance is defined as the mental discomfort felt by an individual when he or she holds two conflicting thoughts or beliefs (Festinger, 1957). For example, a person would likely experience cognitive dissonance if he or she completed a task he or she hated but told others that the task was actually enjoyable. The feelings of dislike towards the task and verbal expression of approval would create the conditions necessary for dissonance. According to Festinger (1957), the presence of cognitive dissonance prompts an individual to change his or her behavior to resolve the conflicting beliefs.

Prior research has found that the presence of cognitive dissonance can be detrimental on performance and other outcomes (e.g., Bashshur, Hernandez, & Gonzalez-Roma, 2011; Erdogan, Kraimer, & Liden, 2004; Kammeyer-Meuller, Simon, & Rick, 2012). Specifically, employees who experience some form of cognitive dissonance tend to be less satisfied with their jobs and careers (Erdogan et al., 2004; Gradney, Chi, & Diamond, 2013). Teams that have perceptions that are inconsistent with their supervisors’ perceptions tend to perform worse than those teams that have congruent perceptions (Bashshur et al., 2011). Elsbach and Bhattacharya (2001) found that employees who experience dissonance between their personal and organization’s
identities withdraw from their work, and Greenhaus and Powell (2003) found that people try to avoid dissonance at work by investing in their most salient role and withdrawing from less salient roles. Ultimately, cognitive dissonance results in stress (Lewig & Dollard, 2003). Additionally, Hobfoll’s (2001) conservation of resources (COR) model suggested that employees who experience stress might try to minimize future resource loss by withdrawing from organizational activities, which corroborates earlier research by Kantola, Syme, and Campbell (1984). Therefore, employees who experience cognitive dissonance as a result of incongruent leader and follower expectations might suffer in their performance and organizational attitudes (e.g., job satisfaction, leader perceptions).

However, it is not clear whether individuals need to be consciously aware of their ILTs and IFTs to experience cognitive dissonance. Substantial research has demonstrated that ILTs and IFTs are accessible through introspection (e.g., Carsten et al., 2010; Sy et al., 2010; Witeley et al., 2012). If an individual becomes aware of his or her implicit theories and those theories remain inconsistent, it is likely that the individual will feel the discomfort associated with cognitive dissonance. An individual might try to alter his or her expectations for leaders or followers to reduce cognitive dissonance. Otherwise, the resulting distress and discomfort could impair individuals’ abilities, such as to normally and accurately complete simple tasks or acquire new knowledge (e.g., Asch, 1940; Dechawatanapaisal & Siengthai, 2006). Therefore, experiencing distress from incongruent leader and follower expectations might affect an employee’s work performance and affective judgment of his or her work environment.

Whereas cognitive dissonance will likely occur when individuals are aware of their ILTs and IFTs, it is unclear whether individuals would experience similar effects if
they were unaware of their implicit theories. This raises the question of under what circumstances people are aware or unaware of their implicit theories. Fazio and Olson (2003) suggested that awareness of one’s implicit theories is dependent upon motivation, situational constraints, and cognitive load. That is, if individuals are not motivated to think about their leader and follower expectations or are already occupied with cognitively demanding tasks, individuals might not even be aware of the expectations they have for leaders or followers. Festinger (1957) suggested that cognitive dissonance occurs when an individual experiences two conflicting thoughts or feelings or consciously acts in opposition to what he or she knows and believes. This theory implies that individuals must be aware of their conflicting beliefs to experience the resulting discomfort. Therefore, it remains unclear what effect, if any, conflicting ILTs and IFTs might have on individuals if they were not consciously aware of their leader and follower expectations.

Previously, researchers have shown the effects of dissonance between implicit theories and actual behavior (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1989; Nye & Forsyth, 1991; Sy et al., 2010). Organizational outcomes, such as employee performance, job satisfaction, and ratings of leader effectiveness, suffered when behavior and implicit theories were incongruent. This provides indirect evidence suggesting that the dissonance created by incongruent implicit theories (ILTs and IFTs) might mimic the effects of actual behavior-implicit theory incongruence on organizational outcomes. Thus, I proposed that incongruent ILTs and IFTs within a follower will lead to negative organizational outcomes for that follower similar to those found when actual behavior is incongruent with implicit theories.
**Hypothesis 1**: Congruence between ILTs and IFTs in followers will positively predict follower performance.

**Hypothesis 2**: Congruence between ILTs and IFTs in followers will positively predict course/job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 3**: Congruence between ILTs and IFTs in followers will positively predict the extent to which followers rate their instructors/leaders as effective.

**The Current Research**

Recently, the field of Psychology has experienced a so-called replication crisis in which studies attempting to replicate the findings of prior research fail to reach the same conclusions (e.g., Earp & Trafimow, 2015). Therefore, I tested my three hypotheses in a series of three studies. First, I conducted a pilot study to identify which ILT and IFT dimensions could be used to calculate a congruence score. Then, I tested my hypotheses in a sample of undergraduate students in which leader was defined as a course instructor and follower was defined as a student. In an attempt to conceptually replicate my findings of Study 1, I tested my hypotheses in a sample of working adults in which leader was defined as a work leader and follower was defined as a work follower.

**Pilot Study**

**Purpose**

I conducted a pilot study in which I used exploratory factor analyses to identify Implicit Leadership Theory and Implicit Followership Theory dimensions that could be used to calculate a congruence score in my final samples of students and working adults. I planned to compare the results of this pilot study to the results of exploratory factor
analyses from Study 1 and Study 2 data to determine which ILT/IFT pairs I would include in my congruence score calculations.

Method

Participants

I collected usable data from 263 participants who were recruited from a mid-sized, Midwest university. Students who participated in this study received credit required for their psychology courses.

Measures

Implicit Leadership Theories (ILT). To measure Implicit Leadership Theories, I used two versions of Epitropaki and Martin’s (2004) adaptation of Offermann, Kennedy, and Wirtz’s (1994) ILT scale. This measure contains 21 items that constitute the following 6 distinct leadership attributes: Sensitivity (α = .88, three items), Intelligence (α = .79, four items), Dedication (α = .77, three items), Dynamism (α = .70, three items), Tyranny (α = .88, six items), and Masculinity (α = .83, two items; see Appendix A). Participants were asked to rate how characteristic each item was of a course instructor on one version and a business leader on another version with no explicit definition of the terms provided. Attributes were rated on a nine-point graphic rating scale (1 = not at all characteristic and 9 = extremely characteristic). According to Epitropaki and Martin (2004), all items of the Sensitivity (e.g., helpful), Intelligence (e.g., educated), Dedication (e.g., hard-working), and Dynamism (e.g., energetic) subscales reflect leadership prototypic attributes. Tyranny (e.g., domineering) and Masculinity (e.g., masculine) subscales reflect leadership anti-prototypic attributes. Item scores on the Sensitivity, Intelligence, Dedication, and Dynamism subscales were averaged, and
higher scores indicated more prototypical ILTs. Item scores on the Tyranny and Masculinity subscales were reverse scored and averaged, and higher scores indicated more prototypical ILTs.

**Implicit Followership Theories (IFTs).** To measure Implicit Followership Theories, I used two versions of Sy’s (2010) IFT scale. This measure contained 18 items that constitute the following six factors: Industry ($\alpha = .86$, three items), Incompetence ($\alpha = .74$, three items), Conformity ($\alpha = .71$, three items), Enthusiasm ($\alpha = .83$, three items), Insubordination ($\alpha = .82$, three items), and Good Citizen ($\alpha = .81$, three items; see Appendix B). Participants were asked to rate how characteristic each item was of a student in one version and a work follower in another version. Attributes were rated on a 10-point graphic rating scale (1 = not at all characteristic and 10 = extremely characteristic). According to Sy (2010), all items of the Industry (e.g., productive), Enthusiasm (e.g., excited), and Good Citizen (e.g., reliable) subscales reflect followership prototypic attributes. Conformity (e.g., easily influenced), Insubordination (e.g., arrogant), and Incompetence (e.g., uneducated) subscales reflect followership anti-prototypic attributes. Item scores on the Industry, Enthusiasm, and Good Citizen subscales were averaged, and higher scores indicated more prototypical IFTs. Item scores on the Conformity, Insubordination, and Incompetence subscales were reverse scored and averaged, and higher scores indicated more prototypical IFTs.

**Results**

**Factor Analysis**

I conducted exploratory factor analyses on the student ILT, student IFT, work ILT, and work IFT measures.
Student ILT. First, I examined the scree plot, which provided evidence of four factors (See Figure 1). Then, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis with four factors. I used an oblique rotation because I expected a correlation between the four factors. Results from the exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded onto four factors. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 1. Items 1, 2, 3, 6, and 14 either did not load onto any factor above .3 or cross loaded on two factors and differed by less than .3. Additionally, Items 20 and 21 created a two-item masculinity factor that did not match with any IFT dimensions, so I did not include this factor in subsequent factor analyses.

Next, I ran the factor analysis with three factors omitting the five items that did not load onto any factor or cross-loaded and the two masculinity items. Results from this exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded as expected onto the three factors. After conducting this factor analysis, Item 17 cross-loaded onto two different factors, so I ran the factor analysis with three factors omitting this item as well. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 2. Factor correlations are displayed in Table 3.
Figure 1. Scree plot of the Pilot Student ILT measure.
Table 1

*Factor Analysis for Pilot Student ILT Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SILT-1</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-2</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-3</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-4</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-5</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-6</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-7</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-8</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-9</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-10</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-11</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-12</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-13</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-14</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-15</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-16</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-17</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>-.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-18</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>-.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-19</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-20</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-21</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Factor Analysis for Pilot Student ILT Measure without Bad Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SILT-4</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-5</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-1.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-7</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-8</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-9</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-10</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-11</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-12</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-13</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-15</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>-.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-16</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>-.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-18</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-19</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Factor Correlations for Pilot Student ILT Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.734</td>
<td>-.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student IFT.** First, I examined the scree plot, which provided evidence of four factors (See Figure 2). Then, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis with four factors. I used an oblique rotation because I expected a correlation between the four factors. Results from the exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded onto four factors. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 4. Items 8 and 9 either did not load onto any factor above .3 or cross loaded on two factors and differed by less than .3.
Next, I ran the factor analysis with four factors omitting the two items that did not fit any factor. Results from this exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded as expected onto the four factors. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 5. Factor correlations are displayed in Table 6.

Figure 2. Scree plot of the Pilot Student IFT measure.
Table 4

Factor Analysis for Pilot Student IFT Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-1</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.932</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-2</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.913</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-3</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.753</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-4</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-5</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-6</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-7</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-8</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-9</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-10</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-11</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-12</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-13</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-14</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-15</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-16</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-17</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-18</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Factor Analysis for Pilot Student IFT Measure without Bad Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-1</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-2</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-3</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-4</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-5</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-6</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-7</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-10</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-11</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-12</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-13</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-14</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-15</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-16</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-17</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-18</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Factor Correlations for Pilot Student IFT Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.577</td>
<td>-.380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>-.175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work IFT.** First, I examined the scree plot, which provided evidence of three factors (See Figure 3). Then, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis with three factors. I used an oblique rotation because I expected a correlation between the three factors. Results from the exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded onto
three factors. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 7. Item 3 did not load onto any factor above .3 or cross loaded on two factors and differed by less than .3. Additionally, Items 20 and 21 created a two-item masculinity factor that did not match with any IFT dimensions, so I did not include this factor in subsequent factor analyses.

Next, I ran the factor analysis with two factors omitting Item 3 that did not fit any factor and the two masculinity items. Results from this exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded as expected onto the two factors. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 8. Factor correlations are displayed in Table 9.

Figure 3. Scree plot of the Pilot Work ILT measure.
Table 7

Factor Analysis for Pilot Work ILT Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILT-1</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-2</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-3</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-4</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-5</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-6</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-7</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-8</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-9</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-10</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-11</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-12</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-13</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-14</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-15</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-16</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-17</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-18</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-19</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-20</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.982</td>
<td>-.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-21</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.955</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

*Factor Analysis for Pilot Work ILT Measure without Bad Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILT-1</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-2</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-4</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-5</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-6</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>-.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-7</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-8</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-9</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-10</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-11</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-12</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-13</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-14</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-15</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-16</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-17</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-18</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-19</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

*Factor Correlations for Pilot Work ILT Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work IFT.** First, I examined the scree plot, which provided evidence of three factors (See Figure 4). Then, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis with three factors. I used an oblique rotation because I expected a correlation between the three factors. Results from the exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded onto
three factors. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 10. Items 10, 11, and 12 did not load onto any factor above .3 or cross loaded on two factors and differed by less than .3.

Next, I ran the factor analysis with three factors omitting the three items that did not fit any factor. Results from this exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded on only two factors rather than three. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 11. Factor correlations are displayed in Table 12.

*Figure 4.* Scree plot of the Pilot Work IFT measure.
Table 10

*Factor Analysis for Pilot Work IFT Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-1</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-2</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-3</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-4</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-5</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-6</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-7</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-8</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-9</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>-.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-10</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-11</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-12</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-13</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-14</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-15</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-16</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-17</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-18</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

*Factor Analysis for Pilot Work IFT Measure without Bad Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-1</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-2</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-3</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-4</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-5</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-6</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-7</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-8</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-9</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-13</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-14</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-15</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>-.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-16</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-17</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-18</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

*Factor Correlations for Pilot Work IFT Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pilot Study Discussion**

The purpose of this pilot study was to determine which student ILT, student IFT, work ILT, and work IFT dimensions were present in a sample of participants. Exploratory factor analyses indicated that there were 3 usable student ILT factors, 4 usable student IFT factors, 2 usable work ILT factors, and 2 usable work IFT factors. I decided to conduct the same exploratory factor analyses with the full student and work factors.
samples in Studies 1 and 2, respectively, to determine whether those samples contained the same factor structures.

**Study 1**

**Purpose**

The purpose of Study 1 was to test my proposed hypotheses with a sample of undergraduate students. In this study, a leader was operationalized as a course instructor and a follower was operationalized as a student. However, it is possible that students do not necessarily characterize themselves as ‘followers’ and their instructors as ‘leaders’ in the same manner as employees would characterize themselves and their managers in an organization. The ILT and IFT measures I used in this study were developed with ‘leaders’ and ‘followers’ in mind specifically. Therefore, it was necessary to replicate this method in a sample of employees with work experience (Study 2). Despite these potential drawbacks, I was able to collect an objective measure of performance through final exam and final course grades with this sample whereas I was not able to collect this type of performance data in a working sample given my methodological constraints.

**Method**

**Participants**

According to a power analysis, I needed at least 132 participants. I conducted this power analysis using the software package G*Power 3.1 (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). My effect size estimate was 0.10 at an alpha level of $\alpha = .05$ with one predictor. Participants consisted of students from a mid-sized, Midwest university. The average age was 19.07 years, the majority were college freshmen (68.6%), and
approximately 59.2% were female and 40.8% were male. Students who participated in this study received credit required for their introductory psychology course.

**Measures**

**Implicit Leadership Theories (ILT).** To measure Implicit Leadership Theories, I used Epitropaki and Martin’s (2004) adaptation of Offermann, Kennedy, and Wirtz’s (1994) ILT scale. This measure contains 21 items that constitute the following 6 distinct leadership attributes: Sensitivity ($\alpha = .88$, three items), Intelligence ($\alpha = .79$, four items), Dedication ($\alpha = .77$, three items), Dynamism ($\alpha = .70$, three items), Tyranny ($\alpha = .88$, six items), and Masculinity ($\alpha = .83$, two items; see Appendix A). Participants were asked to rate how characteristic each item was of a course instructor with no explicit definition of the term provided. Attributes were rated on a nine-point graphic rating scale (1 = *not at all characteristic* and 9 = *extremely characteristic*). According to Epitropaki and Martin (2004), all items of the Sensitivity (e.g., helpful), Intelligence (e.g., educated), Dedication (e.g., hard-working), and Dynamism (e.g., energetic) subscales reflect leadership prototypic attributes. Tyranny (e.g., domineering) and Masculinity (e.g., masculine) subscales reflect leadership anti-prototypic attributes. Item scores on the Sensitivity, Intelligence, Dedication, and Dynamism subscales were averaged, and higher scores indicated more prototypical ILTs. Item scores on the Tyranny and Masculinity subscales were reverse scored and averaged, and higher scores indicated more prototypical ILTs.

**Implicit Followership Theories (IFT).** To measure Implicit Followership Theories, I used Sy’s (2010) IFT scale. This measure contained 18 items that constitute the following six factors: Industry ($\alpha = .86$, three items), Incompetence ($\alpha = .74$, three
items), Conformity ($\alpha = .71$, three items), Enthusiasm ($\alpha = .83$, three items),
Insubordination ($\alpha = .82$, three items), and Good Citizen ($\alpha = .81$, three items; see
Appendix B). Participants were asked to rate how characteristic each item was of a
student. Attributes were rated on a 10-point graphic rating scale (1 = not at all
characteristic and 10 = extremely characteristic). According to Sy (2010), all items of
the Industry (e.g., productive), Enthusiasm (e.g., excited), and Good Citizen (e.g.,
reliable) subscales reflect followership prototypic attributes. Conformity (e.g., easily
influenced), Insubordination (e.g., arrogant), and Incompetence (e.g., uneducated)
subscales reflect followership anti-prototypic attributes. Item scores on the Industry,
Enthusiasm, and Good Citizen subscales were averaged, and higher scores indicated
more prototypical IFTs. Item scores on the Conformity, Insubordination, and
Incompetence subscales were reverse scored and averaged, and higher scores indicated
more prototypical IFTs.

**Congruence Score.** Initially, I planned to create my own method for calculating
congruence scores. To create the congruence score, I would have calculated two
different types of congruence scores, an absolute value congruence score and a positive to
negative congruence score. To calculate the first congruence score, an absolute value
congruence score, I planned to match dimensions on the ILT scale with dimensions from
the IFT scale that were either synonyms or conceptually similar to each other.
Hypothetical dimension pairings were as follows (the first dimension in each pair is an
ILT item and the second dimension is and IFT item): Sensitivity (understanding, helpful,
sincere) and Good Citizen (team player, reliable, loyal), Dedication (dedicated,
motivated, hard-working) and Industry (productive, goes above and beyond, hard-
working), Dynamism (energetic, dynamic) and Enthusiasm (excited, outgoing), Tyranny (domineering, pushy, manipulative, loud, selfish, conceited) and Insubordination (arrogant, rude, bad tempered), and Intelligence (intelligent, clever, knowledgeable) and Incompetence (slow, inexperienced).

For this congruence score, I would have compared participants’ responses on each dimension pair. A pair would be counted as congruent if a participant rated both dimensions above the median or both dimensions below the median of each respective item. I would have assigned a score of one for each pair in which both scores are high or in which both scores are low.

To calculate the second congruence score, a positive to negative congruence score, I would have counted the number of matches using the same dimension pairs as above. I would have assigned a score of one for each pair in which both scores are above the median, and I would have assigned a score of negative one for pairs in which both scores are below the median.

At the advice of my committee members, I decided to calculate congruence scores between ILTs and IFTs using a within-person correlation method. Prior research has used within-person correlations to calculate similar dimensions, such as person-organization fit (e.g., Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003) and insufficient effort responding (Huang, Curran, Keeney, Poposki, & DeShon, 2012). I calculated the correlation between a participant’s ILT ratings and the same participant’s IFT ratings. Each matching ILT/IFT dimension pair served as a data pair in these analyses (in that the ILT rating was the X variable and the IFT rating was the Y variable).
**Performance.** I measured performance by obtaining final introductory psychology course grades and final exam scores. Final grade percentages and final exam percentages served as the measures of performance.

**Course Satisfaction.** I measured course satisfaction with an adapted version of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Subscale (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983). This measure contained three items and has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .84$ (Bowling & Hammond, 2008). The items were scored on a seven-point graphic rating scale ($1 = strongly disagree$ and $7 = strongly agree$). The negatively keyed item was reverse scored. Scores were averaged, and higher averages indicated higher course satisfaction. A sample item is “All in all I am satisfied with this course” (see Appendix C).

**Perceived Instructor Effectiveness.** I measured perceived instructor effectiveness with a four-item measure ($\alpha = .93$) that assessed the extent to which followers perceive their leader (in this case, reworded to assess their instructor) to be a good leader (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). van Knippenberg and van Knippenberg made the text of two items available. I created two new items for the purposes of this study. The items were scored on a five-point graphic rating scale ($1 = strongly disagree$ and $5 = strongly agree$). Scores were averaged, and higher averages indicated higher perceived instructor effectiveness. Sample items include “My instructor carries out his/her role well” and “My instructor is an excellent teacher” (see Appendix D).

**Demographic Variables.** I assessed participants’ age, gender, race, and year in school (see Appendix E).
**Additional Measures.** I assessed the following constructs in order to examine potential alternative explanations for results.

**Affectivity.** I measured participants’ affectivity using the 18-item PANAS mood measure (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1998). This measure consisted of a positive affect scale with an internal consistency of $\alpha = .88$ and a negative affect scale with an internal consistency of $\alpha = .87$ on which participants were asked to rate their mood in general. Each item was scored on a five-point graphic rating scale ($1 = \text{very slightly or not at all}$ and $5 = \text{extremely}$). Scores from each subscale were averaged, and higher scores indicated higher positive affectivity and higher negative affectivity. Sample items from the positive affect scale include enthusiastic, determined, and excited. Sample items from the negative affect scale include scared, afraid, and upset (see Appendix F).

**Expected Performance.** I included a measure of how participants predicted they would perform in the class. I asked participants to rate what percent out of 100 they believed they would receive on the final exam and in the class overall (see Appendix G).

**Instructor Satisfaction.** To measure instructor satisfaction, I administered the five-item supervisor subscale of the Facet Satisfaction Scale (Beehr et al., 2006) reworded to assess instructor satisfaction. This measure has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .93$. Items were scored on a seven-point graphic rating scale ($1 = \text{strongly disagree}$ and $7 = \text{strongly agree}$). Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated higher instructor satisfaction. Sample items include “Overall, I am very pleased with the way my instructor teaches me” and “I am more satisfied with my instructor than with almost anyone I have taken a class with” (see Appendix H).
**Cognitive Dissonance.** I assessed the dissonance participants experienced as a result of incongruence between ILTs and IFTs. To measure cognitive dissonance, I administered a five-item scale created for this study. Participants were asked to indicate what extent they experience each state when they think about their expectations for leaders (in this case, instructors) and followers (students). The items were scored on a seven-point graphic rating scale (e.g., $1 = \text{not at all comfortable}$ and $7 = \text{very comfortable}$). Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated less cognitive dissonance. Sample items include “not at all stressed to very stressed” and “not at all focused to very focused” (see Appendix I).

**Consideration.** I assessed Consideration using the 15-item Consideration scale of the Leadership Behavioral Dimensions Questionnaire (LBDQ; Halpin, 1957). This measure has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .92$. Participants were asked to rate how often they engaged in relationship-oriented leadership behaviors and were told to consider their classmates as group members. Items were scored on a 5-point graphic-rating scale ($1 = \text{rarely}$ and $5 = \text{very often}$). Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated higher levels of Consideration. A sample item is, “I find time to listen to group members” (see Appendix J).

**Initiating Structure.** I assessed Initiating Structure using the 15-item Initiating Structure scale of the LBDQ (Halpin, 1957). This measure has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .83$. Participants were asked to rate how often they engaged in task-oriented leadership behaviors and were told to consider their classmates as group members. Items were scored on a 5-point graphic-rating scale ($1 = \text{rarely}$ and $5 = \text{very often}$). Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated higher levels of Initiating
Structure. A sample item includes, “I assign group members to particular tasks” (see Appendix K).

**Followership.** I assessed Followership using a 22-item scale developed by Peyton (2014). This measure has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .86$. Participants were asked to rate how often they engaged in following behaviors and were told to consider their classmates as group members. Items were scored on a 5-point graphic-rating scale ($1 = rarely$ and $5 = very often$). Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated higher levels of Followership. A sample item includes, “I accept help from other group members” (see Appendix L).

**Leader-Member Exchange.** To measure leader-member exchange, I administered a 7-item LMX scale (Scandura & Graen, 1984). This measure has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .86$. Participants were asked to rate how they felt about the relationship between themselves and their instructor. Items were scored on 4-point scales (e.g., $1 = completely$ and $4 = not at all$) and were different for each item. Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated higher levels of LMX. A sample item includes, “How well do you feel that your instructor understands your problems and needs?” (see Appendix M).

**Role ambiguity.** To assess role ambiguity, I administered a 6-item role ambiguity scale (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). This measure has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .86$. Participants were asked to consider their role as a student and to rate to what extent each condition existed for them. Items were scored on a 7-point graphic-rating scale ($1 = very false$ and $7 = very true$). Scores from the scale were
averaged, and higher scores indicated lower levels of role ambiguity. A sample item includes, “I know what my responsibilities are” (see Appendix N).

**Procedure**

The survey was distributed via Qualtrics. Participants were able to complete the survey at any point in the academic term. Participants opened the survey through a specific link and completed the survey at a time and setting of their own choosing. First, participants completed an informed consent process (see Appendix O). During this, participants were asked for permission to access their final course grade and final exam grade in their introductory psychology course. Then, participants completed all questionnaires assessing the Implicit Leadership Theories, Implicit Followership Theories, course satisfaction, perceived instructor effectiveness, affectivity, expected performance, instructor satisfaction, cognitive dissonance, consideration, initiating structure, followership, leader-member exchange, role ambiguity, and demographic information (age, race, gender, and college class rank). After participants completed all questionnaires, they were debriefed (see Appendix P). Final course and final exam grades were collected at the end of the academic term in which participants completed the study.

**Results**

**Data Cleaning**

Of the 297 participants who participated in this study, 10 were deleted due to missing data. These 10 participants did not complete any of the survey questions. Next, I reverse-coded appropriate items from each scale as necessary. Then, I calculated scale scores by averaging the scores for each measure. I calculated scale scores for each of the
hypothesized ILT and IFT dimensions as well as scale scores for the factors determined by an exploratory factor analysis.

**Measure Evaluation**

I conducted exploratory factor analyses on the student ILT and IFT measures to determine which of the hypothesized dimensions were present in the current study.

**Student ILT.** First, I examined the scree plot, which provided evidence of five factors (see Figure 5). Then, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis with five factors. I used an oblique rotation because I expected a correlation between the five factors. Results from the exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded onto five factors. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 13. Items 6, 7, and 13 either did not load onto any factor above .3 or cross loaded on two factors and differed by less than .3. Additionally, Items 20 and 21 created a two-item masculinity factor that did not match with any IFT dimensions, so I did not include this factor in subsequent factor analyses.

Next, I ran the factor analysis with four factors omitting the three items that did not load onto any factor or cross-loaded and the two masculinity items. Results from this exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded as expected onto the four factors. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 14. Factor correlations are displayed in Table 15.
Figure 5. Scree plot of the Student ILT measure.
Table 13

Factor Analysis for Student ILT Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SILT-1</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.715</td>
<td>-.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-2</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.989</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-3</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.688</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-4</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>-.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-5</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-6</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>-.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-7</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-8</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-9</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-10</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-11</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-12</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-13</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-.349</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-14</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-15</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-16</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-17</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-18</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-19</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-20</td>
<td>-.891</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-21</td>
<td>-.994</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

*Factor Analysis for Student ILT Measure without Bad Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SILT-1</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.719</td>
<td>-.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-2</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.993</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-3</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.681</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-4</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>-.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-5</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-8</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-9</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-10</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-11</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>-.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-12</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-14</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-15</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-16</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-17</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-18</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT-19</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

*Factor Correlations for Student ILT Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.601</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.492</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student IFT.** First, I examined the scree plot, which provided evidence of five factors (see Figure 6). Then, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis with five factors. I used an oblique rotation because I expected a correlation between the five factors. Results from the exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded onto five factors.
Factor loadings are displayed in Table 16. All items loaded onto only one factor above .3 and did not cross load on two factors with a difference of less than .3. Factor correlations are displayed in Table 17.

*Figure 6.* Scree plot of the Student IFT measure.
Table 16

*Factor Analysis for Student IFT Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-1</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.905</td>
<td>-.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-2</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.954</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-3</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.654</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-4</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-5</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-6</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-7</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-8</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-9</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-10</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-11</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-12</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-13</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-14</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-15</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.187</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-16</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-17</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT-18</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

*Factor Correlations for Student IFT Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-.285</td>
<td>-.324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>-.494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Matching ILT and IFT Dimensions

I created four congruence variations of matching ILT and IFT dimensions using the observed dimensions from the EFAs. Therefore, I calculated four Congruence Correlations, one each for the congruence variations.

Table 18

Student Congruence Variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruence Variation 1</th>
<th>ILT</th>
<th>IFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Good Citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Incompetence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruence Variation 2</th>
<th>ILT</th>
<th>IFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Good Citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Incompetence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamism</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruence Variation 3</th>
<th>ILT</th>
<th>IFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Good Citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyranny</td>
<td>Insubordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congruence Variation 4</th>
<th>ILT</th>
<th>IFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Good Citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyranny</td>
<td>Insubordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamism</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Statistics

The final sample included 287 participants of which 117 (40.8%) were male and 170 (59.2%) were female, 68.6% were freshmen, and 67.9% were white. The average age of participants was 19.07 years ($SD = 2.02$).

I calculated internal consistency reliability estimates in the current sample for each of my measures. I reported measure means, standard deviations, alpha coefficients, and intercorrelations for all hypothesized ILT and IFT factors (Table 19), for all observed ILT and IFT factors as determined by my EFAs (Table 20), and for all study outcome variables (Table 21). Additionally, I reported measure intercorrelations for all hypothesized ILT and IFT factors and study outcome variables (Table 22) and intercorrelations for all observed ILT and IFT factors as determined by my EFAs (Table 23).

I expected the hypothesized ILT and IFT dimensions and the observed dimensions to have a similar pattern of relationships. As shown in Tables 19 and 20, hypothesized ILT dimensions had intercorrelations similar to intercorrelations for observed ILT dimensions ($r = .16$ to $.67$ for hypothesized, $r = .16$ to $.62$ for observed). Additionally, the factor that combined Dedication and Dynamism was highly correlated with each individual dimension ($r = .93$ and $.87$, respectively). Hypothesized IFT dimensions had intercorrelations similar to intercorrelations for observed IFT dimensions ($r = .21$ to $.62$ for hypothesized, $r = .20$ to $.62$ for observed). Additionally, the factor that combined Insubordination and Incompetence was highly correlated with each individual dimension ($r = .92$ and $.88$, respectively). As shown in Table 21, most study outcomes were only moderately correlated with each other. The strongest correlations were...
between instructor satisfaction and instructor effectiveness ($r = .83$) and Consideration and Followership ($r = .65$). As shown in Tables 22 and 23, hypothesized ILT and IFT dimensions had correlations with study outcomes similar to correlations between observed ILT and IFT dimensions and study outcomes. Most relationships were as expected. However, the observed dimensions of Dynamism, Enthusiasm, and Incompetence (reverse-coded) were significantly, negatively related to final exam grade ($r = -.15$, -.21, and -.16, respectively).
Table 19

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Hypothesized ILT and IFT Factors in Student Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>1. Sensitivity</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.90</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>2. Intelligence</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.86</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>3. Dedication</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.91</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>4. Dynamism</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tyranny</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Masculinity</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SILT</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Industry</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Enthusiasm</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Good Citizen</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Conformity</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Insubordination</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SIFT</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Alpha coefficients are placed along the diagonal. Sensitivity, Intelligence, Dedication, Dynamism, Tyranny, and Masculinity are SILT dimensions. SILT dimensions were rated on a 1-9 scale. Industry, Enthusiasm, Good Citizen, Conformity, Insubordination, and Incompetence are SIFT dimensions. SIFT dimensions were rated on a 1-10 scale. Bolded values are significant at the $p < .05$ level. Bolded and enlarged values are significant at the $p < .01$ level. SILT and SIFT were calculated by averaging all items of the scale.
### Table 20

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Observed ILT and IFT Factors in Student Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sensitivity</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.90</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>2. Intelligence</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.89</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>3. Dedication</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dynamism</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dedication/Dynamism</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tyranny</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Industry</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Enthusiasm</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Good Citizen</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conformity</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Insubordination</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetence</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Alpha coefficients are placed along the diagonal. Sensitivity, Intelligence, Dedication, Dynamism, and Tyranny are SILT dimensions. SILT dimensions were rated on a 1-9 scale. Industry, Enthusiasm, Good Citizen, Conformity, Insubordination, and Incompetence are SIFT dimensions. SIFT dimensions were rated on a 1-10 scale. Bolded values are significant at the $p < .05$ level. Bolded and enlarged values are significant at the $p < .01$ level. Combined dimensions (5 and 13) were observed in the EFA. I included the scores for the original hypothesized dimension to be comprehensive.
### Table 21

**Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Study Outcomes in Student Sample**

| Variables                      | M     | SD    | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   | 17   | 18   | 19   |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Exam Grade                  | 71.23 | 13.25 | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 2. Course Grade                | 78.23 | 12.52 | .76  | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 3. Course Satisfaction         | 5.31  | 1.32  | .04  | .11  | .79  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 4. Instructor Effectiveness    | 4.84  | 1.40  | .02  | .04  | .52  | .92  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 5. Congruence Corr. 1          | .27   | .66   | .01  | .05  | -.05 | -.04 | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 6. Congruence Corr. 2          | .35   | .68   | -.03 | .02  | -.01 | -.01 | .51  | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 7. Congruence Corr. 3          | .22   | .71   | -.01 | .07  | -.03 | .23  | .09  | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 8. Congruence Corr. 4          | .22   | .71   | -.01 | .03  | -.06 | -.03 | .04  | .38  | .61  | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 9. Expected Exam Grade         | 79.41 | 8.39  | .35  | .31  | .15  | .25  | .05  | .04  | -.02 | -.01 | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 10. Expected Course Grade      | 81.33 | 9.08  | .45  | .55  | .22  | .18  | .05  | .09  | -.01 | .00  | .58  | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 11. Instructor Satisfaction    | 4.92  | 1.36  | .03  | .03  | .59  | .83  | .01  | .00  | .06  | .05  | .24  | .22  | .91  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 12. Cognitive Dissonance       | 4.59  | .97   | .07  | .17  | .38  | .39  | .01  | -.04 | .06  | .00  | .24  | .17  | .45  | .72  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 13. Consideration              | 3.70  | .50   | .00  | .05  | .31  | .17  | -.05 | -.04 | -.02 | -.03 | .03  | .11  | .19  | .18  | .84  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 14. Initiating Structure       | 2.89  | .67   | -.03 | .07  | -.01 | -.03 | -.12 | -.05 | -.14 | -.08 | -.06 | .03  | -.01 | -.06 | .23  | .89  |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 15. Followership               | 3.79  | .45   | .07  | .12  | .29  | .08  | .00  | .01  | .03  | .01  | -.01 | .06  | .12  | .20  | .65  | .24  | .86  |      |      |      |      |      |
| 16. LMX                        | 2.32  | .54   | -.05 | .07  | .26  | .43  | -.10 | -.07 | .01  | .02  | .13  | .18  | .39  | .31  | .15  | .16  | .07  | .80  |      |      |      |      |
| 17. Role Ambiguity             | 5.36  | .87   | .08  | .12  | .21  | .26  | -.10 | -.07 | -.09 | .02  | .15  | .16  | .19  | .37  | .26  | .25  | .46  | .18  | .84  |      |      |      |
| 18. Positive Affectivity       | 3.35  | .71   | -.11 | .03  | .28  | .20  | -.08 | -.12 | -.04 | -.06 | .12  | .07  | .18  | .27  | .33  | .35  | .28  | .26  | .39  | .87  |      |      |
| 19. Negative Affectivity       | 1.94  | .65   | -.12 | -.13 | -.27 | -.19 | .06  | -.02 | -.03 | .01  | -.19 | -.16 | -.25 | -.47 | -.18 | .06  | -.21 | -.09 | -.27 | -.08 | .84  |

Note. Alpha coefficients are placed along the diagonal. Bolded values are significant at the \( p < .05 \) level. Bolded and enlarged values are significant at the \( p < .01 \) level. Exam grade, course grade, course satisfaction, and instructor effectiveness were the four main outcome variables. Congruence Corr. 1 is Congruence Correlation 1, Congruence Corr. 2 is Congruence Correlation 2, Congruence Corr. 3 is congruence Correlation 3, Congruence Corr. 4 is Congruence Correlation 4. Role ambiguity and Cognitive Dissonance are positively keyed and thus reflect Role Clarity and Cognitive Consonance, respectively.
### Table 22

*Correlations Between Hypothesized ILT and IFT Factors and Study Outcomes in Student Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td><strong>.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>.20</strong></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td><strong>.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>.22</strong></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td><strong>.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>.22</strong></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamism</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyranny</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td><strong>.22</strong></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td><strong>.25</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILT</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td><strong>.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>.25</strong></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td><strong>.27</strong></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td><strong>.24</strong></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Citizen</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td><strong>.23</strong></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insubordination</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td><strong>.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>.13</strong></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetence</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td><strong>.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>.16</strong></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Course Sat. is course satisfaction, Inst. Sat. is instructor satisfaction, Pos. Aff. is positive affectivity, Neg. Aff. is negative affectivity, Exp. Exam is expected percent on final exam, Exp. Course is expected percent of final course grade, Inst. Effect. is instructor effectiveness, Cog. Diss. is cognitive dissonance, Cons. is consideration, In. Struc. is initiating structure, Foll. is followership, LMX is leader-member exchange, and Role Amb. is role ambiguity.

Bolded values are significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Bolded and enlarged values are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Role ambiguity and Cognitive Dissonance are positively keyed and thus reflect Role Clarity and Cognitive Consonance, respectively.
Correlations Between Observed ILT and IFT Factors and Study Outcomes in Student Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td><strong>.25</strong></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td><strong>.14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td><strong>.22</strong></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td><strong>.15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td><strong>.23</strong></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td><strong>.20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamism</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td><strong>.15</strong></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td><strong>.12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td><strong>.18</strong></td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication/Dynamism</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td><strong>.21</strong></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td><strong>.18</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyranny</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td><strong>.22</strong></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td><strong>.23</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td><strong>.27</strong></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td><strong>.20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td><strong>.24</strong></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td><strong>.20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Citizen</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td><strong>.23</strong></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td><strong>.16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td><strong>.15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insubordination</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td><strong>.15</strong></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td><strong>.21</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetence</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td><strong>.15</strong></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insub./Incomp.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td><strong>.13</strong></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td><strong>.18</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Course Sat. is course satisfaction,Inst. Sat. is instructor satisfaction,Pos. Aff. is positive affectivity,Neg. Aff. is negative affectivity,Exp. Exam is expected percent on final exam,Exp. Course is expected percent of final course grade,Inst. Effect. is instructor effectiveness,Cog. Diss. is cognitive dissonance,Cons. is consideration,In. Struc. is initiating structure,Foll. is followership,LMX is leader-member exchange, and Role Amb. is role ambiguity.

Bolded values are significant at the \( p < .05 \) level.

Bolded and enlarged values are significant at the \( p < .01 \) level.

Role ambiguity and Cognitive Dissonance are positively keyed and thus reflect Role Clarity and Cognitive Consonance, respectively.
**Hypothesis Testing**

Hypothesis 1 stated that congruence between ILTs and IFTs in followers would positively predict follower performance. To test this hypothesis, I regressed final exam grade on the four within-person correlations for each of the calculated congruence variations. None of the Congruence Correlations were significantly related to final exam grade. Congruence Correlation 1 ($\beta = .01, t = .14, p > .05$), Congruence Correlation 2 ($\beta = -.03, t = -.45, p > .05$), Congruence Correlation 3 ($\beta = -.01, t = -.19, p > .05$), and Congruence Correlation 4 ($\beta = -.01, t = -.20, p > .05$) showed no relationship with final exam grade.

Additionally, I regressed final course grade on the four Congruence Correlations. None of the Congruence Correlations were significantly related to final course grade. Congruence Correlation 1 ($\beta = .05, t = .77, p > .05$), Congruence Correlation 2 ($\beta = .02, t = .24, p > .05$), Congruence Correlation 3 ($\beta = .07, t = 1.09, p > .05$), and Congruence Correlation 4 ($\beta = .03, t = .48, p > .05$) showed no relationship with final course grade. These results fail to support hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 2 stated that congruence between ILTs and IFTs in followers would positively predict course satisfaction. To test this hypothesis, I regressed course satisfaction on the four Congruence Correlations. None of the Congruence Correlations were significantly related to course satisfaction. Congruence Correlation 1 ($\beta = -.05, t = -.72, p > .05$), Congruence Correlation 2 ($\beta = -.01, t = -.21, p > .05$), Congruence Correlation 3 ($\beta = .00, t = -.06, p > .05$), and Congruence Correlation 4 ($\beta = -.06, t = -.99, p > .05$) showed no relationship with course satisfaction. These results fail to support hypothesis 2.
Hypothesis 3 stated that congruence between ILTs and IFTs in followers would positively predict perceived instructor effectiveness. To test this hypothesis, I regressed perceived instructor effectiveness on the four Congruence Correlations. None of the Congruence Correlations were significantly related to perceived instructor effectiveness. Congruence Correlation 1 ($\beta = -.04, t = -.61, p > .05$), Congruence Correlation 2 ($\beta = -.01, t = -.19, p > .05$), Congruence Correlation 3 ($\beta = -.03, t = -.46, p > .05$), and Congruence Correlation 4 ($\beta = -.03, t = -.56, p > .05$) showed no relationship with final exam grade. These results fail to support hypothesis 3.

**Additional Analyses**

To be comprehensive, I created a congruence score using the originally proposed method for the first congruence variation (see Table 18) in addition to the within-person correlation method. I tested my hypotheses on the four study outcomes using this congruence score as the predictor variable. Just as with the Congruence Correlations, no hypotheses were supported.

First, I regressed final exam grade on the congruence score. Congruence was not significantly related to final exam grade, $\beta = -.03, t = -.41, p > .05$. Next, I regressed final course grade on the congruence score. Congruence was not significantly related to final course grade, $\beta = .05, t = .91, p > .05$. Then, I regressed course satisfaction on the congruence score. Congruence was not significantly related to course satisfaction, $\beta = .03, t = .49, p > .05$. Finally, I regressed perceived instructor satisfaction on the congruence score. Congruence was not significantly related to perceived instructor satisfaction, $\beta = .00, t = -.03, p > .05$. Using this method to calculate congruence yielded results similar to results obtained using the within-person correlation method.
In addition to my hypothesized relationships between the Congruence Correlations and the study outcomes, I tested whether traditional measures of leadership (e.g., Consideration, Initiating Structure, Followership, LMX), role ambiguity, and a measure of cognitive dissonance created for this study predicted the study outcomes. I regressed Consideration, Initiating Structure, and Followership on the four study outcomes, LMX on the four study outcomes, role ambiguity on the four study outcomes, and cognitive dissonance on the four study outcomes (see Table 24). I found that Consideration was significantly related to course satisfaction and perceived instructor effectiveness, Followership was significantly related to final course grade and course satisfaction, and LMX, role ambiguity, and cognitive dissonance was significantly related to course satisfaction and perceived instructor effectiveness. Cognitive dissonance was related to final course grade also. Additionally, I calculated the bivariate correlations between the four Congruence Correlations and the measure of cognitive dissonance. Congruence Correlations were significantly correlated with each other. However, none of the Congruence Correlations were significantly related to cognitive dissonance (see Table 25).
Table 24

Regression Analyses for Additional Predictors and Study Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Exam Grade</th>
<th>Course Grade</th>
<th>Course Sat</th>
<th>Instructor Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followership</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Dissonance</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Course Sat is course satisfaction and Instructor Effect is perceived instructor effectiveness. Bolded Betas and $t$-statistics are significant at the .05 level.

Table 25

Correlations Between Congruence Correlations and Cognitive Dissonance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cognitive Dissonance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Congruence Correlation 1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Congruence Correlation 2</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Congruence Correlation 3</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Congruence Correlation 4</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded correlation coefficients are significant at the .05 level.
Study 1 Discussion

The purpose of Study 1 was to test the proposed hypotheses that congruence between ILTs for a course instructor and IFTs for a student would positively predict performance, course satisfaction, and perceived instructor effectiveness in a sample of undergraduate students. None of the Congruence Correlations were related to performance, course satisfaction, and perceived instructor effectiveness, which failed to support any of the hypotheses. In additional analyses, I found that Consideration and Followership were significantly related to course satisfaction and perceived instructor effectiveness and LMX, role ambiguity, and cognitive dissonance were significantly related to course satisfaction and perceived instructor effectiveness. Also, Followership and cognitive dissonance were related to final course grade.

Study 2

Purpose

The purpose of Study 2 was to test my hypotheses in a sample of working adults in an attempt to replicate the findings of Study 1. For the purposes of this study, leader was operationalized as business leader and follower was operationalized as work follower. Due to the limitations of my method collection, I was unable to obtain supervisor ratings of performance and instead assessed self-reported in-role performance. As self-reported performance is not as reliable as objective measures of job performance, I included two additional measures of contextual performance: Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) and Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWBs). Study 2 had the same proposed hypotheses as Study 1.
**Hypothesis 1:** Congruence between ILTs and IFTs in followers will positively predict follower performance (self-reported in-role performance, OCBs, and CWBs).

**Hypothesis 2:** Congruence between ILTs and IFTs in followers will positively predict job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 3:** Congruence between ILTs and IFTs in followers will positively predict the extent to which followers rate their leaders as effective.

**Method**

**Participants**

According to a power analysis, I needed at least 132 participants. I conducted this power analysis using the software package G*Power 3.1 (Faul et al., 2007). My effect size estimate was 0.10 at an alpha level of $\alpha = .05$ with one predictor. Participants consisted of currently employed adults. I recruited participants through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk, which researchers have demonstrated offers reliable samples to Industrial/Organizational psychologists (e.g., Woo, Keith, & Thornton, 2015). The mean age was 39.64 years old ($SD = 12.36$). Just under half of the sample was female (44.4%). The sample was mostly white (76.8%) individuals who have earned at least a bachelor’s degree (65.2%). Participants worked an average of 40.46 hours per week ($SD = 8.19$), worked for their current employer for an average of 6.71 years ($SD = 6.15$), worked for their current supervisor for an average of 4.05 years ($SD = 3.92$), and worked in the service industry (41.6%). These participants received a monetary compensation of $1.50 for their participation.
Measures

Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTs). To measure Implicit Leadership Theories, I used Epitropaki and Martin’s (2004) adaptation of Offermann and colleagues’ (1994) ILT scale. This measure contained 21 items that constituted the following 6 distinct leadership dimensions: Sensitivity ($\alpha = .88$, three items), Intelligence ($\alpha = .79$, four items), Dedication ($\alpha = .77$, three items), Dynamism ($\alpha = .70$, three items), Tyranny ($\alpha = .88$, six items), and Masculinity ($\alpha = .83$, two items; see Appendix Q). Participants were asked to rate how characteristic each item was of a business leader with no explicit definition of the term provided. Attributes were rated on a nine-point graphic rating scale (1 = not at all characteristic and 9 = extremely characteristic). According to Epitropaki and Martin (2004), all items of the Sensitivity (e.g., helpful), Intelligence (e.g., educated), Dedication (e.g., hard-working), and Dynamism (e.g., energetic) subscales reflected leadership prototypic attributes. Tyranny (e.g., domineering) and Masculinity (e.g., masculine) subscales reflected leadership anti-prototypic attributes. Item scores on the Sensitivity, Intelligence, Dedication, and Dynamism subscales were averaged, and higher scores indicated more prototypical ILTs. Item scores on the Tyranny and Masculinity subscales were reverse scored and averaged, and higher scores indicated more prototypical ILTs.

Implicit Followership Theories (IFTs). To measure Implicit Followership Theories, I used Sy’s (2010) IFT scale. This measure contained 18 items that constituted the following six factors: Industry ($\alpha = .86$, three items), Incompetence ($\alpha = .74$, three items), Conformity ($\alpha = .71$, three items), Enthusiasm ($\alpha = .83$, three items), Insubordination ($\alpha = .82$, three items), and Good Citizen ($\alpha = .81$, three items; see
Appendix R). Participants were asked to rate how characteristic each item was of a work follower. Attributes were rated on a 10-point graphic rating scale (1 = not at all characteristic and 10 = extremely characteristic). According to Sy (2010), all items of the Industry (e.g., productive), Enthusiasm (e.g., excited), and Good Citizen (e.g., reliable) subscales reflected followership prototypic attributes. Conformity (e.g., easily influenced), Insubordination (e.g., arrogant), and Incompetence (e.g., uneducated) subscales reflected followership anti-prototypic attributes. Item scores on the Industry, Enthusiasm, and Good Citizen subscales were averaged, and higher scores indicated more prototypical IFTs. Item scores on the Conformity, Insubordination, and Incompetence subscales were reverse scored and averaged, and higher scores indicated more prototypical IFTs.

**Congruence Score.** Initially, I planned to create my own method for calculating congruence scores. To create the congruence score, I would have calculated two different types of congruence scores, an absolute value congruence score and a positive to negative congruence score. To calculate the first congruence score, an absolute value congruence score, I planned to match dimensions on the ILT scale with dimensions from the IFT scale that were either synonyms or conceptually similar to each other. Hypothetical dimension pairings were as follows (the first dimension in each pair is an ILT item and the second dimension is an IFT item): Sensitivity (understanding, helpful, sincere) and Good Citizen (team player, reliable, loyal), Dedication (dedicated, motivated, hard-working) and Industry (productive, goes above and beyond, hard-working), Dynamism (energetic, dynamic) and Enthusiasm (excited, outgoing), Tyranny (domineering, pushy, manipulative, loud, selfish, conceited) and Insubordination
(arrogant, rude, bad tempered), and Intelligence (intelligent, clever, knowledgeable) and Incompetence (slow, inexperienced).

For this congruence score, I would have compared participants’ responses on each dimension pair. A pair would be counted as congruent if a participant rated both dimensions above the median or both dimensions below the median of each respective item. I would have assigned a score of one for each pair in which both scores are high or in which both scores are low.

To calculate the second congruence score, a positive to negative congruence score, I would have counted the number of matches using the same dimension pairs as above. I would have assigned a score of one for each pair in which both scores are above the median, and I would have assigned a score of negative one for pairs in which both scores are below the median.

At the advice of my committee members, I decided to calculate congruence scores between ILTs and IFTs using a within-person correlation method. Prior research has used within-person correlations to calculate similar dimensions, such as person-organization fit (e.g., Verquer et al., 2003) and insufficient effort responding (Huang et al., 2012). I calculated the correlation between a participant’s ILT ratings and the same participant’s IFT ratings. Each matching ILT/IFT dimension pair served as a data pair in these analyses (in that the ILT rating was the X variable and the IFT rating was the Y variable).

**Self-reported in-role Performance.** I measured self-reported performance with Walumbaw, Avolio, and Zhu’s (2008) four-item individual performance scale. This scale has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .94$. The items were scored on a five-point graphic
rating scale (1 = consistently perform way below expectations and 5 = consistently perform way above expectations). Scores were averaged, and higher averages indicated higher self-reported job performance. A sample item includes “How would you judge the overall quality of your work?” (see Appendix S).

**Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB).** OCBs were a second measure of employee performance. Even though OCBs were self-reported, research has suggested that self-reported OCBs are as reliable as data reported by other individuals (e.g., Carpenter, Berry, & Houston, 2014). I measured OCBs with Lee and Allen’s (2002) 16-item scale, which included an OCB-I subscale (eight items) and an OCB-O subscale (eight items). The OCB-I subscale has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .83$, and the OCB-O subscale has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .88$ (Lee & Allen, 2003). Participants were asked to rate how often they engaged in a list of behaviors on a seven-point graphic rating scale (1 = never and 7 = always). Scores were averaged, and higher averages indicated more OCBs. A sample OCB-I item is “Give up time to help others who have work or non-work problems”. A sample OCB-O item is “Show pride when representing the organization in public” (see Appendix T).

**Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWB).** CWBs were a third measure of employee performance. Even though CWBs were self-reported, research has suggested that self-reported CWBs are as reliable as data reported by other individuals (e.g., Berry, Carpenter, & Barratt, 2012). I measured CWBs with the 19-item scale developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000), which included a CWB-I subscale (seven items) and a CWB-O subscale (12 items). The CWB-I subscale has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .84$, and the CWB-O subscale has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .85$ (Bennett & Robinson,
Participants were asked to rate how frequently they engaged in a list of behaviors on a seven-point graphic rating scale (1 = never and 7 = daily). Scores were averaged, and higher averages indicated more CWBs. A sample CWB-I item is “played a mean prank on someone at work.” A sample CWB-O item is “Come in late to work without permission” (see Appendix U).

**Job Satisfaction.** I measured job satisfaction with the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Subscale (Cammann et al., 1983). This measure contained three items and has an internal consistency of \( \alpha = .84 \) (Bowling & Hammond, 2008). The items were scored on a seven-point graphic rating scale (1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree). Scores were averaged, and higher averages indicated higher job satisfaction. A sample item includes “All in all I am satisfied with my job” (see Appendix V).

**Perceived Leader Effectiveness.** I measured perceived leader effectiveness with a four-item measure (\( \alpha = .93 \)) that assessed the extent to which followers perceived their leader to be a good leader (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). van Knippenberg and van Knippenberg made the text for two of these items available. I created two new items for the purposes of this study. The items were scored on a five-point graphic rating scale (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree). Scores were averaged, and higher averages indicated higher perceived leader effectiveness. Sample items include “My supervisor carries out his/her role well” and “My supervisor is an excellent supervisor” (see Appendix W).
Demographic Variables. I assessed participants’ age, gender, race, hours worked per week, job tenure, tenure with current supervisor, the nature of their job, and education level (see Appendix X).

Additional Measures. I assessed the following constructs in order to examine potential alternative explanations.

Supervisor Satisfaction. To measure supervisor satisfaction, I administered the five-item supervisor subscale of the Facet Satisfaction Scale (Beehr et al., 2006). This measure has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .93$. Items were scored on a seven-point graphic rating scale ($1 = strongly disagree$ and $7 = strongly agree$). Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated higher supervisor satisfaction. Sample items include “Overall, I am very pleased with the way my manager supervises me” and “I am more satisfied with my manager than with almost anyone I have ever worked for” (see Appendix Y).

Perceived Worker Competence. I assessed participants’ perceived competence at their current job with a five-item scaled created for this study. Participants were asked to indicate to what extent they agreed with the five statements on a seven-point graphic rating scale ($1 = very much disagree$ and $7 = very much agree$). Items three and five were reverse-scored, items were averaged, and higher averages indicated more perceived competence. A sample item is “I am qualified for my current position” (see Appendix Z).

Affective Organizational Commitment. I included an eight-item measure of affective organizational commitment developed by Allen and Meyer (1990). This scale has an internal consistency of $\alpha = .87$. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which
they agree to a list of eight statements on a seven-point graphic rating scale \((1 = \text{strongly disagree} \text{ and } 7 = \text{strongly agree})\). Items four, five, six, and eight were reverse-scored, scores were averaged, and higher averages indicated stronger affective commitment. A sample item is “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization” (see Appendix AA).

**Cognitive Dissonance.** I assessed the dissonance employees experience as a result of incongruence between ILTs and IFTs. To measure cognitive dissonance, I administered a five-item scale created for this study. Participants were asked to indicate what extent they experienced each state when they think about their expectations for supervisors and work followers. The items were scored on a seven-point graphic rating scale (e.g., \(1 = \text{very uncomfortable} \) and \(7 = \text{very comfortable}\)). Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated less cognitive dissonance. Sample items include “very stressed to very relaxed” and “very distracted to very focused” (see Appendix BB).

**Consideration.** I assessed Consideration using the 15-item Consideration scale of the Leadership Behavioral Dimensions Questionnaire (LBDQ; Halpin, 1957). This measure has an internal consistency of \(\alpha = .92\). Participants were asked to rate how often they engaged in relationship-oriented leadership behaviors. Items were scored on a 5-point graphic-rating scale \((1 = \text{rarely} \) and \(5 = \text{very often}\)). Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated higher levels of Consideration. A sample item is, “I find time to listen to group members” (see Appendix CC).

**Initiating Structure.** I assessed Initiating Structure using the 15-item Initiating Structure scale of the LBDQ (Halpin, 1957). This measure has an internal consistency of
\( \alpha = .83 \). Participants were asked to rate how often they engaged in task-oriented leadership behaviors. Items were scored on a 5-point graphic-rating scale (1 = rarely and 5 = very often). Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated higher levels of Initiating Structure. A sample item includes, “I assign group members to particular tasks” (see Appendix DD).

**Followership.** I assessed Followership using a 22-item scale developed by Peyton (2014). This measure has an internal consistency of \( \alpha = .86 \). Participants were asked to rate how often they engaged in following behaviors. Items were scored on a 5-point graphic-rating scale (1 = rarely and 5 = very often). Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated higher levels of Followership. A sample item includes, “I accept help from other group members” (see Appendix EE).

**Leader-Member Exchange.** To measure leader-member exchange, I administered a 7-item LMX scale (Scandura & Graen, 1984). This measure has an internal consistency of \( \alpha = .86 \). Participants were asked to rate how they felt about the relationship between themselves and their immediate supervisor. Items were scored on 4-point scales (e.g., 1 = completely and 4 = not at all) and were different for each item. Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated higher levels of LMX. A sample item includes, “How well do you feel that your supervisor understands your problems and needs?” (see Appendix FF).

**Role ambiguity.** To assess role ambiguity, I administered a 6-item role ambiguity scale (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). This measure has an internal consistency of \( \alpha = .86 \). Participants were asked to consider their role at work and to rate to what extent each condition existed for them. Items were scored on a 7-point graphic-
rating scale (1 = very false and 7 = very true). Scores from the scale were averaged, and higher scores indicated lower levels of role ambiguity. A sample item includes, “I know what my responsibilities are” (see Appendix GG).

**Procedure**

The survey was administered through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. Participants completed the survey at a time and location of their own choosing. First, participants completed an informed consent process (see Appendix HH). Then, participants completed all questionnaires assessing the Implicit Leadership Theories, Implicit Followership Theories, self-reported performance, OCBs, CWBs, job satisfaction, perceived leader effectiveness, supervisor satisfaction, perceived worker competence, affective organizational commitment, cognitive dissonance, Consideration, Initiating Structure, Followership, leader-member exchange, role ambiguity, and demographic information (age, race, gender, hours worked per week, job tenure, tenure with current supervisor, and education level). After participants completed the questionnaires, they were debriefed (see Appendix II).

**Results**

**Data Cleaning**

Of the 406 participants who participated in this study, 156 were deleted as they did not meet the qualifications necessary to participate. Next, I reverse-coded appropriate items from each scale as necessary. Then, I calculated scale scores by averaging the scores for each measure. I calculated scale scores for each of the hypothesized ILT and IFT dimensions as well as scale scores for the factors determined by an exploratory factor analysis.
Measure Evaluation

I conducted exploratory factor analyses on the work ILT and IFT measures to determine which of the hypothesized dimensions were present in the current study.

**Work ILT.** First, I examined the scree plot, which provided evidence of four factors (see Figure 7). Then, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis with four factors. I used an oblique rotation because I expected a correlation between the four factors. Results from the exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded onto four factors. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 26. All items loaded onto only one factor above .3 and did not cross load on two factors with a difference of less than .3. However, Items 20 and 21 created a two-item masculinity factor that did not match with any IFT dimensions, so I did not include this factor in subsequent factor analyses.

Next, I ran the factor analysis with three factors omitting the two masculinity items. Results from this exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded as expected onto the three factors. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 27. Factor correlations are displayed in Table 28.
Figure 7. Scree plot of the Work ILT measure.
Table 26

*Factor Analysis for Work ILT Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILT-1</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.838</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-2</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.996</td>
<td>-.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-3</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.788</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-4</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-5</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-6</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-7</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-8</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-9</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-10</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-11</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-12</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-13</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-14</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-15</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-16</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-17</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-18</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-19</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-20</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-21</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27

*Factor Analysis for Work ILT without Bad Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILT-1</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-2</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-3</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-4</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-5</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-6</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-7</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>-.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-8</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-9</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-10</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>-.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-11</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-12</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-13</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-14</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>-.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-15</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-16</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-17</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-18</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT-19</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28

*Factor Correlations for Work ILT Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.491</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Work IFT.* First, I examined the scree plot, which provided evidence of four factors (see Figure 8). Then, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis with four factors. I used an oblique rotation because I expected a correlation between the four factors.
Results from the exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded onto four factors. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 29. Items 16, 17, and 18 did not load onto any factor above .3 or cross loaded on two factors and differed by less than .3.

Next, I ran the factor analysis with four factors omitting the three items that did not fit any factor. Results from this exploratory factor analysis indicated that items loaded as expected onto the four factors. Factor loadings are displayed in Table 30. Factor correlations are displayed in Table 31.

![Scree plot of the Work IFT measure.](image)

*Figure 8.* Scree plot of the Work IFT measure.
Table 29

*Factor Analysis for Work IFT Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-1</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-2</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-3</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-4</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-5</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-6</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-7</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-8</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-9</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-10</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-12</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>-.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-13</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.919</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-14</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.904</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-15</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.892</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-16</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.419</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-17</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-18</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30

*Factor Analysis for Work IFT Measure without Bad Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-1</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-2</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-3</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-4</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-5</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-6</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-7</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-8</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-9</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>-.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-10</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-11</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-12</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-13</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.926</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-14</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.911</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT-15</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.893</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31

*Factor Correlations for Work IFT Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matching ILT and IFT Dimensions

I created one congruence variation of matching ILT and IFT dimensions using the observed dimensions from the EFAs. Therefore, I calculated one Congruence Correlation for the work sample.
Table 32

*Work Congruence Variation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILT</th>
<th>IFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyranny</td>
<td>Insubordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Good Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamism</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Statistics**

The final sample included 250 participants of which 139 (55.6%) were male and 111 (44.4%) were female with an average age of 39.64 years ($SD = 12.36$).

I calculated internal consistency reliability estimates in the current sample for each of my measures. I reported measure means, standard deviations, alpha coefficients, and intercorrelations for all hypothesized ILT and IFT factors (Table 33), for all ILT and IFT factors as determined by my EFAs (Table 34), and for all study outcome variables (Table 35). Additionally, I reported measure intercorrelations for all hypothesized ILT and IFT factors and study outcome variables (Table 36) and intercorrelations for all ILT and IFT factors as determined by my EFAs (Table 37).

I expected the hypothesized ILT and IFT dimensions and the dimensions revealed through my EFA analyses to have a similar pattern of relationships. As shown in Tables 33 and 34, hypothesized ILT dimensions had intercorrelations similar to intercorrelations for the observed ILT dimensions ($r = .19$ to $.78$ for hypothesized, $r = .13$ to $.78$ for observed). Additionally, the factor that combined Intelligence, Dedication, and Dynamism was highly correlated with each individual dimension ($r = .93$, .91 and .87,
respectively). Hypothesized IFT dimensions had intercorrelations similar to intercorrelations for the observed IFT dimensions ($r = .19$ to $.76$ for hypothesized, $r = -.16$ to $.76$ for observed). Additionally, the factor that combined Industry and Good Citizen was highly correlated with each individual dimension ($r = .94$ and .94, respectively). As shown in Table 35, most study outcomes were moderately correlated with each other. The strongest correlations were between leader effectiveness and supervisor satisfaction ($r = .85$) and Consideration and Followership ($r = .79$). As shown in Tables 36 and 37, hypothesized ILT and IFT dimensions had correlations similar to those obtained between study outcomes and observed ILT and IFT dimensions.
Table 33

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Hypothesized ILT and IFT Factors in Work Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</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>1. Sensitivity</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.92</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>2. Intelligence</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.85</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>3. Dedication</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dynamism</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tyranny</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Masculinity</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. WILT</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Industry</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Enthusiasm</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Good Citizen</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Conformity</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Insubordination</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Incompetence</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. WIFT</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Alpha coefficients are placed along the diagonal. Sensitivity, Intelligence, Dedication, Dynamism, Tyranny, and Masculinity are WILT dimensions. WILT dimensions were rated on a 1-9 scale. Industry, Enthusiasm, Good Citizen, Conformity, Insubordination, and Incompetence are WIFT dimensions. WIFT dimensions were rated on a 1-10 scale. Bolded values are significant at the \( p < .05 \) level. Bolded and enlarged values are significant at the \( p < .01 \) level. WILT and WIFT were calculated by averaging all items of the scale.
Table 34

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Observed ILT and IFT Factors in Work Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sensitivity</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intelligence</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dedication</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dynamism</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intelligence/Dedication/Dynamism</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tyranny</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Industry</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Good Citizen</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Industry/Good Citizen</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Enthusiasm</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Conformity</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Insubordination</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Alpha coefficients are placed along the diagonal.
Sensitivity, Intelligence, Dedication, Dynamism, and Tyranny are WILT dimensions. SILT dimensions were rated on a 1-9 scale.
Industry, Enthusiasm, Good Citizen, Conformity, and Insubordination are WIFT dimensions. WIFT dimensions were rated on a 1-10 scale.
Bolded values are significant at the $p < .05$ level.
Bolded and enlarged values are significant at the $p < .01$ level.
Combined dimensions (5 and 9) were observed in the EFA. I included the scores for the original hypothesized dimensions to be comprehensive.
Table 35

Mean, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Study Outcomes in Work Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</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>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Performance</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.92</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OCB-I</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.77</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OCB-O</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.83</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CWB-I</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.19</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CWB-O</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.24</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>6. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.91</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>7. Leader Effectiveness</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Congruence Corr. 1</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Supervisor Sat.</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Work Competence</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Org. Commitment</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cognitive Diss.</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Consideration</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Initiating Structure</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Followership</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. LMX</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Alpha coefficients are placed along the diagonal. Bolded values are significant at the \( p < .05 \) level. Bolded and enlarged values are significant at the \( p < .01 \) level. Performance, OCB-I, OCB-O, CWB-I, CWB-O, job satisfaction, and leader effectiveness were the main outcome variables. Congruence Corr. 1 is the Congruence Correlation. Role ambiguity and Cognitive Dissonance are positively keyed and thus reflect Role Clarity and Cognitive Consonance, respectively.
Table 36

Correlations Between Hypothesized ILT and IFT Factors and Study Outcomes in Work Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamism</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyranny</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILT</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Citizen</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insubordination</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetence</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFT</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Perf is self-perceived job performance, OCB-I is organizational citizenship behaviors towards individuals, OCB-O is organizational citizenship behaviors towards the organization, CWB-I is counterproductive work behaviors towards individuals, CWB-O is counterproductive work behaviors towards the organization, Job Sat is job satisfaction, Lead. Effect. is leadership effectiveness, Sup. Sat. is supervisor satisfaction, Comp. is worker competency, Comm. is organizational commitment, Cog. Diss. is cognitive dissonance, Cons. is consideration, In. Struc. is initiating structure, Foll. is followership, LMX is leader-member exchange, and Role Amb. is role ambiguity.

Bolded values are significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Bolded and enlarged values are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Role ambiguity and Cognitive Dissonance are positively keyed and thus reflect Role Clarity and Cognitive Consonance, respectively.
Table 37

Correlations Between Observed ILT and IFT Factors and Study Outcomes in Work Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamism</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intell/Ded/Dyn</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyranny</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Citizen</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry/Good Citizen</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insubordination</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Perf is self-perceived job performance, OCB-I is organizational citizenship behaviors towards individuals, OCB-O is organizational citizenship behaviors towards the organization, CWB-I is counterproductive work behaviors towards individuals, CWB-O is counterproductive work behaviors towards the organization, Job Sat is job satisfaction, Lead. Effect. is leadership effectiveness, Sup. Sat. is supervisor satisfaction, Comp. is worker competency, Comm. is organizational commitment, Cog. Diss. is cognitive dissonance, Cons. is consideration, In. Struc. is initiating structure, Foll. is followership, LMX is leader-member exchange, and Role Amb. is role ambiguity.

Bolded values are significant at the \( p < .05 \) level.

Bolded and enlarged values are significant at the \( p < .01 \) level.

Role ambiguity and Cognitive Dissonance are positively keyed and thus reflect Role Clarity and Cognitive Consonance, respectively.
Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1 stated that congruence between ILTs and IFTs in followers will positively predict follower performance (self-reported in-role performance, OCBs, and CWBs). To test this hypothesis, I regressed self-reported in-role performance on the within-person correlation for the calculated congruence variation. The Congruence Correlation was not significantly related to self-reported in-role performance, $\beta = -.06$, $t = -.85, p > .05$. Additionally, I regressed OCB-Is, OCB-Os, CWB-Is, and CWB-Os on the Congruence Correlation. The Congruence Correlation was not significantly related to OCB-Is ($\beta = -.05$, $t = -.67, p > .05$), OCB-Os ($\beta = .03$, $t = .41, p > .05$), CWB-Is ($\beta = .06$, $t = .83, p > .05$), or CWB-Os ($\beta = .03$, $t = .38, p > .05$). These results fail to support hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 2 stated that congruence between ILTs and IFTs in followers will positively predict job satisfaction. To test this hypothesis, I regressed job satisfaction on the Congruence Correlation. The Congruence Correlation was not significantly related to job satisfaction, $\beta = .01$, $t = .20, p > .05$. These results fail to support hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3 stated that congruence between ILTs and IFTs in followers will positively predict perceived leader effectiveness. To test this hypothesis, I regressed perceived leader effectiveness on the Congruence Correlation. The Congruence Correlation was not significantly related to perceived leader effectiveness, $\beta = .05$, $t = .68, p > .05$. These results fail to support hypothesis 3.

Additional Analyses

In addition to my hypothesized relationships between the Congruence Correlation and the study outcomes, I tested whether traditional measures of leadership (e.g.,
Consideration, Initiating Structure, Followership, LMX), role ambiguity, and a measure of cognitive dissonance created for this study predicted study outcomes. I regressed Consideration, Initiating Structure, and Followership on the three study outcomes, LMX on the three study outcomes, role ambiguity on the three study outcomes, and cognitive dissonance on the three study outcomes (see Table 38). Additionally, I calculated the bivariate correlation between the Congruence Correlation and the measure of cognitive dissonance. The Congruence Correlation was not significantly related to cognitive dissonance, \( r = .03, p > .05. \)

Table 38

*Regression Analyses for Additional Predictors and Study Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th></th>
<th>Job Sat</th>
<th></th>
<th>Leader Effect</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( t )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( t )</td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>( t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followership</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>18.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Dissonance</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Job Sat is job satisfaction and Leader Effect is perceived leader effectiveness. Bolded Betas and \( t \)-statistics are significant at the .05 level.
Study 2 Discussion

The purpose of Study 2 was to replicate the findings of Study 1 and test my hypotheses in a sample of working adults. Specifically, I tested the hypotheses that congruence between ILTs and IFTs positively predicted follower performance, job satisfaction, and perceived leader effectiveness. The Congruence Correlation was not significantly related to follower performance, job satisfaction, or perceived leader effectiveness and failed to support the three hypotheses. In additional analyses, I found that Consideration was significantly related to self-reported in-role performance, job satisfaction, and perceived leader effectiveness, Initiating Structure was significantly related to self-reported in-role performance, and Followership was significantly related to perceived leader effectiveness. Additionally, LMX, role ambiguity, and cognitive dissonance were significantly related to self-rated in-role performance, job satisfaction, and perceived leader effectiveness.

General Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine whether congruence between followers’ Implicit Leadership Theories and Implicit Followership Theories affects follower performance, job satisfaction, and perceived leader effectiveness. None of the hypotheses in Study 1 were supported. ILT/IFT congruence did not positively predict final exam or final course performance, course satisfaction, or perceived instructor effectiveness in a sample of undergraduate college students in which ‘leader’ was operationally defined as a course instructor. Also, none of the hypotheses in Study 2 were supported. ILT/IFT congruence did not positively predict job performance, job satisfaction, or perceived leader effectiveness in a sample of working adults in which
'leader' was operationally defined as business leader. However, this study raises important issues, including the question of how to measure congruence between ILTs and IFTs, whether congruence influences organizational outcomes, the role of cognitive dissonance in organizational outcomes, the relationship between traditional leadership dimensions and cognitive dissonance, and possible differences in expectations of leaders and followers in different contexts, e.g., student versus work samples.

**Theoretical Implications, Practical Implications, and Future Research**

**Measuring congruence.** The first issue this study raises relates to how to measure ILTs, IFTs, and ILT/IFT congruence. To begin, the ILT and IFT measures used in these studies were developed separately and are not parallel measures of implicit theories (i.e., there are not perfectly matching pairs of dimensions on these measures). Therefore, I paired dimensions on the two scales on the basis of similar themes, which created similar but not identical dimension pairs. As a result, some of the dimension pairs were synonyms but not identical (e.g., Dynamism and Enthusiasm). More specifically, it is possible that individuals might not perceive these *synonym* pairs identically for leaders and followers. For example, what individuals perceive as characteristic of dynamic leaders might not be parallel to what individuals perceive as characteristic of enthusiastic followers. Additionally, some of the dimension pairs were antonyms in which one dimension was reverse-scored (e.g., Intelligence and Incompetence, with Incompetence being reverse-scored). Individuals might perceive negative dimensions differently than positive dimensions, which could limit the extent to which those dimensions are rated similarly. It would be better to measure congruence
using parallel measures of implicit theories and avoid pairing positive and negative dimensions.

Further, research has suggested that these measures fail to capture dimensions adequately that individuals use to characterize leaders and followers (Burns et al., 2017). More specifically, the Epitropaki and Martin (2004) ILT measure has some deficiencies (i.e., does not cover all domains of leadership) and some items contaminate the measure (i.e., cover domains not related to leadership). Similarly, the Sy (2010) IFT measure has some deficiencies (i.e., does not cover all domains of followership) and some items contaminate the measure (i.e., cover domains not related to followership). If the measures we use to gauge individuals’ ILTs and IFTs do not adequately represent a leader or follower, it is likely that those measures will not effectively capture the congruence between expectations for leaders and followers. Future research is needed to develop better measures of implicit theories for leaders and followers to assess individuals’ ILTs, IFTs, and ILT/IFT congruence more accurately.

Moreover, there is no existing method to calculate ILT/IFT congruence, and the method I used to calculate congruence, within-person correlations, might not be the most effective way of capturing implicit theory congruence. I measured congruence using what my committee and I thought was the best technique available, which was within-person correlations. Although researchers have used this technique to measure similar constructs in prior research (e.g., Huang et al., 2012; Verquer et al., 2003), there is no precedent for using within-person correlations to measure congruence between expectations for a leader and follower. Also, correlations are extremely sensitive to small sample sizes, and each within-person correlation essentially had a sample size of three
(i.e., the three paired dimensions), so it is possible that this technique does not capture congruence appropriately. Originally, I proposed a matching mechanism through which I could create congruence scores using the paired ILT and IFT dimensions. This, too, yielded insignificant results when I tested my hypotheses using this congruence calculation. Future research should explore additional methods of calculating congruence beyond the two methods I used in my studies.

**Existence of congruence versus incongruence.** If we can appropriately measure congruence, a related issue is whether incongruence can exist between an individual’s expectations for a leader and follower. Correlations between the paired dimensions in both the student and work samples were moderate and ranged from .37 to .65 with the exception of one pair ($r = .17$ between Intelligence and Incompetence in the student sample). These correlations suggested that these measures might detect congruence if it exists. Also, these results provided evidence to suggest that it is possible for one to have ILTs and IFTs that are not perfectly aligned. For example, there was variability in participants’ ratings of individual ILT and IFT dimensions across both samples (see Tables 20 and 34). Further, there was variability in congruence across participants as indicated by the within-person correlations. If there was perfect congruence, one would expect a Congruence Correlation of 1 for each participant, but participants had a range of Congruence Correlations from +/- .01 to +/- 1. As I was constrained with measurement issues discussed above, there is no way to know whether these correlations were the result of congruent ILT and IFT ratings or were the result of measurement limitations.

**Role of congruence in organizational outcomes.** A second issue is whether ILT and IFT congruence influences organizational outcomes. Prior research has suggested
that negative organizational outcomes occur when actual leader or follower behavior is not congruent with implicit theories of leader or follower behavior, respectively (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1989; Junker et al., 2014). However, the idea that ILTs subsume IFTs and vice-versa is only an implicit assumption within leadership research. As I stated in the introduction, I believe incongruent ILTs and IFTs would create cognitive dissonance, which would result in negative effects on organizational outcomes. The results of my research have suggested that congruence does not have any relationship with performance, satisfaction, or leader effectiveness. Additionally, I could not test the mediating effects of cognitive dissonance because the relationships between congruence and the study outcomes were not significant. Again, there is no way to know whether these insignificant relationships indicate that there is no relationship between congruence and the study outcomes or if measurement issues prevented me from detecting any existing relationships.

Future research related to measurement of congruence and the possible existence of incongruence. The results of my research highlighted a few areas future research should address, including identifying specific implicit leader and follower attributes, the degree to which the same set of attributes describe both leaders and followers, and whether ILT/IFT congruence should be defined as similarity or complementarity. It will be necessary for future research to provide more substantial evidence identifying attributes that comprise individuals’ ILTs and IFTs as well as similarities and differences in attributes associated with leaders versus followers. For example, in addition to having raters judge the applicability of attributes for leaders and followers, separately, researchers could ask raters to report whether a word more
accurately describes a leader, a follower, or both. Also, future research should identify whether individuals perceive non-overlapping attributes for leaders and followers or whether individuals perceive the same set of attributes as describing both leaders and followers. If individuals perceive attributes that overlap for leaders and followers, more research is needed to identify whether it is better for leaders and followers to be similar or complementary on those attributes. If research finds people expect similar levels of attributes for leaders and followers, then perhaps organizations do not need to treat leaders and followers as entirely separate entities but can offer professional development from which both leaders and follower can benefit. However, if research finds people expect leaders and followers to have complementary attributes, then organizations might need to consider assessing what specific differences exist in employees’ expectations for leaders and followers. Organizations could develop programs that create an understanding shared by leaders and followers regarding what attributes characterize leaders and what attributes characterize followers.

**Role of cognitive dissonance in organizational outcomes.** A third issue suggested by my research relates to the role of cognitive dissonance in organizational outcomes. I proposed that the effects of congruence would occur, in part, because of cognitive dissonance. As no Congruence Correlation was significantly related to any of the study outcomes, I could not test whether the Congruence Correlations accounted for any additional unique variance over and above cognitive dissonance. These results do not mean that incongruent ILTs and IFTs do not result in cognitive dissonance, necessarily. As mentioned above, it is possible that I failed to capture congruence as a result of measurement issues. Better measurement of congruence would allow
researchers to test the effects of congruence and cognitive dissonance in the future. Additionally, it is possible that my cognitive dissonance measure did not capture cognitive functions but rather an emotional reaction to expectations about leaders and followers (e.g., comfort, anxiety). This would limit the conclusions I could draw about the relationship between cognitive dissonance and my study outcomes.

Although I was not able to test the mediating effects of cognitive dissonance, my results supported my initial predictions that cognitive dissonance would be detrimental to organizational outcomes, which provides a direction for future research to pursue. Prior research has found that cognitive dissonance can influence employees’ performance, satisfaction, and commitment (e.g., Bashshur et al., 2011; Elsbach & Bhattacharya, 2001; Erdogan et al., 2004). When positively keyed, cognitive dissonance becomes cognitive consonance, which is the term I will use below. In my study, cognitive consonance was positively related to final course grade, course satisfaction, and perceived instructor effectiveness in the student sample and self-rated in-role performance, job satisfaction, and perceived leader effectiveness in the work sample. Cognitive consonance was not significantly related to any Congruence Correlations in either sample, which could mean that incongruent ILTs and IFTs do not create cognitive dissonance or that I did not adequately measure ILT/IFT congruence.

Additionally, the measure of cognitive dissonance used in my research was a five-item scale created for use in this study and has not been validated in other research. The psychometric properties of this measure were acceptable ($\alpha = .72$ in the student sample and $\alpha = .82$ in the work sample). However, researchers should examine further the properties of this measure and revise it as necessary or develop new measures of
cognitive dissonance with better psychometric properties. Creating better measures of cognitive dissonance will allow researchers to assess more accurately its relationship with organizational outcomes.

**Congruence and explicit measures of leadership.** A fourth issue that this study raises is related to the influence explicit measures of leadership have on organizational outcomes and whether congruence accounts for additional variance over and above these measures of leadership. I could not test this in my samples as planned, but I did find evidence of relationships between explicit measures of leadership and outcomes in both of my samples. More specifically, Consideration, Followership, and LMX were related to at least one outcome variable in Study 1, and Consideration, Initiating Structure, Followership, and LMX were related to all three outcome variables in Study 2 with the exception of Initiating Structure and perceived leader effectiveness and Followership with self-rated in-role performance and job satisfaction. These results suggested that explicit measures of leadership (as opposed to ILTs and IFTs) were related to my study outcomes although congruence was not. Perhaps, congruence, if it exists, was not adequately captured in my research, else I would have observed relationships between congruence and the study outcomes if such a relationship existed. Nonetheless, these significant relationships highlighted the importance of Consideration, Initiating Structure, Followership, and leader-follower relationships (the crux of the LMX framework) in organizational outcomes. Future research should develop a better measure of ILT/IFT congruence. With such a measure, researchers could examine whether these explicit leadership dimensions and ILT/IFT congruence each account for unique variance.
Organizations could use that information to develop better leadership and leader-follower training in order to maximize work performance, satisfaction, and leader effectiveness.

**Context-specific nature of Implicit Theories.** A fifth issue this study highlights is the potentially context-specific nature of Implicit Leadership and Followership Theories. Some researchers have considered the influence that contextual factors, such as leadership style, age, and culture, have on individuals’ ILTs and IFTs (e.g., Ensari & Murphy, 2003; Gordon & Arvey, 2004). For example, Ensari and Murphy (2003) found that individuals from individualistic cultures rate charismatic attributes using recognition-based processing and individuals from collectivistic cultures rate charismatic attributes using inference-based processing. The two studies in my project involved examining implicit theories in two different contexts: a college classroom and a business setting. I found indirect evidence that context might influence leadership perceptions in my research because I saw a different pattern of effects involving explicit leadership measures, role ambiguity, or cognitive dissonance and study outcomes. More specifically, there were a greater number of significant relationships in the work sample than the student sample.

The above direct and indirect evidence suggests that context might influence ILTs, IFTs, and ILT/IFT congruence, and there are two ways in which this can occur: through aspects of the situation (e.g., tasks, context) or aspects of the individual (e.g., whether leaders or followers are responding). Whereas some implicit leadership and followership theories make no distinction between attributes or characteristics that are desired in certain contexts and not others, it is plausible to think that certain attributes would be expected of leaders in some situations or settings and not others. For example,
a soldier in the Army might have a different subjective view of an Army leader (i.e., an ILT) than a grocery store clerk will of his or her store manager. Similarly, an Army soldier is expected to act in different ways than a grocery clerk. Additionally, leaders might expect different sets of attributes for leaders and followers than followers. As a result, ILT/IFT congruence might differ for a leader compared to a follower. Practically speaking, it might be necessary for measures of ILTs and IFTs to specify what type of leaders and followers raters should think of when completing such measures (e.g., the context). Future research should examine the extent to which context affects the degree to which people perceive the same set of attributes as describing both leaders and followers (e.g., a factory assembly line, military, athletic teams, academic settings, etc.) as well as ILT/IFT congruency. Also, future research should examine whether leaders’ ILT and IFT ratings and ILT/IFT congruence differ from ratings and congruence of followers.

**Limitations**

This study has a few limitations to consider. The operationalization of leadership in the student sample might have limited the extent to which findings of Study 1 can be generalized to other settings. I used a sample of undergraduate college students to test my hypotheses on a sample in which I could gather objective performance data, but operationalizing ‘leader’ and ‘follower’ differently between the two studies might have limited the extent to which I could find significant results in Study 1. Students might not conceptualize their instructors as leaders and themselves as followers in the same manner that employees conceptualize their supervisor as their work leader and themselves as followers.
Also, in the work sample, it was not possible to collect measures of follower performance other than follower self-reported in-role performance. Participants were asked to subjectively rate their own performance, but these ratings could have been influenced by individual biases or social desirability. Either of these factors might have limited the validity of follower performance measures in this sample, which could have impacted the observed relationship between ILT/IFT congruency and performance.

Conclusions

The purpose of my research was to determine whether congruency between followers’ Implicit Leadership Theories and Implicit Followership Theories predicted follower performance, job satisfaction, and perceived leader effectiveness. The results highlighted five main issues and observations. First, there were problems with the way in which we measured ILTs, IFTs, and ILT/IFT congruence. Second, ILT/IFT congruence might not affect organizational outcomes if congruence even exists. Third, ILT/IFT incongruence might not lead to cognitive dissonance although the results suggested that cognitive dissonance was significantly related to several main outcomes. Fourth, we do not know whether ILT/IFT congruence accounts for unique variance over and above explicit measures of leadership, but several explicit measures of leadership were related to the main study outcomes. Fifth, the context in which ILTs and IFTs are measured might influence individuals’ expectations for leaders and followers. Overall, my study adds to the leadership literature because I examined the effects of both Implicit Leadership Theories and Implicit Followership Theories simultaneously. Although I did not find support for the expected relationships, my research highlighted several issues and future research directions relevant to ILT and IFT research, including how to
measure and conceptualize ILT/IFT congruence, the influence of congruence on organizational outcomes, and the role of cognitive dissonance in organizational outcomes.
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Appendix A

Implicit Leadership Theories

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use the following scale to rate how characteristic each item is of a course instructor.

1 (not at all characteristic)………………………………………9 (extremely characteristic)

Sensitivity
1. Helpful
2. Understanding
3. Sincere

Intelligence
4. Intelligent
5. Educated
6. Clever
7. Knowledgeable

Dedication
8. Dedicated
9. Motivated
10. Hard-working

Dynamism
11. Energetic
12. Strong
13. Dynamic

Tyranny
14. Domineering
15. Pushy
16. Manipulative
17. Loud
18. Conceited
19. Selfish

Masculinity
20. Male
21. Masculine
Appendix B
Implicit Followership Theories

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use the following scale to rate how characteristic each item is of a student.

1 (not at all characteristic) …………………………………………10 (extremely characteristic)

Industry
1. Hardworking
2. Productive
3. Goes above and beyond

Enthusiasm
4. Excited
5. Outgoing
6. Happy

Good Citizen
7. Loyal
8. Reliable
9. Team player

Conformity
10. Easily influenced
11. Follows trends
12. Soft spoken

Insubordination
13. Arrogant
14. Rude
15. Bad tempered

Incompetence
16. Uneducated
17. Slow
18. Inexperienced
Appendix C

Course Satisfaction

INSTRUCTIONS: Three states which people have used to describe their feelings about their courses are given below. Read each statement and then use the scale below to rate how you generally feel about your Introductory to Psychology course. There are no right or wrong answers.

1 (strongly disagree)........................................7 (strongly agree)

1. All in all, I am satisfied with my course.
2. In general, I don’t like my course. (reversed)
3. In general, I like working here.
Appendix D

Perceived Instructor Effectiveness

INSTRUCTIONS: Four statements which people have used to describe their feelings about instructors are given below. Read each statement and then use the scale below to rate how you generally feel about your Introduction to Psychology instructor. There are no right or wrong answers.

1 (very much disagree) .................................................. 7 (very much agree)

1. My instructor is an excellent teacher.
2. I put my trust in this instructor.
3. No one could perform my instructor’s job better than my instructor.
4. My instructor is effective at his or her job.
Appendix E

Study 1 Demographics

1. What is your current age?
   
   ________ years of age

2. What is your gender?
   
   1. Male       2. Female

3. What is your class rank?
   
   4. Junior                  5. Senior    6. Senior 5 years +
   7. Other

4. What is your race?
   
Appendix F

PANAS Mood Measure

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you feel this way in general. Use the following scale to record your answers.

1. Very slightly or not at all
2. A little
3. Moderately
4. Quite a bit
5. Extremely

_ interested
_ distressed
_ excited
_ upset
_ strong
_ guilty
_ scared
_ hostile
_ enthusiastic

_ irritable
_ alert
_ ashamed
_ inspired
_ nervous
_ determined
_ attentive
_ jittery
_ proud
Appendix G

Expected Performance

INSTRUCTIONS: Below, please indicate what grade you expect to receive on your PSY 1010 final exam and what final grade you expect to receive in PSY 1010. Indicate your expected grade on a 0-100 percentage scale.

Total percent on final exam: _____%

Total percent in course: _____%
Appendix H

Instructor Satisfaction

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use the following scale to rate the extent to which you agree with each statement pertaining to your introductory psychology lecture instructor.

1 (strongly disagree)……………………………………………………………………7 (strongly agree)

1. Overall, I am very pleased with the way my instructor teaches me.
2. I would be more content with my class if my instructor was not the teacher. (reverse-scored)
3. I am more satisfied with my instructor than with almost anyone I have ever taken a class with.
4. All in all, I am very satisfied with this person as my instructor.
5. All in all, I would rather take this class with some other instructor. (reverse-scored)
Appendix I

Cognitive Dissonance

INSTRUCTIONS: When you think about your expectations for instructors in general compared to your expectations for students in general, to what extent do you feel:

1. Not at all comfortable…………………………very comfortable
2. Not at all stressed…………………………very stressed (reverse-scored)
3. Not at all frustrated…………………………very frustrated (reverse-scored)
4. Not at all anxious…………………………very anxious (reverse-scored)
5. Not at all focused…………………………very focused
Appendix J

LBDQ Consideration Scale (formatted for student sample)

Please read each item carefully. Think about how frequently you engage in the behavior described in each item below. Consider your classmates as group members. Select the answer you believe to be most accurate of yourself.

1 (Rarely) ................................................................. 5 (Very Often)

1. I do personal favors for group members.
2. I do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.
3. I am easy to understand.
4. I find time to listen to group members.
5. I keep to myself. *
6. I look out for the personal welfare of individual group members.
7. I refuse to explain my actions. *
8. I act without consulting the group. *
9. I back up the members in their actions.
10. I treat all group members as my equals.
11. I am willing to make changes.
12. I am friendly and approachable.
13. I make group members feel at ease when talking with them.
14. I put suggestions made by the group into operation.
15. I get group approval on important matters before going ahead.
Appendix K

LBDQ Initiating Structure Scale (formatted for student sample)

Please read each item carefully. Think about how frequently you engage in the behavior described in each item below. Consider your classmates as group members. Select the answer you believe to be most accurate of yourself.

1 (Rarely) …………………………………………………………………… 5 (Very Often)

1. I make my attitudes clear to group members.
2. I try out my new ideas with group members.
3. I rule with an iron hand.
4. I criticize poor work.
5. I speak in a manner not to be questioned.
6. I assign group members to particular tasks.
7. I schedule the work to be done.
8. I maintain definite standards of performance.
9. I emphasize the meeting of deadlines.
10. I encourage the use of uniform procedures.
11. I make sure that my part in the team is understood by all team members.
12. I ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations.
13. I let group members know what is expected of them.
14. I see to it that group members are working up to capacity.
15. I see to it that the work of group members is coordinated.
Appendix L

Followership Behavior Questionnaire (formatted for student sample)

Please read each item carefully. Think about how frequently you engage in the behavior described in each item below. Consider your classmates as group members. Select the answer you believe to be most accurate of yourself.

1 (Rarely)........................................................................................................5 (Very Often)

1. I listen to other group members’ ideas.
2. I accept help from other group members.
3. I accept encouragement from other group members.
4. I am uncomfortable with other group members disagreeing with me. *
5. I understand other group members’ perspectives.
6. I help to make other group members’ ideas better.
7. I accept task assignments from other group members.
8. I let others speak for the group.
9. I am prepared to contribute to group assignments.
10. I get along well with other group members.
11. I communicate well with other group members.
12. I disrupt group work. *
13. I contribute my fair share to group assignments.
14. I am uncomfortable accepting help from other group members.
15. I like being part of the group.
16. I am bothered when someone else leads. *
17. I ask questions of other group members.
18. I ask advice from other group members.
19. I follow advice from other group members.
20. I accept praise from other group members.
21. I accept feedback from other group members.
Appendix M

Leader-Member Exchange (formatted for student sample)

Please read each item carefully. Use the scale below each item to indicate how you feel about the relationship between you and your instructor.

1. Do you usually know how satisfied your instructor is with what you do?
   a. Always know where I stand
   b. Usually know where I stand
   c. Seldom know where I stand
   d. Never know where I stand

2. How well do you feel that your instructor understands your problems and needs?
   a. Completely
   b. Well enough
   c. Some but not enough
   d. Not at all

3. How well do you feel that your instructor recognizes your potential?
   a. Fully
   b. As much as the next person
   c. Some but not enough
   d. Not at all

4. Regardless of how much formal authority your instructor has built into his or her position, what are the chances that he or she would be personally inclined to use power to help you solve your problems in your class?
   a. Certainly would
   b. Probably would
   c. Might or might not
   d. No chance

5. Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your instructor has, to what extent can you count on him or her to “bail you out” at his or her expense when you really need it?
   a. Certainly would
   b. Probably would
   c. Might or might not
   d. No chance

6. I have enough confidence in my instructor that I would defend and justify his or her decisions if her or she were not present to do so.
   a. Certainly would
   b. Probably would
   c. Maybe
   d. Probably not

7. How would you characterize your working relationship with your instructor?
   a. Extremely effective
   b. Better than average
   c. About average
   d. Less than average
Appendix N

Role Ambiguity scale (formatted for student sample)

Please read each item carefully. Consider your role as a student. Use the following scale to indicate to what extent each condition exists for you.

1 (very false)…………………………………………………………………7 (very true)

1. I feel certain about how much authority I have.
2. There are clear, planned goals and objectives for my role as a student.
3. I know that I have divided my time properly.
4. I know what my responsibilities are.
5. I know exactly what is expected of me.
6. Explanation is clear of what has to be done.
Appendix O

Consent Form

The purpose of this research study is to examine the effects of Leadership and Followership theories on organizational outcomes.

During the study you will be asked to complete several online questionnaires. The study should take about 40-45 minutes to complete. You will receive SONA research credit for completing all of the questionnaires.

There is minimal risk and discomfort anticipated as part of or as a result of this research study. The primary risk is fatigue resulting from responding to the questionnaires. Any information about you obtained from this study will be kept strictly confidential and you will not be identified in any report or publication.

Clicking the “I Agree” button below and continuing with the questionnaires implies your consent to participate and your consent to allow researchers access to your Wright State academic record. You are free to refuse to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time. Your decision to participate or to not participate will not adversely affect your standing at this institution or cause a loss of benefits to which you might otherwise be entitled. There is no penalty of any kind for either non-participation or withdrawal at any time.

Only the researchers will have access to your academic information. Though there is a possibility of a breach of confidentiality, the chances of this are very small. This is because the researchers will keep confidential all data collected on a secure computer; including records identifying a participant with specific data. The researchers will use your name only to access your academic record. The researchers will identify your information only with a code number in the data files they create using this information. Also, only aggregate data (and no individual participant’s data) will be reported in any resulting report or presentation.

A summary of the results of this study may be requested by contacting the researchers listed below. The summary will show only aggregate (combined) data. No individual results will be available. If you have questions or concerns about this study, you can contact the researcher Daniel Bashore at bashore.17@wright.edu or Dr. Debra Steele-Johnson at debra.steele-johnson@wright.edu. If you have general questions about giving consent or your rights as a research participant in this research study, you can call the Wright State University Institutional Review Board at 937-775-4462.

Please indicate your agreement to participate in this study. If you choose not to participate you may close your browser now.

☐ I agree to participate in this study.
Please indicate your name and UID below if you agree to participate in the study.

________________________
Name

________________________
UID
Appendix P

Debriefing form

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

The experiment you just completed examines Implicit Leadership Theories and Implicit Followership Theories.

Prior research has examined how discrepancies between actual behavior and Implicit Leadership Theories or Implicit Followership Theories affect employee performance and affective outcomes. We are interested in how both Leadership and Followership Theories within followers will affect performance and affective outcomes.

With data from you and other individuals, we are discovering more about how Implicit Leadership Theories and Implicit Followership Theories affect students in a classroom setting.

Please do not discuss these surveys with anyone else because it is important that future participants know nothing about the experiment before they participate in the same experiment.

The data you provided today is important to us, and we appreciate your help. If you have any questions or comments about today's experiment, please talk to the researcher, Daniel Bashore at bashore.17@wright.edu or contact Dr. Debra Steele-Johnson at debra.steele-johnson@wright.edu. Thank you for your time and cooperation.
Appendix Q

Implicit Leadership Theories

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use the following scale to rate how characteristic each item is of a business leader.

1 (not at all characteristic) ........................................... 9 (extremely characteristic)

Sensitivity
1. Helpful
2. Understanding
3. Sincere

Intelligence
4. Intelligent
5. Educated
6. Clever
7. Knowledgeable

Dedication
8. Dedicated
9. Motivated
10. Hard-working

Dynamism
11. Energetic
12. Strong
13. Dynamic

Tyranny
14. Domineering
15. Pushy
16. Manipulative
17. Loud
18. Conceited
19. Selfish

Masculinity
20. Male
21. Masculine
Appendix R

Implicit Followership Theories

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use the following scale to rate how characteristic each item is of a work follower.

1 (not at all characteristic)………………………10 (extremely characteristic)

Industry
  1. Hardworking
  2. Productive
  3. Goes above and beyond

Enthusiasm
  4. Excited
  5. Outgoing
  6. Happy

Good Citizen
  7. Loyal
  8. Reliable
  9. Team player

Conformity
  10. Easily influenced
  11. Follows trends
  12. Soft spoken

Insubordination
  13. Arrogant
  14. Rude
  15. Bad tempered

Incompetence
  16. Uneducated
  17. Slow
  18. Inexperienced
Appendix S

Self-Reported Job Performance

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use the following scale to rate the four items below to the best of your ability.

1. Consistently perform way below expectations
2. Consistently perform below expectations
3. Consistently perform at expectations
4. Consistently perform above expectations
5. Consistently perform way beyond expectations

1. All in all, how competently do you perform your job?
2. In your estimation, how effectively do you get your work done?
3. How would you judge the overall quality of your work?
4. Overall, how would your summarize your competence at your current job?
Appendix T
Organizational Citizenship Behavior

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are statements describing people’s behaviors at work. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you at work and only at work. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future.

1 (never)…………………………………………………………………………………………7 (always)

At work, how frequently do you engage in these behaviors?

OCB-I Items
1. Help others who have been absent.
2. Willingly give your time to help others who have work-related problems.
3. Adjust your work schedule to accommodate other employees’ requests for time off.
4. Go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group.
5. Show genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even under the most trying business or personal situations.
6. Give up time to help others who have work or non-work problems.
7. Assist others with their duties.
8. Share personal property with others to help their work.

OCB-O Items
1. Attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image.
2. Keep up with developments in the organization.
3. Defend the organization when other employees criticize it.
4. Show pride when representing the organization in public.
5. Offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization.
6. Express loyalty toward the organization.
7. Take action to protect the organization from potential problems.
8. Demonstrate concern about the image of the organization.
Appendix U

Counterproductive Work Behavior

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are statements describing people’s behaviors at work. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you at work and only at work. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future.

1 (never) ................................................................................................................. 7 (always)

At work, how frequently do you engage in these behaviors?

CWB-I
1. Made fun of someone at work
2. Said something hurtful to someone at work.
3. Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work.
4. Cursed at someone at work.
5. Played a mean prank on someone at work.
6. Acted rudely toward someone at work.
7. Publicly embarrassed someone at work.

CWB-O
1. Taken property from work without permission.
2. Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working.
3. Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses.
4. Taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your workplace.
5. Come in late to work without permission.
6. Littered your work environment.
7. Neglected to follow your boss’s instructions.
8. Intentionally worked slower than you could have worked.
9. Discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person.
10. Used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job.
11. Put little effort into your work.
12. Dragged out work in order to get overtime.
Appendix V

Job Satisfaction

INSTRUCTIONS: Three states which people have used to describe their feelings about their jobs are given below. Read each statement and then use the scale below to rate how you generally feel about your job. There are no right or wrong answers.

1 (strongly disagree)…………………………………………………………………..7 (strongly agree)

1. All in all, I am satisfied with my course.
2. In general, I don’t like my course. (reversed)
3. In general, I like working here.
Appendix W

Perceived Leader Effectiveness

INSTRUCTIONS: Four statements which people have used to describe their feelings about their supervisors are given below. Read each statement and then use the scale below to rate how you generally feel about your supervisor. There are no right or wrong answers.

1 (very much disagree)……………………………………7 (very much agree)

1. My supervisor is an excellent supervisor.
2. I put my trust in this supervisor.
3. No one could perform my supervisor’s job better than my supervisor.
4. My supervisor is effective at his or her job.
Appendix X

Study 2 Demographics

1. What is your current age?

______ years of age

2. What is your gender?

1. Male 2. Female

3. What is your race?


4. On average, how many hours per week do you work?

___________ hours per week

5. Approximately how long (in months) have you worked for your current organization?

___________ months

6. Approximately how long (in months) have you worked with your current supervisor?

___________ months

7. What level of education did you last complete?

1. Some high school 2. Completed high school/GED
3. Some college 4. Completed a bachelor’s degree
5. Some graduate school 6. Completed a graduate degree

8. Please indicate your occupation.

1. Management, professional, and related 2. Sales and office
3. Service 4. Education
5. Government 6. Retired
7. Family manager/Stay at home parent 8. Unemployed
9. Other
Appendix Y

Supervisor Satisfaction

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use the following scale to rate the extent to which you agree with each statement pertaining to your immediate supervisor.

1 (strongly disagree)………………………………………………………….7 (strongly agree)

1. Overall, I am very pleased with the way my manager supervises me.
2. I would be more content with my job if my manager did not work here. (reverse-scored)
3. I am more satisfied with my manager than with almost anyone I have ever worked for.
4. All in all, I am very satisfied with this person as my manager.
5. All in all, I would rather work for some other manager. (reverse-scored)
Appendix Z

Perceived Worker Competence

INSTRUCTIONS: Four statements which people have used to describe their work abilities are given below. Read each statement and then use the scale below to rate how you generally feel about your ability to complete your current job. There are no right or wrong answers.

1 (very much disagree)…………………………………………………7 (very much agree)

1. I am qualified for my current position.
2. I perform good work at my job.
3. There are times when I feel my work could be better. (reverse-scored)
4. I am always able to perform the tasks required of my job.
5. My supervisor is not satisfied with the level of my job performance. (reverse-scored)
Appendix AA

Affective Organizational Commitment

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are statements describing people’s attitudes toward work. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes your attitude at work and only at work. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future.

1 (strongly disagree)………………………………………………………………7 (strongly agree)

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.
3. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.
4. I think that I could easily become attached to another organization as I as to this one. (reverse-scored)
5. I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization. (reverse-scored)
6. I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organization. (reverse-scored)
7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. (reverse-scored)
Appendix BB

Cognitive Dissonance

INSTRUCTIONS: When you think about your expectations for supervisors in general compared to your expectations for work followers in general, to what extent do you feel:

1. Not at all comfortable……………………………………very comfortable
2. Not at all stressed……………………………………very stressed (reverse-scored)
3. Not at all frustrated……………………………………very frustrated (reverse-scored)
4. Not at all anxious……………………………………very anxious (reverse-scored)
5. Not at all focused……………………………………very focused
Appendix CC

LBDQ Consideration Scale (formatted for work sample)

Please read each item carefully. Think about how frequently you engage in the behavior described in each item below. Select the answer you believe to be most accurate of yourself.

1 (Rarely)…………………………………………………………………5 (Very Often)

1. I do personal favors for group members.
2. I do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.
3. I am easy to understand.
4. I find time to listen to group members.
5. I keep to myself. *
6. I look out for the personal welfare of individual group members.
7. I refuse to explain my actions. *
8. I act without consulting the group. *
9. I back up the members in their actions.
10. I treat all group members as my equals.
11. I am willing to make changes.
12. I am friendly and approachable.
13. I make group members feel at ease when talking with them.
14. I put suggestions made by the group into operation.
15. I get group approval on important matters before going ahead.
Appendix DD

LBDQ Initiating Structure Scale (formatted for work sample)

Please read each item carefully. Think about how frequently you engage in the behavior described in each item below. Select the answer you believe to be most accurate of yourself.

1 (Rarely)…………………………………………………………………5 (Very Often)

1. I make my attitudes clear to group members.
2. I try out my new ideas with group members.
3. I rule with an iron hand.
4. I criticize poor work.
5. I speak in a manner not to be questioned.
6. I assign group members to particular tasks.
7. I schedule the work to be done.
8. I maintain definite standards of performance.
9. I emphasize the meeting of deadlines.
10. I encourage the use of uniform procedures.
11. I make sure that my part in the team is understood by all team members.
12. I ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations.
13. I let group members know what is expected of them.
14. I see to it that group members are working up to capacity.
15. I see to it that the work of group members is coordinated.
Appendix EE

Followership Behavior Questionnaire (formatted for work sample)

Please read each item carefully. Think about how frequently you engage in the behavior described in each item below. Select the answer you believe to be most accurate of yourself.

1 (Rarely) .......................................................... 5 (Very Often)

1. I listen to other group members’ ideas.
2. I accept help from other group members.
3. I accept encouragement from other group members.
4. I am uncomfortable with other group members disagreeing with me. *
5. I understand other group members’ perspectives.
6. I help to make other group members’ ideas better.
7. I accept task assignments from other group members.
8. I let others speak for the group.
9. I am prepared to contribute to group assignments.
10. I get along well with other group members.
11. I communicate well with other group members.
12. I disrupt group work. *
13. I contribute my fair share to group assignments.
14. I am uncomfortable accepting help from other group members.
15. I like being part of the group.
16. I am bothered when someone else leads. *
17. I ask questions of other group members.
18. I ask advice from other group members.
19. I follow advice from other group members.
20. I accept praise from other group members.
21. I accept feedback from other group members.
Appendix FF

Leader-Member Exchange (formatted for work sample)

Please read each item carefully. Use the scale below each item to indicate how you feel about the relationship between you and your immediate supervisor.

1. Do you usually know how satisfied your immediate supervisor is with what you do?
   a. Always know where I stand
   b. Usually know where I stand
   c. Seldom know where I stand
   d. Never know where I stand

2. How well do you feel that your immediate supervisor understands your problems and needs?
   a. Completely
   b. Well enough
   c. Some but not enough
   d. Not at all

3. How well do you feel that your immediate supervisor recognizes your potential?
   a. Fully
   b. As much as the next person
   c. Some but not enough
   d. Not at all

4. Regardless of how much formal authority your immediate supervisor has built into his or her position, what are the chances that he or she would be personally inclined to use power to help you solve your problems in your class?
   a. Certainly would
   b. Probably would
   c. Might or might not
   d. No chance

5. Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your immediate supervisor has, to what extent can you count on him or her to “bail you out” at his or her expense when you really need it?
   a. Certainly would
   b. Probably would
   c. Might or might not
   d. No chance

6. I have enough confidence in my immediate supervisor that I would defend and justify his or her decisions if she or he were not present to do so.
   a. Certainly would
   b. Probably would
   c. Maybe
   d. Probably not

7. How would you characterize your working relationship with your immediate supervisor?
   a. Extremely effective
b. Better than average
  c. About average
  d. Less than average
Appendix GG

Role Ambiguity scale (formatted for work sample)

Please read each item carefully. Consider your role at work. Use the following scale to indicate to what extent each condition exists for you.

1 (very false) .................................................................7 (very true)

1. I feel certain about how much authority I have.
2. There are clear, planned goals and objectives for my role.
3. I know that I have divided my time properly.
4. I know what my responsibilities are.
5. I know exactly what is expected of me.
6. Explanation is clear of what has to be done.
Appendix HH

Consent Form

The purpose of this research study is to examine the effects of Leadership and Followership theories on organizational outcomes.

During the study you will be asked to complete several online questionnaires. You will receive a 25 cent credit to your Mechanical TURK account for completing all of the questionnaires.

There is minimal risk and discomfort anticipated as part of or as a result of this research study. The primary risk is fatigue resulting from responding to the questionnaires. Any information about you obtained from this study will be kept strictly confidential and you will not be identified in any report or publication.

Clicking the “I Agree” button below and continuing with the questionnaires implies your consent to participate. You are free to refuse to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time. Your decision to participate or to not participate will not cause a loss of benefits to which you might otherwise be entitled. There is no penalty of any kind for either non-participation or withdrawal at any time.

A summary of the results of this study may be requested by contacting the researchers listed below. The summary will show only aggregate (combined) data. No individual results will be available. If you have questions or concerns about this study, you can contact the researcher Daniel Bashore at bashore.17@wright.edu or Dr. Debra Steele-Johnson at debra.steele-johnson@wright.edu. If you have general questions about giving consent or your rights as a research participant in this research study, you can call the Wright State University Institutional Review Board at 937-775-4462.

Please indicate your agreement to participate in this study. If you choose not to participate you may close your browser now.

☐ I agree to participate in this study.
Appendix II

Debriefing form

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

The experiment you just completed examines Implicit Leadership Theories and Implicit Followership Theories.

Prior research has examined how discrepancies between actual behavior and Implicit Leadership Theories or Implicit Followership Theories affect employee performance and affective outcomes. We are interested in how both Leadership and Followership Theories within followers will affect performance and affective outcomes.

With data from you and other individuals, we are discovering more about how Implicit Leadership Theories and Implicit Followership Theories affect employees.

Please do not discuss these surveys with anyone else because it is important that future participants know nothing about the experiment before they participate in the same experiment.

The data you provided today is important to us, and we appreciate your help. If you have any questions or comments about today's experiment, please talk to the researcher, Daniel Bashore at bashore.17@wright.edu or contact Dr. Debra Steele-Johnson at debra.steele-johnson@wright.edu. Thank you for your time and cooperation.