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Introduction
We welcome you as a participant of the Erasmus Leadership Conference. The meeting is organized by the recently founded Erasmus Centre for Leadership Studies (http://www.erin.eur.nl/leadership), which is part of the Rotterdam School of Management, one of the top three research schools in management in Europe.

We thank the Erasmus Research Institute of Management (ERIM) and the Erasmus Trustfonds (ref:97090.06/09.0350/etv) for providing financial support to organize this conference.

We sincerely hope you will enjoy this conference, and we look forward to the exciting presentations of our conference.

Kind regards,

Daan van Knippenberg  Dirk van Dierendonck  Steffen R. Giessner
Program
Schedule
**WEDNESDAY, 17th JUNE**

| 17.00 - 18.00 | Welcome Drinks at the Bilderberg Parkhotel Rotterdam (Conference Hotel) and Registration |

**THURSDAY, 18th JUNE**

| 8.30 | Bus Shuttle from the Bilderberg Parkhotel to the Conference Venue |
| 9.00 - 9.15 | Coffee available and Registration |
| 9.15 - 9.45 | Welcome words by Daan van Knippenberg |

**MORNING SESSION I**

**CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON LEADERSHIP**

| 9.45 - 10.15 | Michelle Ryan  
**Opting out or being left out:**  
Examining alternative explanations for women’s lower career ambition |
| 10.15 - 10.45 | Tanya Menon  
**Blazing the Trail versus Trailing the Group:**  
Culture and Perceptions of the Leader’s Position |

**10.45 - 11.00 COFFEE BREAK**

**MORNING SESSION II**

**LEADER, FOLLOWER AND TEAM PERSONALITY**

| 11.00 - 11.30 | Annabel de Hoogh  
**Neuroticism and Locus of Control as Moderators of the Relationships of Charismatic and Autocratic Leadership with Burnout** |
| 11.30 - 12.00 | Eric Kearney  
**Team Personality Configurations as Moderators of the Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Team Performance** |
| 12.00 - 12.30 | Stephen Zaccaro  
**Leader Attribute Patterns:**  
Linking Complex Integrations of Individual Differences to Leadership Outcomes |

**12.30 - 14.00 LUNCH**
### AFTERNOON SESSION I
**LEADER ETHICS AND FAIRNESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.00 - 14.30</td>
<td>Steven Blader</td>
<td><em>Fairness at the Front Line: Status and Power as Predictors of Leader Fairness</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30 - 15.00</td>
<td>David Mayer</td>
<td><em>Why Are Followers of Ethical Leaders Less Deviant? The Mediating Role of Moral Disengagement</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00 – 15.30</td>
<td>Francesca Gino</td>
<td><em>Contagion and Differentiation in Unethical Behavior: The Effect of One Bad Apple on the Barrel</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 - 16.00</td>
<td>David de Cremer</td>
<td><em>When Leader Passion breeds Justice: Procedural fairness effects as a function of leader’s passion</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.00 - 16.30</td>
<td>COFFEE BREAK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AFTERNOON SESSION II
**NEW CONCEPTS IN LEADERSHIP RESEARCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.30 - 17.00</td>
<td>Dirk van Dierendonck</td>
<td><em>Servant-Leadership: A multidimensional conceptualization and measurement</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00 - 17.30</td>
<td>Niels van Quaquebeke</td>
<td><em>Which communication technique is the most under-appreciated in leadership scholarship? (Hint: The answer is in the title)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30 - 18.00</td>
<td>David Waldman</td>
<td><em>Can the Concept of Responsibility Inform Leadership Theory and Research?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>Bus Shuttle from the Conference Venue to the Bilderberg Parkhotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Bus Shuttle from the Bilderberg Parkhotel to the Conference Venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30 - 9.45</td>
<td>Coffee available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MORNING SESSION I**

**LEADER GROUP PROTOTYPICALITY AND ITS EFFECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.45 - 10.15</td>
<td>Daan van Knippenberg</td>
<td><em>A multilevel perspective on leader group prototypicality and leadership</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15 - 10.45</td>
<td>Steffen R. Giessner</td>
<td><em>When does a leader show fair behavior?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Influences of group prototypicality and the social context</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COFFEE BREAK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.45 - 11.00</td>
<td>COFFEE BREAK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MORNING SESSION II**

**HOW LEADERS SHAPE FOLLOWER CONSTRUAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.00 - 11.30</td>
<td>Rolf van Dick</td>
<td><em>Leader and follower organizational identification: A transfer model</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 - 12.00</td>
<td>Sim Sitkin</td>
<td><em>Distinguishing the Faces of Leadership Vision</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 - 12.30</td>
<td>Daan Stam</td>
<td><em>An Image of Who We Might Become: Follower Possible Selves and Leader Vision Effectiveness</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LUNCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.30 - 14.00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AFTERNOON SESSION

**LEADING TEAMS AND GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.00 - 14.30</td>
<td>Scott De Rue</td>
<td>Team Leadership: Network Structures, Processes, and Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30 - 15.00</td>
<td>Fred Morgeson</td>
<td>What’s Leadership Got to Do with Team Effectiveness? Exploring Contextual Contingencies and Team Need Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00 - 15.30</td>
<td>Wendy van Ginkel</td>
<td>Leading To Find Value in Diversity: Leadership, Diversity Beliefs, and Group Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 - 16.00</td>
<td>Todd Pittinsky</td>
<td>Intergroup Leadership: A Two-Dimensional Theory of Leadership and Diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.00 - 16.30</td>
<td>COFFEE BREAK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AFTERNOON SESSION II

**RISK MANAGEMENT, LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT, AND SUBSTITUTES OF FAIRNESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.30 - 17.00</td>
<td>Mark Griffin</td>
<td>Leadership and error avoidance: Implications for risk management in the current regulatory climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00 - 17.30</td>
<td>David Day</td>
<td>Integrative Leader Development: Theory and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30 - 18.00</td>
<td>Johannes Ullrich</td>
<td>Substitutes for fairness: Prototypical leaders are endorsed whether they are fair or not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SATURDAY, 20TH JUNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All day</td>
<td>Departure of participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstracts
Fairness at the Front Line: Status and Power as Predictors of Leader Fairness

Steven Blader and Yaru Chen
Leonard N. Stern School of Business, New York University

Organizational justice research makes clear that the fairness employees encounter in their workplaces is a primary predictor of their attitudes and behavior at work. Furthermore, research also shows that while the fairness of formal organizational policies and procedures are an important determinant of employees’ justice judgments, relatively more important is the fairness that enacted by leaders and specific organizational authorities. Leaders – who set organizational policies, make day-to-day decisions, allocate outcomes, and frequently interact with employees – can therefore be said to represent the “front line” of justice. Yet surprisingly little research has examined the factors that determine leader fairness, with the justice literature instead focusing almost exclusively on how, why, and when employees react to their justice perceptions. As such, we do not know enough about what prompts leaders to create workplaces marked by justice or injustice.

My talk will focus on a current project (with Yaru Chen) that addresses this shortcoming in the literature. This project draws on fundamental social psychological and sociological principles to address the issue of leader fairness. In this work, we compare two key elements of leadership – status and power – and examine their effect on fairness. The emerging results of this research show that while status and power are often confounded in the research literature, they actually have quite different effects on fairness. In particular, status tends to push leaders to distribute outcomes, make decisions, and treat others in relatively fair ways. Power, in contrast, tends to have the opposite effect on leader fairness. I will discuss the results of several studies that demonstrate this finding across a wide range of experimental contexts and forms of justice. Furthermore, I will discuss the mechanism that underlies these effects, and will propose potential moderators that shape when and where they might be most likely to emerge. In discussing the implications of these two projects for leader fairness, I will also highlight contributions they make to the literatures on status and power.
Despite the prevalence of leader development interventions, there is little theory to guide research or advance practice. Recent developments in this area have promoted a theoretical understanding of how adult development processes, identity and self-regulation, as well as expertise acquisition shape the life-long development of leaders (Day, Harrison, & Halpin, 2009). An overview of this integrative approach to leader development will be presented, including the results of recent research designed to test various aspects of the theory. In a recent study (Day & Sin, 2009) the personal change trajectories of participants (N = 1315) engaged in team-based action learning projects (k = 205) to promote leader development were estimated using multilevel growth modelling techniques. Evidence was found supporting differences in the initial leadership effectiveness levels across participants as well as differences in the shape or form of their personal trajectories. Hypotheses were proposed and tested predicting that adopting a leader identity would serve as a within-person, time-varying covariate of leadership effectiveness and that goal orientation would be a between-person, cross-level moderator of personal trajectories. Results suggested full support for the role of leader identity and partial support for goal orientation, with the most consistent and beneficial effects associated with a high mastery or learning goal orientation. Subsequent research adopts growth mixture modelling to identify different subpopulations and predict different forms of latent change trajectories using measures of adult development processes, core self evaluations, and goal orientation.

References
When Leader Passion breeds Justice: Procedural fairness effects as a function of leader’s passion

David De Cremer
Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University

In the present talk I will discuss research examining how procedural fairness predicts negative emotions and withdrawal behavior as a function of authority’s display of passion. In a series of studies it was shown that (a) reinforcing the concept of passion made the concept of justice and fairness more accessible to participants, as such suggesting that authority passion should make people focus more on procedural fairness information, and (b) the effects of procedural fairness (i.e., voice vs. no voice) were stronger on negative emotions and willingness to withdraw when the authority was passionate relative to not being passionate. It is concluded that more research is needed focusing on the interactions between different leadership styles/characteristics and procedural fairness effects.
Neuroticism and Locus of Control as Moderators of the Relationships of Charismatic and Autocratic Leadership with Burnout

Annebel de Hoogh and Deanne N. Den Hartog
University of Amsterdam

This study examined the moderating role of personality traits in the relationship between leader behavior and burnout. In two samples, employees (N = 91; N = 190) filled out the Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey, rated their leader’s autocratic and charismatic leader behavior and rated their own neuroticism and work internal locus of control. As expected, neuroticism and work locus of control moderate the relationship between leader behavior and burnout. Charisma is associated with lower burnout, particularly for individuals low on internal work locus of control. The relationship between autocratic leadership and burnout was positive for neurotic individuals, whereas for emotionally stable individuals this relationship weakens. These results were consistent across two independent field samples: one assessing individual employee ratings of manager’s leadership styles and the other assessing aggregate ratings of manager’s leadership styles among employees in diverse organizations. Thus, although charismatic and autocratic leader behavior may respectively act to hinder or enhance overload and stress, the relationship between these leadership styles and burnout differs for followers with different traits.
Teams have become the basic unit through which work is carried out in organizations, and leadership is considered crucial to enabling team effectiveness (Hackman & Walton, 1986; Zaccaro, Rittman, & Marks, 2001). Drawing from social network theory, recent research has examined the different structural forms of team leadership and their influence on team process and performance (Balkundi & Harrison, 2006; Carson, Tesluk, & Marrone, 2007). This study seeks to extend this research by examining how the efficacy of different leadership network structures is a function of the leadership role being fulfilled by that network, and potential contingencies to these relationships. The sample for this study consists of 80 consulting teams, and data was collected from multiple sources, including team members and their clients.
When does a leader show fair behavior? Influences of group prototypicality and the social context

Steffen R. Giessner and Daan van Knippenberg
Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University

When do leaders allocate outcomes in a fair versus self-benefiting way? Based on a social identity approach, we predict that perceived team prototypicality (i.e., perceived degree of an embodiment of the group identity) influences leader fairness. A prototypical leader takes on the collective interest and should, therefore, be more sensitive to the group norms (i.e., the social identity of the group) which define what fairness is within the team context. In contrast, a non-prototypical leader should be less influenced by the fairness group norms. Because such a leader is more driven by self-interest (i.e., personal identity) than by collective interests, she/he should be more influenced by accountability concerns which influence the degree to which self-interest can be shown. We conducted two experiments testing these predictions. In both studies, participants ostensibly worked as a team leader and had to make a distributive decision for the team. In Study 1 we manipulate leader prototypicality (high, low) and group norm (equity, equality) in a between-subjects design (N = 165). In Study 2 we manipulate leader prototypicality (high, low) and accountability (high, low) in a between-subjects design (N = 152). Both studies confirm our hypotheses and field data support the external validity of our data. Thus, depending on the degree of the leader’s prototypicality of the team identity, different social context information (i.e., group norms and accountability) influence the leader’s distributive decisions. From a practical view, this implies that organizations can change organizational settings in ways that would facilitate (or inhibit) fair decisions of team leaders.
Contagion and Differentiation in Unethical Behavior: The Effect of One Bad Apple on the Barrel

Francesca Gino
Kenan-Flagler Business School, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

In a world where encounters with dishonesty are frequent, it is important to know if exposure to other people’s unethical behavior can increase or decrease an individual’s dishonesty. In Experiment 1, our confederate cheated ostentatiously by finishing a task impossibly quickly and leaving the room with the maximum reward. In line with social-norms theory, participants’ level of unethical behavior increased when the confederate was an in-group member, but decreased when the confederate was an out-group member. In Experiment 2, our confederate instead asked a question about cheating, which merely strengthened the saliency of this possibility. This manipulation decreased the level of unethical behavior among the other group members. These results suggest that individuals’ unethically does not depend on the simple calculations of cost-benefit analysis, but rather depends on the social norms implied by the dishonesty of others and also on the saliency of dishonesty.
Leadership and error avoidance: Implications for risk management in the current regulatory climate

Mark Griffin
Institute for Work Psychology, The University of Sheffield

Current approaches to leadership, such as transformational leadership theory, emphasize how leaders create a more motivating and successful work environment. Less attention is paid to the way leaders avoid errors or manage day-to-day deficiencies in performance. This presentation explores the integration of transformational leadership with theories of error culture management. I argue that the challenge of error management has been poorly served by current measures of management-by-exception in the leadership literature. First, data from an organizational survey shows that management by exception has a complex relationship with workplace outcomes. Then, a new measure of leader error management is presented to explore the joint role of transformational and error management behaviors. Finally, the role of error management in the current regulatory climate is discussed. Examples of media commentaries suggest that a leader’s role in regulation is being viewed in fairly narrow terms.
Team Personality Configurations as Moderators of the Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Team Performance

Eric Kearney
Jacobs Center on Lifelong Learning and Institutional Development,
Jacobs University Bremen

Despite lagging behind research conducted at the individual level of analysis, numerous studies have established a positive effect of transformational leadership on team performance (e.g., Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lim & Ployhart, 2004). In line with other authors (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007), I therefore shift my research focus to the topic of what conditions enable more or less positive effects of transformational leadership. Given the rising interest in the effects of team personality (i.e., mean levels and dispersion with respect to particular individual difference variables; e.g., Bell, 2007), I examine whether team personality configurations can act as a substitute for transformational leadership. Specifically, I posit that team personality moderates the relationship between transformational leadership and team outcomes such that this typically positive relationship will be significantly weaker in the case of certain team personality configurations. Theoretically, I discuss why some team personality configurations might make leadership redundant or at least attenuate its positive effects. Moreover, I report empirical findings from a field study of 84 consulting teams in 14 different firms. In this study, I investigated the interactive effects of transformational leadership and team personality on team outcomes. The focal team personality variables were extroversion, conscientiousness, emotional stability, need for cognition, and need for structure. I discuss the theoretical and practical implications for the respective literatures on transformational leadership and team personality.
Why Are Followers of Ethical Leaders Less Deviant? The Mediating Role of Moral Disengagement

David Mayer
Stephen M. Ross School of Business, University of Michigan

Tomek Kosalka
University of Central Florida

Celia Moore
London Business School

Robert Folger
University of Central Florida

The managerial indiscretions that were the impetus for a number of corporate scandals in recent years highlight the need to examine ethical leadership in organizations. Recently, Brown, Treviño, and Harrison (2005) introduced a theory and measure of ethical leadership, defined as, “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (p. 120). Brown et al. draw on social learning theory (Bandura, 1977, 1986) to argue that followers model the behaviors of ethical leaders and thus are less likely to engage in deviant behavior.

In the present research, we offer an alternative theoretical explanation for the link between ethical leadership and follower deviant behavior. Specifically, we posit that followers of ethical leaders are better able to self-regulate their conduct and are thus less likely to morally disengage (Bandura, 1999). Consistent with our theoretical model, across three field studies using multi-source data, we find that ethical leadership is negatively related to follower moral disengagement, follower moral disengagement is positively related to follower deviance, and the negative relationship between ethical leadership and follower deviance is mediated by follower moral disengagement. These findings demonstrate a novel mechanism to explain the effects of ethical leadership on follower behavior.
Blazing the Trail versus Trailing the Group: Culture and Perceptions of the Leader’s Position

Tanya Menon  
The University of Chicago Booth School of Business, University of Chicago

We compare American and East Asian mental representations of leaders. Whereas Americans represent leaders standing ahead of groups, East Asians also represent leaders trailing behind groups. Studies 1 and 2 employ etic and emic methods respectively, showing that Singaporeans are more likely than Americans to represent leaders behind groups. Study 3 replicates these experiments in a naturalistic setting, examining World Cup soccer teams’ captain selections. We simulated these cross-cultural differences among primarily Western managerial samples, showing that managers primed with threats (versus opportunities, Study 4) or those who viewed their role as protective (versus innovative, Study 5) preferred back leaders. In Study 6, Singaporeans evaluated back leaders more favorably than Americans did, and innovation and protection ratings mediated cultural differences. We suggest that the metaphor that leaders precede followers may be culturally bound, and that contrasting physical representations derive from differing cultural conceptions of leader roles.
What’s Leadership Got to Do with Team Effectiveness? Exploring Contextual Contingencies and Team Need Satisfaction

Fred Morgeson
The Eli Broad Graduate School of Management, Michigan State University

Although the use of self-managing teams has become a fact of organizational life, many questions remain about the leadership of such teams. This includes questions about whether leadership is needed, what form leadership might take, and when leadership is most appropriate. This presentation reviews a program of research which has sought to explore the nature of leadership in teams by explicitly considering how elements of a team’s context influences the challenges a team faces, the team needs that arise, and the ways in which leadership manifests itself in a team. The presentation closes by outlining a recently developed model of team leadership which seeks to further expand our understanding of the role of leadership in team settings.
Intergroup conflict — whether it’s turf battles between different organizational units, gridlock between rival political parties, or outright war between nations — is ever-present. How leaders lead plays a powerful role in intensifying or easing these conflicts, not only through actions and policies aimed at other groups, but through what they do to promote strong identification and cohesion within their own group. While these tactics may strengthen the ingroup, they can also heighten conflicts with other groups. This is one of the most difficult dilemmas of leadership: the tradeoff between ingroup and outgroup effects. For the short-sighted leader, of course, the tradeoff poses no dilemma at all. Leaders whose positions are threatened will often exploit, or in some cases create, intergroup hostilities to secure their hold on power. These embattled leaders, instead of establishing credibility, defining constituencies, and motivating followers through ingroup identities (“we are X” and “X is good”), will manipulate intergroup identities (“we are not Y” and “Y is bad”). For leaders who define their sphere of concern more broadly than their own ingroup, however, balancing the ingroup/outgroup tradeoffs is a constant struggle. In this presentation, I will discuss empirical and theoretical work on intergroup leadership that help leaders choose strategies that will have positive and longer-lasting intergroup effects.
Opting out or being left out: Examining alternative explanations for women’s lower career ambition

Michelle Ryan  
Department of Psychology, University of Exeter

Women continue to be underrepresented in the upper echelons of organizations and it has been argued that this reflects inherent gender differences in ambition that lead women to opt-out of organizational life. However, we argue that organizational culture and identity factors may play an important role in a person’s career ambition. One important factor may be the degree to which individuals perceive their traits and abilities to fit their prototype of organizational leaders. As leader prototypes tend to be masculine, women are likely to perceive that they are incongruent with the prototype, which may have negative implications for their career ambition. We will present a series of survey and experimental studies which test this hypothesis using samples of police officers and surgeons. Together these studies demonstrate that perceiving a lack of congruence with organizational leaders reduces women’s career ambition and that this in turn is associated with reduced professional identification and an increased desire for career exit. Practical implications will be discussed.
The term “vision” is an attractive one for authors, consultants, and practitioners to adopt as it seems to convey something positive and important. It probably helps to sell books, consulting services, and high executive salaries. However, from a scholarly perspective, the term is problematic because it is often used in imprecise ways, meaning a lot of different things such as whether a person has good ideas, plans ahead, is creative or charismatic.

This research explores the idea that the vision construct can best be made sense of by distinguishing three distinct ways in which the term can be fruitfully used. Specifically, we propose and test that vision can be distinguished in terms of perceived behaviors of the leader that project (i) individual competencies, (ii) clarification about structures, processes or plans, and (iii) emotionally engaging images of potential future states.

We further propose that each aspect of vision has a different effect on followers’ beliefs. Specifically, we hypothesize that because the first aspect of vision (labeled vision competence) is associated with a leader’s ability to predict likely future states, this aspect of vision will positively predict follower perceptions of the leader’s credibility. We predict the second aspect (labeled vision clarification), which provides a way of simplifying the complexity of organizational structure, relationships, and processes, will promote a greater sense of community in followers. The third aspect of vision (labeled vision inspiration) deals with conveying a future state worth pursuing, thus generating and directing enthusiasm, optimism and attention toward that which is possible. We hypothesize that leaders displaying more vision inspiration will promote higher aspirations in followers.
An Image of Who We Might Become: Follower Possible Selves and Leader Vision Effectiveness

Daan Stam and Daan van Knippenberg
Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University

Drawing from theories of identity, persuasion, and leadership, we present a model of leader vision communication effectiveness. Prior research on vision communication emphasizes how visions affect follower actual selves, perceptions of the current self. We emphasize follower possible selves, perceptions of the potential future self. We argue that the creation of follower possible selves is crucial for vision communication and that knowledge of the functioning of possible selves leads to new insights in vision communication.
Substitutes for fairness:
Prototypical leaders are endorsed whether they are fair or not

Johannes Ullrich
Department of Psychology, Johan Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt

Oliver Christ
Phillips University Marburg

Rolf van Dick
Department of Psychology, Johan Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt

This paper extends research on leader procedural fairness as well as the social identity model of leadership effectiveness (SIMOL) by demonstrating that leader prototypicality can act as a substitute for procedural fairness. Although procedural fairness in general and voice in particular have been found to have a robust positive influence on leader endorsement, an experimental scenario study and a correlational field study showed that the influence of voice on leader endorsement is substantially reduced when leaders are perceived as prototypical for the group that they lead and followers are highly identified with their group. Additionally, supportive of predictions of the SIMOL, leader prototypicality interacted with follower identification in predicting leader endorsement, such that prototypicality had a positive effect on leader endorsement, which was enhanced among high identifiers. Overall, these results suggest that leaders who are attuned to their followers’ group identity can afford to go it alone, for the better or the worse.
A leader who is more strongly identified with his or her group also emphasizes the group’s identity more and acts more in accordance with the group goals. This, in turn, should lead followers also to construe themselves in terms of the collective, i.e. to higher group identification. The talk will first provide a summary of several cross-sectional field studies by van Dick, Hirst, Grojean, and Wieseke (2007, JOOP) and Wieseke, Ahearne, Lam, and van Dick (2009, Journal of Marketing) demonstrating that there is indeed a relationship between organizational leaders’ organizational identification and their followers’ organizational identification. The main part of the presentation will present first experimental evidence showing that leader identification is causally related to follower identification and that higher follower identification leads to higher performance. More specifically, two experiments will be presented that test the assumption of a leader-follower identification transfer. In the first study, a scenario design is used that shows that a CEO who is described as owner manager (high identification condition) of a firm facing a merger versus an externally appointed CEO (high identification condition) is indeed perceived to be more strongly identified and participants in the former condition also identify more strongly with the organization themselves. The second study presents a laboratory experiment with a confederate acting as either a strongly versus weakly identified group leader. Supporting the hypotheses, in the “strongly identified leader” condition participants identified more strongly with their groups and also performed better compared to the “weakly identified leader” condition.
Servant-Leadership: a multidimensional conceptualization and measurement

Dirk van Dierendonck and Inge Nuijten
Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University

Being interested in people and their needs is increasingly seen as a prerequisite of good leadership. People are looking for ethical conduct and personal consideration within organization. Of all the leadership styles available, servant-leadership might best cater these particular needs. This paper introduces the Servant-Leadership Inventory (SLI). The SLI focuses specifically on behavior of the leader that encourages more personal growth, commitment, engagement and well-being among employees. First, a conceptual analysis of the available literature was performed, combined with 10 interviews of servant leaders. Second, a first study was conducted among 668 persons from diverse occupational backgrounds. Third, confirmatory factor analysis was done on data from a second study among 263 persons working in civil services. Fourth, the construct validity of the inventory was confirmed through moderate correlations with related leadership constructs: LMX, transformational leadership (five dimensions), charisma, and punishment behavior. The predictive validity was confirmed by moderate to high correlations with engagement and job satisfaction and weak - but significant - correlations with organizational citizenship behavior. It seems that this inventory is a promising servant-leadership measure. It combines excellent factorial validity, internal consistency with good construct validity. Especially its multi-dimensional format allows for measuring servant-leadership behavior in its fullness.
Organizational work teams are facing growing levels of diversity. While diversity may offer groups a wealth of new perspectives, knowledge, and viewpoints, it also may pose a challenge to effectively use these resources. An important question therefore concerns how positive effects of diversity may be harvested. In the present study we contrast two group leadership approaches concerned with dealing with work group diversity. One approach, rooted in social categorization theory, is to emphasize similarities and to downplay differences in search for common ground. While focusing on commonalities may create feelings of harmony, we propose that it may also inhibit potentially fruitful interactions stemming from diversity. In contrast, a second approach is to emphasize differences between group members and to treat differences as valuable resources that may benefit the group. We argue that this second leadership style is more likely to foster high levels of information elaboration and group performance, because it is likely to engender more positive diversity beliefs. In an experiment we show that this is indeed the case. The study points out the importance of group leadership styles for group performance, especially in more diverse contexts, but it also shows that what has arguably been regarded as a successful way to lead diverse groups (i.e. stress commonalities) may actually not be the most suitable way to achieve high levels of information elaboration and group performance.
A Multilevel Perspective on Leader Group Prototypicality and Leadership

Daan van Knippenberg  
Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University

Antonio Pierro and Fabio Presaghi  
University of Rome

The social identity analysis of leadership emphasizes a fact typically ignored in leadership research: Leaders are also members of the groups they lead, and followers respond to leadership also on the basis of leaders’ perceived characteristics as a group member (Hogg & van Knippenberg, 2003; van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). This analysis highlights the role of leader group prototypicality – leaders’ representativeness of the shared group identity – as a key factor in leadership effectiveness. Somewhat surprisingly, however, in view of the group-based nature of prototypicality’s effects, empirical analysis of leader group prototypicality have been limited to the individual level of analysis. Extending these analyses, we present a multilevel analysis of the relationship between leader group prototypicality and leadership effectiveness. Building on social contagion models of leadership and shared cognition models of team functioning, we propose that leader group prototypicality is more strongly related to leadership effectiveness the more the perception of the leader’s prototypicality is shared by group members (i.e., the more their perceptions are in agreement) – an interaction of mean and sharedness of prototypicality perceptions at the group level. In addition, however, connecting with earlier individual-level analyses, we recognize that some group members are more sensitive to leader group prototypicality than others as a function of their dispositional need for closure – a desire to reduce uncertainty that leads people to rely on their group memberships (Pierro, Cicero, Bonaiuto, van Knippenberg, & Kruglanski, 2005) – a cross-level interaction of prototypicality, sharedness of perceptions, and individual need for closure. We present evidence in support of these hypotheses from a study of work groups in an Italian organization combining group member ratings of leadership and leader ratings of individual group member performance as indicator of leadership effectiveness.
Asking questions has been repeatedly noted by practitioners to be one of the most powerful tools a leader has at hand. Despite such prominence, leadership scholarship has rarely investigated question asking as a leadership technique, and the rare exceptions lack a theoretical framework within which to interpret results. The objective of the present paper is to provide such a theoretical framework, hoping that it will instigate future management research and inform leadership practice. Drawing upon motivation theory, we suggest that questions can meet three potentially overlapping objectives – to belong, to control, and to understand. We use this typology of questions to formulate a number of propositions describing the antecedents of question asking by leaders as well as the consequences of question asking for both leaders and followers. Additionally, we propose that contextual factors moderate whether different types of questions will have functional or dysfunctional consequences. Altogether, following the notion of “engaged scholarship”, our approach attempts to respect what leaders in the field are talking about. The present paper focuses on one of such topic – i.e. question asking – and subjects it to rigorous theorizing to make it accessible for empirical research and, ultimately, to foster our understanding of its power.
Can the Concept of Responsibility Inform Leadership Theory and Research?

David Waldman  
W.P. Carey School of Business, Arizona State University

For a number of years, the concept of responsibility has been relevant to such macro-focused areas as social issues in management, as well as more micro areas as human personality. The former connection is perhaps best known in terms of corporate social responsibility (CSR), while the latter has encompassed such phenomena as the responsibility disposition of individuals. However, there have been few attempts to directly connect responsibility to leadership processes.

The overall purpose of this presentation is to show how responsibility can inform our understanding of effective leadership, perhaps especially at more strategic levels. First, recent research will be overviewed pertaining to responsible leadership at the CEO/firm level. This research links leader values that are relevant to responsibility, leader style, and firm financial and social performance. A key finding is that predominant, stakeholder-oriented values on the part of CEOs are linked to follower perceptions of CEO visionary / inspirational leadership which, in turn, is associated with both financial and social performance. In contrast, predominant, economically-oriented values are predictive of follower perceptions of autocratic leadership, which is not related to firm performance. In short, this research points toward the idea that, in line with stakeholder theory and CSR, executive values that are oriented more toward the balancing of the needs of multiple constituencies may help form the basis of effective executive leadership.

Second, theoretical ideas will be explored suggesting different conceptualizations of responsible leadership depending on to whom, or to what, such responsibility is focused. That is, responsibility can be oriented toward oneself, owners or shareholders of a firm, multiple stakeholder groups or constituencies, or an institutionally-based ethos. Depending on the focus of responsibility, the ramifications for leadership behavior will be considered.
Leader Attribute Patterns:
Linking Complex Integrations of Individual Differences to Leadership Outcomes

Stephen Zaccaro
Department of Psychology, George Mason University

Trait and individual difference perspectives of leadership have a long and checkered history. While such approaches dominated research on leadership in the early 20th century, they fell mostly into disfavor after 1950. However, over the last 20 years there has been a resurgence of leadership models that specify individual differences as important predictors of leader effectiveness. This resurgence was driven by (a) the use of more sophisticated statistical procedures to reanalyze previous studies, (b) meta-analyses of studies showing significant associations between personality and leadership, and (c) the emergence of models of inspirational leadership that emphasized qualities of the empowering or inspiring leader. More recently, some researchers have argued that leader attributes should not be examined in isolation, or even additively, in terms of their effects on leadership outcomes. Instead, models of leader traits should focus on examining complex integrations or patterns of attributes that account for (a) the complexity of leadership situations, and (b) the full range of normative leader performance requirements. This presentation will summarize recent findings on leader attribute patterns. It will also offer some propositions regarding the composition of these patterns and their relationships to leader emergence, leader effectiveness, and shared leadership in teams.
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For many organizations, human resources are their greatest asset. Indeed, organizational performance and organizations’ ability to gain a competitive advantage is often critically contingent on the effective management of people. Leadership is a key element in this process. Leaders may motivate employees to excellent performance and mobilize employees for the organization’s mission and vision. Leaders may also be a primary source of conflict and demotivation, however. Understanding how leadership can bring out the best in people as well as where leadership can go wrong therefore is of critical importance to successful organizational functioning.

The mission of the Erasmus Centre for Leadership Studies is to contribute to this understanding through fundamental as well as applied research in leadership. To this end, we conduct field research in collaboration with a variety of organizations as well as experimental research in carefully controlled laboratory environments. This research has allowed us to develop models of effective leadership that highlights leaders’ role as influencing agents and motivators of followers, and that emphasize such aspects of leadership as leaders’ vision, servant leadership, team leadership, and leaders’ ability to represent the shared identity of the team or organization. Researchers at the Erasmus Centre for Leadership Studies are keen to apply these models to help organizations resolve leadership issues and increase organizations’ understanding of the role of leadership in their effective functioning, and invite interested organizations to contact us.

The Erasmus Research Institute of Management (ERIM) is the Research School (Onderzoekschool) in the field of management of the Erasmus University Rotterdam. The founding participants of ERIM are Rotterdam School of Management (RSM) and Erasmus School of Economics (ESE). ERIM was founded in 1999 and is officially accredited by the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). The research undertaken by ERIM is focused on the management of the firm in its environment, its intra- and interfirm relations, and its business processes in their interdependent connections.

The objective of ERIM is to carry out first rate research in management, and to offer an advanced doctoral programme in Research in Management. Within ERIM, over three hundred senior researchers and PhD candidates are active in the different research programmes. From a variety of academic backgrounds and expertises, the ERIM community is united in striving for excellence and working at the forefront of creating new business knowledge.