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Abstract

The rationale of this study was to examine the potential relationship of team members’ leadership expectations and followers’ attitudes and team’s performance. Leadership expectations can vary between the individual level leadership and leadership as a collective or shared team activity (Zhu et al., 2018). Although relational models of leadership consider leadership as an emergent social construction of the team, there may be instances where it is difficult for the team to converge on a single agreed upon model. The purpose of this experiment was to better understand the impact of different alignment of leadership expectations between leaders and followers on follower perceptions, attitudes, and performance. Twenty-five teams with three to five members worked on a decision-making group task. Half of the teams had similar expectations of leadership as the leader while the other half of the teams had differing expectations from the leader. At the end of the team task, team members responded to questions assessing whether they felt appreciated by their leader, their role clarity, their perceptions of team effectiveness, their team satisfaction, and actual team performance. With the use of a multilevel regression analysis, this study found no significant relationship between the leadership expectation alignment vs nonalignment and followers’ attitudes, and a Chi-Square test found no significant relationship between leadership expectation alignment vs nonalignment and team performance. Overall, the results of the study show conflicting leadership expectations has no significant influence on followers’ attitudes, perceptions, or the team’s performance. This information can be useful for future research on leadership expectations that impacts the group’s dynamics and functions.
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Introduction

Leadership is largely understood as a social process dependent on both leaders and followers (Lord & Maher, 1991), however, the followers are perceived as an underestimated source of variance in understanding leadership processes (Lord, Brown, & Freiberg, 1999). A majority of leadership theories concentrate on the understanding of leadership by the leader’s point of view and paid less attention to understanding leadership by the followers’ viewpoint and how this might impact the leaders/follower dynamics. Essentially, leadership literature has paid little attention to the intervening mechanisms by which the leader influences the followers (Lord & Maher, 1991). Recently, the function of effective leaders and leadership has been established from strengthening research and implementing a more scientific and evidence-driven foundation for organizations to utilize.

This study aimed to investigate the impact of follower constructions of leadership when they are in alignment with the leader’s behaviors vs when they are not in alignment. The focus is on the impact of alignment versus non-alignment on the follower ratings of the leader, the team, and their selves, as well as the team’s overall performance. This examination occurs in a scientific and evidence-focus realm to provide justified support.

Understanding Leadership

Recent theories suggest that leadership is considered as a social construction rather than an objective reality (Drath et al., 2008; Uhl-Bein, 2006). The shift from viewing leadership from subjective interpretations to a constructive reality has opened doors for scholars to investigate what type of knowledge principles exist in leadership. These types of knowledge principles or meaning making structures hold value to the continuous investigation of leadership.
Three Principles of Leadership

According to Drath (2001), leadership comes in or out of being due to the presence or absence of some organized knowledge principle or meaning making structure regarding leadership. These principles allow individuals to organize and recognize what is and what is not leadership, causing leadership to be a subjective belief. Essentially, how individuals in a group view leadership influences how they perceive events. These knowledge principles are a set of ideas that are accepted by the individual to be true about leadership that are not subjective to debate, doubt, and challenge. Furthermore, a knowledge principle is deeper than the definition of leadership since it is the set of ideas that organize and describe the reality behind the definition. According to Drath (2001) there are three broad knowledge principles of how individuals recognize leadership: Personal Dominance, Interpersonal Influence, and Relational Dialogue.

*Personal Dominance* is the hierarchical process of the leader setting the vision and direction for colleagues to follow (Drath, 2001). It is a way to understand leadership as a personal characteristic of a certain kind of person, not from behaviors and actions (Drath, 2001). The leader is thought of holding an inherent quality that exists independently of the followers. This characteristic is activated with the presence of followers and a goal. The followers accept the leader’s power since they are convinced of the truth of their leadership.

*Interpersonal Influence* is the understanding that leadership occurs when a group of people plan and negotiate until an individual emerges as the most influential individual and thus claiming the leadership role (Drath, 2001). The influence that the individual uses must meet the identified self-interests of the group. Individuals can either possess or acquire certain qualities and characteristics that enable them to be effective leaders (Drath, 2001). The leader negotiates their power and influence with colleagues to gain their support. Thus, the act of negotiation of
power between the leader and followers is bi-directional. However, the leader leads by influencing the followers more than followers influence the leader.

*Relational Dialogue* is the understanding that leadership happens when members who acknowledge shared work and use collaboration to create leadership processes to accomplish common goals even with differing perspectives, values, beliefs, and cultures (Drath, 2001, see also Uhl-Bein, 2006). It is a process of a social system where individual people do not hold leadership. Leadership occurs when members participate in collaborative processes of thought and action (Drath, 2001). A group can have an individual leader; however, the individual’s actions are an aspect of participation in the process of leadership (Drath, 2001). From this perspective, leadership can occur in a number of different ways. Wellman (2017) suggests two common ways: 1.) Authority ranking in which leadership is the property of individuals who are perceived to possess leadership capabilities (similar to personal dominance discussed above), and 2.) communal sharing in which leadership is viewed as a shared group responsibility.

These three principles are separated by the source of the influence, which can alter the type of leadership exhibited and how it influences the followers, thus resulting in various outcomes such as satisfaction and performance. For the purposes of this study, I concentrate on the individual and collective leadership levels.

**Individual Leadership**

Individual leadership has been a prominent feature in the leadership literature for decades. ‘Individual leadership’ is conceptualized as a hierarchical, leader-centric paradigm where the influence process is derived from an individual within a group. Also referred to as conventional leadership, the hierarchical nature brings about authority ranking of the members to give a social activity (Wellman, 2017). Differences in valued individual attitudes determine the
group members’ ranking, thus this ordering determines members’ roles in the group (Wellman, 2017). The member ranked the highest is deemed the influential power over the lower-ranking members. In contrast, the lower-status members follower the higher-status member and display loyalty and obedience. This ranking involves implicitly ranking the group members based on the social dimension that is perceived to be the most aligned with leadership (Wellman, 2017). Based on Wellman’s (2017) relational model of leadership, groups with strong individual identity context involve high levels of formal hierarchical differentials, individual rewards incentives, little intergroup competition, and low exclusivity.

A formal leader influences the followers in a team or organization, where influence on the group entails making strategic decisions, managing colleagues, and spearheaded the team to reach the common goal (Bass & Bass, 2008). There is little to no room for the followers to add their influence within the group.

In individual leadership, the leader expects to be the main focal point of influence within the team. The leader is formally placed in the position, thus instilled with power and the power travels down to the followers. The followers are expected to accept the leader’s power since they are convinced of the truth of the leader’s leadership. The highest-status member fulfills the group’s leadership responsibilities, while the other members conform to the leader’s orders, suggestions, and directions.

**Collective or Shared Leadership**

Collective leadership has been recently gaining popularity in the realm of leadership. Collective leadership is defined as “a dynamic leadership process in which a defined leader, or set of leaders, selectively utilize skills and expertise within a network, effectively distributing elements of the leadership role as the situation or problem at hand requires” (Friedrick, Vessey,
Collective leadership is related to Wellman’s (2017) communal sharing relational model. This is based on unity and conformity amongst members of a group. Group members interact with each other as all of the same, where the focus is on commonalities and not on individual identities (Wellman, 2017). There is a shift from individual attributes to group members as the primary criterion that governs group participation in completing activities. Communal sharing approach groups display behavior that is focused on achieving the group’s goals rather than advancing individual agendas and perspectives. It is notable that members can differ in amount of leadership exhibited, but the difference is not as significant than individual leadership. Groups with strong collective identity context possibly have lower levels of hierarchical differentiation, group performance incentives, high intergroup competition, and high exclusivity (Wellman, 2017).

Due to collective leadership fluidity where more than one leader can emerge or where team members can do leadership together, collective leadership holds the team members accountable to be part of both the leader and follower roles and responsibilities. Collective leadership assumes that team members will selectively perform leadership behaviors that align with their skills and expertise, while efficiently exhibiting them as the current situation requires...
When a team member is activated as the leader as the situation demands, they are expected to perform leadership roles, as the rest of the team follows.

**Alignment versus Non-alignment**

Although there is some belief that constructions of leadership emerge socially and converge within the team (Drath, 2001; Drath & Palus, 1994, Uhl-Bein, 2006, Wellman, 2017), there may be instances where it is difficult for the team to make sense together regarding leadership. Less leadership research has recognized the possibility of discrepancy in understanding leadership and behaviors of leaders and followers within a team (Alvesson, 2017).

For example, how do individuals holding differing knowledge principles of leadership converge on an agreed understanding of leadership? Another example where it may be difficult to create a shared construction of leadership is in short term project or decision-making teams that come together to do a project then disperse since the environment of short-term teams do not foster enough time for the individuals to understand each other’s leadership principles and make adjustment. Adapting to opposing leadership principles is a task within itself and is not identified as a priority task when a group comes together to complete a group task efficiently and effectively.

What happens when team members hold differing knowledge principles of leadership and these do not converge within the team? As leadership is a construction derived from principles, complexity and dynamics can lead to variations in meaning and interpretations. Thus, it is likely that all team members do not hold similar leadership principles or meaning making structures.

Regarding Wellman’s (2017) relational model convergence, a group can experience weak identity context. This is where contextual cues do not clearly promote group members to self-
define themselves as either individual or collective terms (Wellman, 2017). It is unlikely that members can converge on a common relational model due to this lack of convergence. The implications of this misalignment are high hieratical differentiation, group reward incentive, high intergroup competition, and low exclusivity (Wellman, 2017).

Many leadership texts share the assumption that group members and leaders agree on the meaning or image of the leadership practiced (Alvesson, 2017). In other words, it is to believe that individuals within the group are assumed to share an understanding of the characteristics between leaders and followers and the form of influencing work. Scholars’ leadership research has not recognized the possibility of discrepancy in understanding leadership and behaviors of leaders and followers within a team (Alvesson, 2017). Agreement of leadership between leaders and followers remains a dominant assumption. Challenging the assumed agreement in the constructions of leadership can be executed by exploring the variations of the followers’ experiences and interpretations of leadership within a group. Including, but not limited to, expectations of the followers’ role clarity, team satisfaction, team effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and leadership appreciation. Additionally, accounting for the objective result of team performance holding value in this assumed agreeableness challenge.

Role Clarity

Role clarity is the degree to which individuals interpret they have clear guidance about their expected roles and behaviors aligned with their position (Vullinghs et al., 2020). It implies the followers’ awareness of their responsibilities and tasks within the team, and what the leader expects from them (Vullinghs et al., 2020). The benefits of strong role clarity in followers include less burnout, stress, and anxiety; however, lack of role clarity is associated with negative follower outcomes and burnout (Vullinghs et al., 2020). A key component to followers’ role
clarity is leadership, essentially behavior, and how they interpret the leadership experience. Followers holding similar leadership understanding as the leader results in a positive leadership experience, thus influencing role clarity. This leading to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 1:** The followers will have better role clarity when leader behavior and follower expectations are in alignment vs when leader behavior and follower expectations are not in alignment.

**Team Satisfaction**

Team satisfaction is the extent to which an individual relates to the team members or the way the team members worked together to complete a common goal (Peeters et al., 2006). An individual who holds a pleasant experience with both their team and the cooperation within the team, the individual will be satisfied, thus being willing to work with the team similarly again (Peeters et al., 2006). The leader within a team is accounted as a team member, and in the position of power with the responsibility to maintain cooperation within the team. The leader and the followers’ agreement or disagreement of leadership principles and expectations influences the followers’ relations to the team members and cooperation, thus influencing team satisfaction. Therefore, expecting:

**Hypothesis 2:** The followers will have more positive team satisfaction when leader behavior and follower expectations are in alignment vs when leader behavior and the follow expectations are not in alignment.

**Team Effectiveness**

Team effectiveness is defined as a construct that measures the degree to which team members accomplish tasks and value the team (Drouin & Bourgault, 2013). Team effectiveness
is how the team reaches quality, organization, and performance expectations; thus, closely tying the concept with team performance. However, team effectiveness includes other perceptions of activities, such as setting common objectives, organizing tasks, information sharing, and problem-solving (Drouin & Bourgault, 2013). Leadership is a key factor in all these activities since individuals’ principles and definitions of leadership can account for the influence leadership has on these. Hence, a leader who holds similar behaviors to the followers’ expectations will carry out these activities successfully. Thus, predicting:

Hypothesis 3: The followers will have a more positive team effectiveness perspective when leader behavior and follower expectations are in alignment vs when leader behavior and follower expectations are not in alignment.

Leader Satisfaction

Though there is little to no research on leader’s satisfaction from the perception of the followers in a group, leader satisfaction is an essential variable when considering the followers’ perspectives or attitudes. In this study, leader satisfaction is defined as the experience of the leader-follower relationship (Logion et al., 2019). It is based on the individual’s subjective interpretations that their needs are being met by the leader (Logion et al., 2019). Schyns and Day (2010) noted how a lack of agreement between the leader and followers may provoke an “impoverish relationship”. From these analyses, it is seen that leader satisfaction is dependent on the followers’ interpretation of how the leader interacts with them. Agreement between the two roles can stem from the congruency of leadership definitions. Furthermore, agreement of leadership expectations fosters a positive leader-follower relationship and may influence the followers’ leader satisfaction. Hence, the following hypothesis was proposed:
Hypothesis 4: The followers will perceive higher leader satisfaction when leader behavior and follower expectations are in alignment vs when leader behavior and follower expectations are not in alignment.

Appreciation from the Leader

Being appreciated by other individuals is relevant to the desire for belongingness and relatedness (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). It implies others acknowledge positive characteristics of an individual or specific behavior, mostly related, but not exclusively, performance (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Appreciation brings about positive emotions, such as greater optimism, happiness, and enthusiasm. It is suggested that the leader's expression on a group has been seen to foster appreciation in their followers. Due to leaders being in a position of power, they grant the approval or rejection of a follower (Stocker et al., 2014). The interaction between the leader and followers is seen as an influential factor to followers’ perceived appreciation (Stocker et al., 2014). This result brings about the interpretation that poor relationships between the leader and followers can bring about less appreciation (Stocker et al., 2014). Furthermore, the assumption that the leader and followers’ disagreeing with leadership behaviors can result in a poor relationship. Thus, expecting:

Hypothesis 5: The followers will perceive more appreciation from their leader when leader behavior and follower expectations are in alignment vs when the leader behavior and follower expectations are not in alignment.

Team Performance

The complex concept of performance can be explained as a set of indicators that describes a process through several types of achieved results (McDonough, 2000). Team
leadership has been seen to be the most influential factor towards team success and performance (McDonough, 2000). Team performance differs from team satisfaction since it is an objective variable rather than a follower’s attribute against the team. One aspect includes the leader portraying a shared vision to engage the team to manage the inconsistency amongst themselves in performance (McDonough, 2000). The shared vision has a strong relationship with teamwork behavior, furthermore, as shared vision increases, team members acknowledge and act upon helpful behaviors with other team members (Pearce & Ensley, 2004). The alignment of leadership definitions is assumed to impact team performance due to the necessity of adopting the shared vision of processes. This leads to the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 6: There will be a higher team performance in groups when leader behavior and follower expectations are in alignment vs when leader behavior and follower expectations are not in alignment.*

**Methods**

**Overview**

The data reported here are part of a larger team study. The study comprised teams of three to five people with one team member as an assigned leader and the others as followers, contingent on pre-determined random selection. The leadership styles, either individual or collective leadership, were in a 2x2 factorial design in either alignment or not in alignment between the two team roles. The group task was to review job candidates for a job opening at an organization. The group examined the final four job candidates' resumes and portfolios and placed them in order from the best fit to the worse fit for the position using the job description. Followers' reports of role clarity, team satisfaction, team effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and
leader’s appreciation were analyzed with the combination of team performance to evaluate the outcomes of alignment or non-alignment of leadership styles.

Participants

Eighty-six undergraduate students enrolled in a large mid-Atlantic state university participated in the study, constructing twenty-five small teams of three to five members, and fifty-nine students were assigned as followers in these groups. The university's SONA-system acted as the recruitment process. Participants gained partial credit towards their course after completion of the study. Participants varied amongst age, biological sex, race and ethnicity, and college level (see Table 1). Participants ranged in age from 18 to 26, with the average age of 19.73 years (Appendix S). Participants’ ethnicity varied, with Hispanic or Latino being the most common throughout the sample (Appendix T). Within the sample, there were 38 freshman, 19 sophomores, 20 juniors, and nine seniors (Appendix U). The sample included 61 females and 25 males (Appendix V).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Multi-Racial</th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures Individual

Demographics

The demographic questionnaire included age, race and ethnicity, biological sex, and school history. These questions were a mix of multiple choices and fill in the blank (see Appendix C).
Role Clarity

Perception of role clarity of every member was collected by six items derived from the tool developed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) (Palomino & Frezatti, 2016). The tool initially contained 20 items, but the items were reduced and edited to be relevant for the study. Although this tool does not have previous scale reliability scores, it has been utilized in more than 85% of studies on role conflict and ambiguity, thus proving its satisfactory of measuring role clarity as a dependent variable (Palomino & Frezatti, 2016). An example of an item is “the aims of my role were clear” and is rated on a five-point Likert response scale ranging from one “strongly disagree” to five “strongly agree”.

Team Satisfaction

Gevers and Peeters' assessment measured the group member's team satisfaction, with this facet as one of the most important when predicting team member reactions or behavior (Peeters et al, 2006). It contained three items scored on a Likert scale of one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree). An item example is "taken as a whole, things went pleasantly within our team". Values of substantive-validity coefficient ranged between .55 and .88, and were tested to be significant, thus confirming the construct validity of the measure (Gevers et al., 2009). Cronbach’s alphas of the three items were .83, .84, and .83 at the three respective measurement points, thus justifying aggregating the item scores to a single scale score (Gevers et al., 2009).

Team Effectiveness

The Team Effectiveness Questionnaire (TEQ) asked team members to rate their team effectiveness (Deeter-Schmelz, Kennedy, & Ramsey, 2002). An example of one of the items was "members of our team trust each other" and other items on a five-point Likert scale. Initially, the
questionnaire contained 56 items but was reduced to 33 items due to their irrelevance towards the study. The TEQ held a Cronbach's alpha of .857 (Brathwaite, Vernon & Ventura, 2019).

**Satisfaction with Leader**

The Satisfaction with leader survey examined the team members’ satisfaction with their leader. One of the items was “how the leader made decisions”, which all ten total items had a response Likert scale from one (very dissatisfied) to five (very satisfied). The first five items measured the consideration subdimension, and the last five items measured the initiation subdimension. No psychometric study was conducted on this survey; however, various validated satisfaction measures assisted in the development for the purpose of the study.

**Appreciation from the Leader**

Appreciation was the followers’ perception of the leaders valuing them within the team (Laub, 1999). The concept was measured from a subdimension in Laub’s (1998) Organizational Leadership Assessment. The rationale for eliminating all but seven of the original 60 items was due to the irrelevance of most of the items towards appreciation. One of the seven items used included “I trusted the leader”. The participants responded to the items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from one “strongly disagree” to five “strongly agree”. From a previous study, researchers found the coefficient alpha at .98 with the lowest item-test correlation was .41 and the highest was .79 (Laub, 1998).

**Manipulation Check**

The last measure that the participants completed was a manipulation check that contained nine questions. The measure asked which shape was assigned which role, what they considered their role was, the other group members' functions, and if they would have rated the job candidates differently than the group’s final answer. Examples of items include “What was your
role as a follower?” and “What was the role of the leader?”. This measure aimed to determine the manipulation's effectiveness and identify any biases in the respondent’s answers.

**Measures Team**

The experimenter measured the group's performance by evaluating the group based upon which candidate they choose as best fitted for the job position. Teams were asked to rank the four job candidates from the best to the worst choice, and also provided one to two sentences per candidate to justify their ranking. The group performance was based on the group’s answer to which job candidate is best fitted for the job, not the accuracy of ordering all four candidates nor their reasoning. The group was marked either 1 for answering the question correctly, or 0 for answering incorrectly.

**Design**

A two-way factorial design was employed, where the factors included the team role and leadership style. The two levels of team roles were followers and leaders. The two levels of leadership style were collective and individual leadership style. The purpose of the factorial design was to manipulate different leadership expectations amongst the leader and the followers.

There was one control group in which the leader and followers received the same instructions regarding the leadership condition expected for the group task, in which both either expect individual leadership or both expect collective leadership. There was one experimental condition where the leader and the followers have different expectations for the type of leadership that occur during the group task. This means that when the followers expected collective leadership, the leader exerted individual leadership, and vice versa. The experimenters collected 28 groups in the control condition and 31 groups in the experimental condition, and all groups were given the same task, regardless of their conditions.
Manipulations

Selection of Roles

The roles of the group members were assigned by random selection before the members entered the Zoom meeting. However, the group members were deceived by this random selection and believe it was based on the merit questionnaire. The experimenters expressed to the members they analyzed the members’ answers in the merit. Afterwards, one experimenter announced the roles and pulled the pre-determined leader into a breakout room while the rest of the members stayed in the main room with the second experimenter. Once there was separation, the experimenters discussed the assigned role to the members. The discussion included the participants' acceptance of the role, the expectations that followed it, and how they would execute this role during the group task.

Manipulation of Leader's Expectations

The leader was told that they were chosen to be the group's leader in the study and asked to commit to the role. Depending on the predetermined leadership design, they were expected to lead the group while completing this task or facilitate the team to work on the task together. They expressed their understanding by describing how they would behave once the group task begins.

Manipulation of Followers' Expectations

The followers were told that they are chosen to be the group's followers in the study and asked to commit to the role. Depending on the predetermined leadership design, they were expected to either follow the leader's orders or to work together with all members with the leader facilitating this. They expressed their understanding by describing how they would behave once the group task begins.
Team Task

Personnel Selection Task

The group was asked from a local organization to review their final four job candidates for a Graphic and Digital Media Designer job opening. Four resumes and portfolios were provided for the group to evaluate each candidate on. The materials were edited to block identifying information to reduce biases. The job description and the job candidates' materials were distributed to all the members of the group. The leader received a Qualtrics to submit the group's ranking of job candidates.

Ranking System

The job description and job candidates' materials were based on sample information pulled from the internet. The job candidates and their materials were identified by letters A through D. Job candidate A was predetermined to be the best candidate, candidate D as second best, candidate C as third best, and candidate B as fourth best. This objective ranking was determined by the experimenters previous based on the alignment between the job candidate’s materials and the job description. Each candidate's materials were edited, so there were distinguishable among the candidates, allowing the group to decide who is best for the job. All candidates had impressive resumes and portfolios; thus, the job description must be used to choose the best candidate will be essential.

Procedure

Pre-Zoom Call

The study was posted on the university's Sona-Systems with available timeslots (see Appendix A). Once at least three to at most five participants sign up for a time slot, they were contacted by the experimenter to verify their availability. This was to increase the likelihood that
enough participants would show up for the study to take place. If less than three students were available for a specific timeslot, the students in that timeslot were rescheduled. The participants were emailed the Zoom link and report to that Zoom link at their scheduled time. All participants were sent a final reminder with the Zoom link an hour before the beginning of their scheduled time. When the participants arrived on Zoom, their names were kept confidential by being renamed to their pre-assigned shapes based on the order of their arrival. There were two experimenters present during the duration of the Zoom call. The experimenters asked to leave their video and microphone on for the duration of the Zoom call.

**Pretest**

The experimenters began the study by explaining the study and the adult consent form. Participants were informed that they were taking a pre-test to determine who the leader in this team would be. All participants received a Qualtrics link with a survey containing the adult consent form (see Appendix B). Any participants who did not wish to consent or not to be recorded were thanked for their time and removed from the Zoom call. All other participants continued to the survey to complete the demographic questionnaire, and two questionnaires about leadership belief and virtual teamwork for merit (see Appendices C, D, and E). Participants had ten minutes to complete the survey. After everyone finished, the experimenter informed the participants that their answers were being analyzed. The purpose of the deception of the role placement was based upon merit is to increase the chances that the members would strongly identify with their position.

**Selection of the Team Roles**

Despite the participants' belief that the leadership position was chosen through merit based on the pre-test, all leaders were randomly assigned. This small deception was revealed to
the participants at the end of the study in the debrief. Each group had one designated leader going into the group task, and all other students are followers. The leader and followers’ role assignments were announced in front of everyone.

One experimenter removed the assigned leader into a breakout room while the remaining group members stayed in the main room with the other experimenter. The separation of the leader and the followers aimed to conceal the type of leadership style the different types of members are expected to execute. All participants were checked for their understanding by being asked to verbally complete sentences begun by the instructor. If individual leadership is expected, all of the followers are expected to complete the following sentence: "I will complete the group task by…". If collective leadership is desired, the followers complete this sentence: "We will complete the group task by…” (see Appendices F and G). The leader also followed the same process in the separate breakout room. This was to ensure that the members would act upon the assigned leadership style.

*Manipulation*

The study was a 2x2 factorial design with two different leadership conditions. In condition 1 (control group 1), leaders and followers are both assigned to the individual leadership condition. In condition 2 (control group 2), leaders and followers are both assigned to the collective leadership condition. In condition 3 (experimental condition 1), leaders are assigned to individual leadership condition and followers assigned to collective leadership condition. In condition 4 (experimental condition 2), leaders are assigned to collective leadership condition and followers assigned to individual leadership condition.

Initially, the four conditions were planned to be examined individually. The study aimed to see if a specific combination of leadership conditions would result in significantly higher
followers’ attitudes and perceptions, and team performance. However, due to the unexpected transition of the study’s methodology from face to face to online and a smaller sample size, the study’s statistical power was threatened. To quickly adapt to this uncontrollable situation, the 4 conditions were collapsed into tow conditions: a control group where leaders and followers are both assigned the same leadership condition (either individual or collective), and an experimental group where leaders and followers are assigned contradicting leadership conditions (one role carried out individual and other role carried out collective). The purpose of appointing conflicting leadership styles to the different roles was to manipulate conflict among the group members’ leadership expectations.

The pairings' assignments were evenly distributed among all the groups to collect an equal amount of data for the leadership style pairings. The members were unaware of the assigned leadership style to create possible conflicts amongst the members. All group members were privately messaged their instructions and expectations for the group task's duration via Zoom chat (see Appendix D and E).

Team Task

Once all participants consented to their assigned roles, the investigator read the group task's instructions aloud as the members read along the instructions posted in the chat. The group was told that an NYC organization asked for an outside party to review their final four job candidates for a Graphic and Digital Media Designer job opening. The organization provided the job description, and the job candidates' resumes and portfolios to be evaluated in one document. The job candidates' names, pictures, and identifying information were blacked out to reduce potential biases. The investigator explained the group must rank the job candidates in order of
best fit to worst for the position within thirty-five minutes. See Appendix F for task instructions, and Appendices H through K for job candidates' materials.

When the time limit was reached, the leader filled out the Qualtrics with the group's final answer for job candidate rankings and the reasoning behind the decisions. See Appendix L for group task Qualtrics answer sheet.

Posttest

The experimenter sent all participants a Qualtrics survey via Zoom chat. In this survey, Palomino and Frezatti’s assessment measured the followers’ role clarity, Gevers and Peeters’ tool measured the followers’ team satisfaction, the Team Effectiveness Questionnaire (TEQ) assessed the follower’s team effectiveness, a created assessment evaluated the followers’ leader satisfaction, and Laub’s tool estimated followers’ perception of appreciation from the leader (Appendices M-Q).

The last measure that the participants completed was a manipulation check that contained nine questions. The measure asked which shape was assigned which role, what they considered their role was, the other group members' functions, and if they would have rated the job candidates differently than the group’s final answer. This measure aimed to determine the manipulation's effectiveness and identify any biases in the respondent’s answers (See Appendix T).

Debriefing

The end of the survey included the debrief for the participants (see Appendix U). In the debrief, the participants were informed that the leader was chosen by random and not merit, and an explanation of their leadership style condition. All group members were placed in individual breakout rooms to complete the last Qualtrics and read the debriefing in private. They were able
return to the main room to ask the experimenters any questions they may have, and if they still wished for their data to be used after being debriefed.

**Results**

This study investigates the impact of different leadership expectations within a group on the followers’ attitudes and perceptions, and the group’s performance. Six specific hypotheses were proposed to investigate this relationship deeper. To examine the hypotheses, data from the study was imported into IBM SPSS 27.0 Statistics was used to run multilevel analyses and Chi-Square tests. Multilevel regression models included a random intercept to account for the group clustering of the data, and a fixed effect of leadership condition alignment vs. non-alignment) to see if leadership expectations had a significant relationship with the various followers’ perceptions and attitudes. Chi-square tests were utilized for the analysis of leadership expectation condition on team performance, as well as the manipulation check if the participants carried out their expected leadership style.

A multilevel regression analysis was executed to explore the relationship between the leadership expectation condition and followers’ role clarity. In the model, role clarity was the dependent variable, alignment vs. non-alignment condition was a fixed predictor, and a random intercept was included to account for the group clustering of the data. Team ID was used as the group clustering variable. The effect of leadership expectation condition on role clarity is not significant, $B = -.08$, $SE = .16$, $p = .618$ (see Table 2). Additionally, the random intercept variance is not significant, Wald $Z = .67$, $p = .502$ (see Table 3). This means that role clarity did not significantly vary at the group level.
To determine if leadership expectation conditions had an impact on followers’ team satisfaction, a multilevel regression model was completed. In the model, team satisfaction was the dependent variable, alignment vs. non-alignment condition was a fixed predictor, and team ID was used as the group clustering variable. The random intercept variance is significant (Wald $Z = 3.0$, $p = .003$), suggesting that there are significant group differences in team satisfaction (see Table 4). This supports the choice of the multilevel modeling framework. However, the effect of leadership expectation condition on team satisfaction is not significant, $B= -.20$, $SE = .28$, $p = .481$ (see Table 5).
Regarding the relationship between the leadership expectation conditions and followers’ perception of team effectiveness, a multilevel regression analysis is completed. In the model, team effectiveness was the dependent variable, alignment vs. non-alignment condition was a fixed predictor, and team ID was the group clustering variable. The effect of leadership expectation condition on team effectiveness is not significant, $B=-.15$, $SE=.31$, $p=.623$ (see Table 6). The random intercept variance is significant, Wald $Z=2.62$, $p=.009$ (see Table 7). This supports the choice of the multilevel modeling framework and shows team effectiveness significantly varies at the group level.

Table 6

Estimates of Fixed Effects$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6.006888</td>
<td>.214528</td>
<td>22.812</td>
<td>28.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>5.562901 - 6.450875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>-.153250</td>
<td>.307246</td>
<td>22.075</td>
<td>-.499</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>-.790313 - .483813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Dependent Variable: Team Effectiveness

$N = 59$, $^*p < 0.05$, $^**p < 0.01$, $^***p < 0.001$
A multilevel regression analysis was executed to investigate the relationship between the leadership expectation conditions and followers’ leader satisfaction. Leader satisfaction was the dependent variable, alignment vs. non-alignment condition was a fixed predictor, and team ID was the group clustering variable. The effect of leader expectation condition on leader satisfaction is not significant, $B = -.05$, $SE = .34$, $p = .890$ (see Table 8). Additionally, the random intercept variance is significant, Wald $Z = 2.8$, $p = .005$. (see Table 9). This suggests that leader satisfaction significantly vary at the group level.
The relationship between the leadership expectation conditions and followers’ perception of appreciation from the leader is explored through a multilevel regression analysis. The appreciation from the leader was the dependent variable, alignment vs. non-alignment condition was a fixed predictor, and team ID was the group clustering variable. The effect of leader expectation condition on leader appreciation of the followers is not significant, $B = -.12, SE = .25, p = .640$ (see Table 10). The random intercept variance is significant, $\text{Wald } Z = 2.4, p = .017$ (see Table 11). This, leader appreciation of the followers significantly varied at the group level.

### Table 10
**Estimates of Fixed Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.356204</td>
<td>.171505</td>
<td>22.743</td>
<td>25.400</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.001197-4.711212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>-.116258</td>
<td>.245051</td>
<td>21.775</td>
<td>-.474</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>-.624766-.392251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Leader Appreciation

$N = 59, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001$

### Table 11
**Estimates of Covariance Parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald Z</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>.218236</td>
<td>.053786</td>
<td>4.057</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.134630-.353761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.279342</td>
<td>.116610</td>
<td>2.396</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.123256-.633090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Leader Appreciation

$N = 59, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001$

A Chi-Square test was performed to analyze if leadership expectation conditions had a significant impact on team performance on the group task. In the model, team performance and alignment vs. non-alignment condition were the variables. Only 2 of the 25 groups completed the task correctly (8% correct). Leadership expectation condition is not significantly related to team performance, $\chi^2(1) = 2.355, p = .125$ (see Table 12 and Table 13).
Table 12

*Chi-Square Tests*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>2.355(^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction(^b)</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>2.261</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .96.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Table 13

*Condition * Performance Crosstabulation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Correct, Incorrect</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Count</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% within Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% within Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardized Residual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 represent the mean difference between the leadership expectation conditions and their respective dependent variables. According to the results, the path of the mean scores for the five followers’ attitudes and perception are in the corresponding direction to the hypotheses.
The aligned leadership expectation groups experience higher mean scores in role clarity, team satisfaction, team effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and leader appreciation. However, the team performance means are not in congruency with Hypothesis 6, where the non-aligned leadership expectation groups produced higher correctness on the team task than the aligned leadership expectation groups.

Table 14
Mean Differences Between Leadership Expectation Conditions and Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Role Clarity</th>
<th>Team Satisfaction</th>
<th>Team Effectiveness</th>
<th>Leader Satisfaction</th>
<th>Leader Appreciation</th>
<th>Team Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SE )</td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SE )</td>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>( SE )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligned Leadership Expectations</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaligned Leadership Expectations</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Chi-Square test was used to analyze the followers’ expected leadership condition and the followers’ executing leadership condition variables from the perspective of the follower. The relationship between the followers’ expected leadership condition and the followers’ executing leadership from the perspective of the follower is significant, \( \chi^2(1) = 26.667, p < .001 \) (see Table 15 and Table 16). This shows that the followers carried out their assigned leadership condition throughout the group task.

Table 15
Crosstab for Followers’ Expected Condition and Followers’ Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the followers expect collective or individual leadership?</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Collective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the followers expect individual leadership?</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the followers expect collective leadership?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Chi-Square test was conducted to explore the followers’ expected leadership condition and the followers’ executing leadership condition variables from the perspective of the leader. The relationship between the followers’ expected leadership condition and the followers’ executing leadership from the perspective of the leader is significant, $\chi^2(1) = 18.958, p < .001$ (see Table 17 and Table 18). This shows that the followers carried out their assigned leadership condition throughout the group task.

### Table 16

*Chi-Square Tests for Followers’ Expected Condition and Followers’ Perspective*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>26.667(^a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction(^b)</td>
<td>24.067</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>29.110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher’s Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>26.222</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.00.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

### Table 17

*Crosstab for Leader’s Expected Condition and Followers’ Perspective*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was the role of the followers?</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Collective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the leader expect individual or collective leadership?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

Chi-Square Tests for Leader’s Expected Condition and Followers’ Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>18.958a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correctionb</td>
<td>15.601</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>23.833</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>18.229</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.62.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table.

A Chi-Square test was utilized to explore the leader’s expected leadership condition and the leader’s executing leadership condition variables from the perspective of the followers. The relationship between the leader’s expected leadership condition and the leader’s executing leadership from the perspective of the followers is significant, $\chi^2(1) = 18.373, p < .001$ (see Table 19 and Table 20). This shows that the leader carried out his or hers assigned leadership condition throughout the group task.

Table 19

Crosstab for Followers’ Expected Condition and Leader’s Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the followers expect collective or individual leadership?</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Collective</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the followers expect collective or individual leadership?</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20  

**Chi-Square Tests for Followers’ Expected Condition and Leader’s Perspective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>18.373a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correctionb</td>
<td>16.148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>19.924</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>18.067</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.00.  
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

A Chi-Square test was conducted to explore the leader’s expected leadership condition and the leader’s executing leadership condition variables from the perspective of the leader. The relationship between the leader’s expected leadership condition and the leader’s executing leadership from the perspective of the leader is significant, $\chi^2(1) = 19.102, p < .001$ (see Table 21 and Table 22). This shows that the leader carried out his or hers assigned leadership condition throughout the group task.

Table 21  

**Crosstab for Leader’s Expected Condition and Leader’s Perspective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the leader expect individual or collective leadership?</th>
<th>Leader’s Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the leader expect individual or collective leadership?</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the leader expect individual or collective leadership?</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the leader expect individual or collective leadership?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosstab for Leader’s Expected Condition and Leader’s Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.54.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Discussion

The purpose of this experiment was to examine if mixed leadership expectations between group members and leaders (1) influences followers’ perceptions of role clarity, team satisfaction, team effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and appreciation from the leader; (2) the team’s overall performance. To address these questions, a sample of 25 groups comprising 3 to 5 undergraduate students who were worked in groups to complete a task and surveyed regarding their experience working in the group.

To address the question of followers’ perceptions and attitudes, multilevel regression models were used to explore if there were significant attitude differences between the groups who had aligned leadership expectations and groups who had unaligned leadership expectations. Results did not reveal that leadership expectation combinations have a significant impact followers’ attitudes of role clarity, team satisfaction, team effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and perception of leader’s appreciation. However, team satisfaction, team effectiveness, leader satisfaction, and leader appreciation significantly varied at the group level.
To address the second aim, a Chi-Square test was utilized to examine if there was a significant difference between team performance and the combination of leadership expectations. In particular, the group’s performance was rated on a binary scale based on if they completed the task correctly. Results do not support a significance in the team performance and leadership expectation relationship. The outcomes of the two questions suggest that leadership expectations within a group do not significantly influence followers’ attitudes nor the group’s performance.

Limitations

The results of this study should be considered in light of several limitations. First, the modest sample size limits generalizability and reduces statistical power. Multilevel modeling procedures require a minimum sample size to achieve accurate estimates of the regression coefficients and the variance components (Rauenbush & Bryk, 2001). Models with fewer than 20-25 groups may not provide accurate estimates, furthermore, simulation studies have shown that analyses with fewer than 50 groups can lead to biased estimates of the standard error at the group level (Hox & Maas, 2002). The study’s previous intentions were to collect data from 80 groups and 320 responses, however, due to the pandemic and swift shift to virtual school interactions, we were unable to meet that goal as the study’s data collection was delayed and shortened the amount of time to run groups.

Second, it is not clear whether and how much the teams carried out the group task correctly based on their understanding of the task itself. The group task required the groups to rank candidates from best fit to worst fit according to the provided job description of the open position. However, when reviewing the trends in the incorrect answers and reasonings, groups ranked based on best overall qualifications, not necessarily best fit to the specific job description. This discrepancy may have altered the team’s true performance, thus reasoning why only 2 of the
25 groups answered the group task correctly. Additionally, the group task was short of holding real consequences towards the group members. This lack of accountability could have shifted the groups’ focus from completing the task correctly too quickly.

Finally, it is unknown what effect the leadership expectations conditions may have had on the followers’ attitudes and team performance if the group interaction was prolonged more than two hours or carried out multiple tasks. It is rational to suspect that as participants continue to interact with one another and display their leadership behaviors aligned with their expectations, the greater the condition’s impact may have had on the followers’ perceptions and attitudes, and team’s performance.

Furthermore, it is difficult to conceptualize that the main followers’ perspectives and attitudes were explored. Due to the lack of research of leadership from the followers’ point of view, key perceptive and attitudes may have not been identified to measure in this study. Little research in this scope of leadership creates obstacles of targeting which variables should be observed and their linkage to team dynamics.

**Future Implications**

Although this study did not prove any significant relationship between mixed leadership expectations between leaders and followers and the measured followers’ perceptions, attitudes, and team performance, this study highlights the need for more research to understand leadership expectations within teams. This study is built with strong internal validity, where it may produce different and important outcomes if the external validity is strengthened by a larger and more target sample related to teamwork in the workplace.
Due to the study’s strong internal validity methodology, simply tweaks to the study itself would influence the results to be more accurate. When reviewing Table 13, the mean scores of all the followers’ attitudes and perceptions where in congruence with the hypotheses but fell short of being significant. A future direction to help increase power in the results is collecting more groups to increase the sample size. Alternative modes to aid the team performance would be to alter the environment from a virtual study to an in-person study in a lab or classroom. The shift in environment would aid with the clarity of directions and implement real consequences due to the environment instilling more professionalism in the participants.

A benefit of this research is to enable other academic researchers to explore other followers’ attitudes that may be significantly impacted by opposing leadership expectations. It is clear that the lack of research of leadership from the followers’ point of view. It is essential to understand leadership from the followers’ side due to the interdependent relationship between the leader and follower to carry out leadership within a team. It would also provide practitioners with a clearer conceptual framework of the effects of opposing leadership principles within a team.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the type of leadership principles that team members possess is important for a group’s productivity and stability. These principles guide how the individual interprets the roles and responsibilities of both the leader and followers. The different type of leadership principles varies the roles and responsibilities that these roles carry out. It is critical to understand how alignment and unalignment of leadership principles within a group can alter the outcomes of both the followers’ attitudes and perceptions, and team performance.
Biography
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Appendix A
SONA-System Posting

The purpose of this study is to grasp the knowledge and reaction of college group members when operating on a task. The study will consist of two questionnaires and a group task. The study requires participants to keep their video and microphone on for the duration of the study.

This study will take approximately 2 hours, and upon its completion you will receive 4 credits. The entire study will be completed virtually via Zoom and Qualtrics. After signing up for the study, participants will be contacted by the researchers with the Zoom link information 24 hours before the scheduled time.

This study requires groups of 3 to 5 participants. Please make an effort to sign up for a time slot that already has other participants signed up. If the minimum amount of participants is not reached in the timeslot, the researchers will contact the participants who have already signed up in order to reschedule.

Do you have any questions about this study?
Email:
Christine Griffith (Co-Principal Investigator)
giffithc2@montclair.edu
OR
Catrina Notari (Co-Principal Investigator)
notaric1@montclair.edu
OR
Pasquale Tosto (Co-Principal Investigator)
tostop1@montclair.edu
Appendix B
Adult Consent Form

Please read below with care. You can ask questions at any time, now or later. You can talk to other people before you sign this form.

Title: Shared Leadership in Group Tasks
Study Number: IRB-FY19-20-1787 - SS

Why is this study being done?
The purpose of this study is to grasp the knowledge and reaction of college group members when operating on a task.

What will happen while you are in the study?
You will be fully informed about the purpose of the study before being asked to participate. If you choose to participate, you will sign this consent form. Next, you will be given a short survey about leadership. Based on this survey, a leader will be chosen for a group assignment. During the group assignment, you and your group will review application materials for a job posting and determine the best candidate for the given position. After the group task, you will answer a questionnaire consisting of short leadership surveys designed to capture your experience working in the group. You do not need to complete any additional activities or projects for this study. All information is confidential.

Time: This study will take about 2 hours total to complete. The first five minutes will be for explaining the purpose of the study and handing out consent forms; the rest of the time is for completing the group task and answer the pre- and post-surveys.

Risks: There are no additional risks associated with participating in this study. Surveys will not ask any questions aside from views about leadership and the group task. There is no anticipated physical, psychological, or social effects with this study.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits for participating in this study. The field of psychology will benefit from this study through helping to fill a gap in research about one’s understanding of shared leadership in teams. It will also help the field clarify and refine how leadership and shared leadership is measured.

Who will know that you are in this study?
You will not be linked to any presentations. Your professor will not know who participated in this study. We will keep who you are confidential. All personal information will be de-identified using a unique code. You should know that New Jersey requires that any person having reasonable cause to believe that a child has been subjected to child abuse or acts of child abuse shall report the same immediately to the Division of Child Protection and Permanency.

Do you have to be in the study?
You do not have to be in this study. You are a volunteer! It is okay if you want to stop at any time and not be included in the study. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. You will receive 4 SONA-System points for your participation, even if you decide to
leave the study early.

**Do you have any questions about this study?**

**Email:**
Christine Griffith (Co-Principal Investigator)
griffithc2@montclair.edu

**OR**
Catrina Notari (Co-Principal Investigator)
(570) 852-0403
notaric1@montclair.edu

**OR**
Pasquale Tosto (Co-Principal Investigator)
tostop1@montclair.edu

**OR**
Dr. Valerie Sessa (Faulty Sponsor)
sessav@mail.montclair.edu

**OR**
Dana Sobel (Investigator)
sobeld2@montclair.edu

**Do you have any questions about your rights as a research participant?**

Phone or email the IRB Chair, Dr. Dana Levitt, at 973-655-2097 or reviewboard@montclair.edu.

1. It is okay to use my data in future studies.
   a. Yes
   b. No
2. It is okay to video-record this Zoom session.
   a. Yes
   b. No
3. I have read this form and decided that I will participate in the project described above. Its general purposes, particulars of involvement, and possible risks and inconveniences have been explaining to my satisfaction. I understand that I can withdraw at any time. Clicking “Yes” below also indicates that I am 18 years of age or older and that I have read the above consent form.
   a. Yes
   b. No
Appendix C
Demographic Questionnaire

1. What shape were you given as your identifier for this study?
   a. Circle
   b. Triangle
   c. Square
   d. Rectangle
   e. Hexagon

2. What is your age?
   a. __________

3. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Prefer to self-describe: __________

4. What is your ethnicity? Please choose all that apply.
   a. White
   b. Black or African American
   c. Hispanic or Latino
   d. American Indian or Alaska Native
   e. Asian
   f. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   g. Other: __________

5. What college academic year are you in?
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Graduate

6. Are you/have every been a member of a competitive/noncompetitive sport(s)?
   a. Yes
      i. If yes, please list: __________
   b. No

7. Have you been or are you currently a formal captain/leader in your sport(s)?
   a. Yes
   b. No

8. Are you/have you been a member of an extracurricular club/activity?
   a. Yes
      i. If yes, please list: __________
   b. No

9. Have you been or are you currently a formal captain/leader in your extracurricular club/activity?
   a. Yes
   b. No
Appendix D
Leadership Selection Script

Vertical leadership expectations
After looking at the group’s answers, you have been chosen to be the group’s leader in this study. This decision has been based on a combination of your answers in the survey, as well as a comparison of the other member’s answers. Out of all of the members, you are the most qualified for this position.

We ask you to take the lead in your group while completing this study. Your job as the leader is to get this task done, and your team members are there to help you. You have full control over the direction of the group, and you need to direct the group and give them instructions in order to complete the task properly. The task will be explained in greater detail once all of the members are spoken to. At the end of the task, you’ll fill out a report with your decision.

I want to make sure you got the directions down. In your own words, what is your role? [let them answer….] Do you have any questions on what you are supposed to do?

Horizontal leadership expectations
After looking at the group’s answers, you have been chosen to be the group’s leader in this study. This decision has been based on a combination of your answers in the survey, as well as a comparison of the other member’s answers. Out of all of the members, you are the most qualified for this position.

We ask you to facilitate the team to work together while completing this study. Your job as the leader is to help the team since you are the expert in leadership out of the group. The performance of the task will reflect the group’s collective effort towards completing the task. You need to encourage the group to work together and use everyone’s abilities and strengths to complete the task. The task will be explained in greater detail once all of the members are spoken to. At the end of the task, you will receive a report to fill out with the group’s decision.

I want to make sure you got the directions down. In your own words, what is your role? [let them answer….] Do you have any questions on what you are supposed to do?
Appendix E
Follower Selection Script

**Vertical leadership expectations**
We ask for the team to work under the direction of the leader to complete the task. As a follower, it is your job to follow the leader and do what is asked of you. The leader has full control over the direction of the group. The task will be explained in greater detail once all of the members are spoken to. At the end of the task, the leader will fill out the report on the decision.

I want to make sure you got the directions down. In your own words, what is your role? [let them answer….] Do you have any questions on what you are supposed to do?

**Horizontal leadership expectations**
We ask for the team to work cohesively and equally together to complete the task. The leader is there to help facilitate the use of everyone’s strengths and to make sure everyone takes part in all decisions so the group does the best job possible in completing the task. The task will be explained in greater detail once all of the members are spoken to. At the end of the task, the leader will receive a report to fill out with the group’s decision.

I want to make sure you got the directions down. In your own words, what is your role? [let them answer….] Do you have any questions on what you are supposed to do?
Appendix F
Task Instruction

A NYC corporation has tasked us with finding focus groups to review their four finalists for an important graphic designer position. This is an effort on their part to reduce the bias in their selection process. For this task, you will be ranking the four candidates from best fit to worst fit for the job position. We ask that you review the job description before reviewing the candidates’ materials. Remember, you are tasked with matching the best candidate for this specific job position, not necessarily the candidate with the best overall materials or experience.

At the end of this task, you will be ranking the candidates from best fit to worst fit based on the job description and giving your reasonings. You will be given 35 minutes to review the materials and discuss the rankings with each other. At the end of the 35 minutes, the co-experimenter will send the leader a survey to record the rankings. If this takes you less than 35 minutes, please let us know so the co-experimenter can send the survey to the leader to record the decision. Are there any questions?

In the Zoom chat, please open the file share. It includes the job description, and the four job candidates’ resumes and portfolios. Each job candidate is identified with an alphabetical letter for confidentiality reasons. When you open the file, you will first see the job description, then the job candidates’ materials. Please let us know if you are having difficulty in opening the file.

We will turn our cameras off but leave our Zoom open with the sound on so we can hop back on if you have any questions. We will not be watching the discussion, but since we are recording, we cannot place you into a breakout room. The time is [______], we will give you a five-minute warning at [______]. You may begin now!
Appendix G
Job Description

The Times Square Alliance is currently seeking a highly motivated Graphic & Digital Media Designer with strong graphic design and video editing skills to help us shape and tell the story of Times Square. Candidate should have a strong interest in and knowledge of design trends and topics and be able to maintain and build a brand identity that celebrates the distinctive human, architectural, cultural and historical assets of the district.

The Times Square Alliance works to promote and improve Times Square, cultivating the creativity, energy and edge that have made the area an icon of entertainment, culture and urban life for over a century. Our goal is to celebrate and serve this multi-use district that is home to some of the world’s most famous theaters, companies, events and public spaces. More about its vision can be found here.

The Communications team manages the message for large scale civic events including New Year’s Eve and Solstice in Times Square as well as major public art projects produced by Times Square Arts. The Communications team manages the official website for Times Square and all official social media handles that promote the district, its businesses, and all major happenings.

The Graphic & Digital Media Designer maintains and builds upon the Alliance’s visual communications, overseeing the visual brand of the Alliance. This position helps solidify a comprehensive brand identity that brings together all the organizations efforts to celebrate and market the distinctive assets that make up the neighborhood through printed materials, programmatic advertisements, logos, signage, and online graphics. This position will also work with the Communications team to create new digital video content to market and promote the neighborhood.

The Graphic & Digital Media Designer works with the entire Communications team as well as other departments within the Alliance to achieve these goals and will also contribute to other Alliance design related initiatives.

Responsibilities include but are not limited to:

• Developing and designing a variety of print and digital materials including advertisements, posters, logos, postcards, promotional items, invitations, annual reports, and other publications
• Creating new video content that helps promote the neighborhood as well as market events and public art projects
• Overseeing and enforcing guidelines for the organization’s visual brand
• Closely coordinating with the events team to update and generate design deliverables, timelines & execute on new/existing event creative
• Coordinating the inventory of all graphical work and photography/video for easy retrieval and backup
• Supporting web design efforts, including the design of website ads, banners, graphics and overseeing email marketing (e-newsletters) program
• Managing printing/mailing vendors, occasional oversight of consulting graphic design firm

Qualifications/Skills

The successful candidate will possess the following qualifications and skills.

• BA/BFA in Graphic Design, or another design related field that can include video content design
• 2-5 years of experience in web or print graphic design, either in an agency, in-house or freelance
• Must have mastery of Adobe Creative Suite (Photoshop, InDesign, Illustrator, After Effects)
• Video editing capabilities to help create short form and long form video content
• Knowledge of printing and experience working directly with a printer is required
• Ability to collaborate with other staff and take directions from various people; ability to work in a fast-paced environment
• Strong conceptual planning, creative design, and typography skills and the ability to follow art direction and collaborate on layouts
• Must have exceptional organizational and time management skills, including handing multiple projects simultaneously and ability to shift priorities and work will under pressure; meeting tight deadlines; and reacting quickly and smoothly to changes.

Candidate must provide a resume. Example digital content created by the candidate is required.
Appendix H
Job Candidate A’s Resume and Portfolio

Graphic Designer

ABOUT ME

Creative and detail-oriented graphic designer with exceptional skill level and experience in various mediums. Highly adept with programs in AASHTO Pavement ME Design, Synchro B, and MicroStation V8i.

SKILLS

- 7 / 10 MicroStation V8i
- 8 / 10 Synchro B
- 9 / 10 AASHTO Pavement ME Design

EXPERIENCE

Developer, Designer, Lead & Solution Architect
Reilly Group/2018-ongoing
Reilly Group is a global IT services and solutions provider across various industries in various IT domains.
- Selected as one of the top participants for an 18-month professional development program with Texas Instruments
- Designed the layer system to enable reachability and usability in 3D
- Freelance audio designer since 2001, produced top quality audio for 400+ videogames

Lead Website Designer
Berliner/2014-2018
Berliner is an online platform dedicated to helping students with CAT Exam preparation.
- Designed 50+ mobile apps with running condition on Google Playstore
- Coordinated and executed 3 successful releases to achieve near zero touch deployment

UI/UX Designer
Schmeier/2013-2014
Schmeier is a mapping platform that allows you to plot your story by location with pictures and videos.
- Planned and designed plant layout drawings in 3D or 3D as requested by engineering department
- Managed storewide business-to-business sales practices and performance metrics to 200% annual revenue growth
Appendix I
Job Candidate B’s Resume and Portfolio

PROFILE
A dynamic, creative mind with the capacity to create and execute interactive artwork in the digital space. Strives to contribute a fresh take on modern marketing with a broad set of ever-growing skills.

CORE QUALIFICATIONS
- Video Animation
- Digital and hand illustration
- Digital Media
- Digital Campaign Development
- Project Management
- Multiple Platform Configuration
- Web Development

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
LEAD DESIGNER / XYZ DESIGNS, [REDACTED] 2014 – PRESENT
Spearheaded the creative content for web and print departments of major tech company.
- Developed innovative packaging for web-based tech software products
- Managed client relations and expectations to build projects around vision, an accurate scope, and an organized project plan
- Delegated design tasks to junior designers including pagination, editing, and image manipulation
- Oversees the production of final designs and communicate all necessary changes

GRAPHIC DESIGNER / Z MAGAZINE, [REDACTED] 2012 – PRESENT
Contribute to a fast-paced creative team through development of content for monthly print publications and weekly web updates. Maintains specific webpages for publication’s website.
- Designed on-brand elements to incorporate in print and digital ads for subscription
- Developed new brand guidelines and communicate throughout design department
- Formatted and corrected images for use in print publication

CLIENTS
Tech: Apple, Samsung, Intel
Retail: Home Depot, Toms, Starbucks

EDUCATION
Bachelor of Art, Graphic Design / FIT, New York, New York / 2014
Appendix J
Job Candidate C’s Resume and Portfolio

EXPERIENCE

Front End Developer / Graphic Designer
Mills Group
2016 – Ongoing
Mills Group is a professional website design company, specializing in social networking website design, development and marketing.
• Made hundreds of flex banners for the school which increased its popularity by approx 20%
• Developed 10-15 websites on different CMS platforms.
• Fashion 101 Workshop became packed with aspiring models
• Created and increased social media channels. (25% for each project)

Web & Graphic Designer
Schmeier
2012 – 2015
Schmeier is the first Bulgarian media focused in electronic sports. Being in this field has been a crazy design adventure, which included tons of Gaming Graphics, Marketing Assets, Web Design, Venue Design and so on and so on.
• Coordinated trade show logistics and booth graphics; reduced costs by 30 percent
• Currently developing two mobile applications, to be released in 2016

Graphic Designer + Project Controller
Mills Group
2011 – 2012
Mills Group is a small but prestigious aluminium manufacturer. Producing the high quality products, varies from sinks, doors, and windows, the customer varies from household to high rise building.
• Successful customer work with over 6 requests fulfilled
• Designed 3 final products weekly by sorting and editing approximately 4000 new photographs
• Prepared materials on Eco Living for all 13 KEA stores across Canada.

EDUCATION

Photographic & Electronic Media
Maryland Institute College of Art
2016 – Ongoing
Boston, MA

Mediegrafiker
Københavns Tekniske Skole
2014 – 2016

ACHIEVEMENTS

Corporate Illustration
Creating designs and illustrations that drive international brands.

Two Squirrels Ceramics
Starting my own small Ceramics business and creating unique functional homewares. Stocking them in two local stores and being a stallholder at local markets.

Instagram profile: https://www.instagram.com/twosquirrels_ceramics/
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Job Candidate D’s Resume and Portfolio

Personal info
Date of birth:
Web:
Address:
Phone number:
Email address:

Interpersonal Skills
Soft Skills
Self-Confidence/Positive
Problem Solving
Collaboration
Empathy
Communication

Work experience
Freelancer
Self Employed
Services in the areas of:
• Video Production
• Digital Marketing
• Website Development
• Social Media Strategy
• Photography & Editing

Communications Director
04/2014 – present
New Beginnings Community Church;
• Managed and lead a 4-person team in the production of marketing projects, promotional materials (video, photography, graphic design), website design, copywriting and audio/visual needs.
• Developed artwork and layout for print and digital signage, banners, inserts, publications and more.
• Led in the video storytelling, lighting, color-correction, editing.
• Serves as a creative guide for all key projects and events.
• Oversees the organization’s social media brand strategies.
• Consults and trains staff on effective use of technology, SaaS and technical equipment.

Certifications
Content Marketing Specialist
Digital Marketer

Storytelling for Business
UCB

Hootsuite Certified
Professional
Hootsuite Media

Education
Christian Studies
08/2006 – 07/2008
California Baptist University, Riverside
Bachelor of Art, Graphic Design / FIT, New York, New York / 2014

Strengths Finder Themes
Achiever
Ideation
Learner
Developer
Maximizer

Adobe CC Skills
Premiere Pro
Photoshop
InDesign
After Effects
Illustrator

Online Design Portfolio
Appendix L
Group Task Answer Survey

Please rank the job candidates below as a group from best to worst fit for the given job description, where 1 is the best and 4 is the worst.

Job Candidate A: ______
Job Candidate B: ______
Job Candidate C: ______
Job Candidate D: ______

Why did you choose the order above? Please write one to two sentences for each job candidate.

Job Candidate A: _____________________________________________________
Job Candidate B: _____________________________________________________
Job Candidate C: _____________________________________________________
Job Candidate D: _____________________________________________________
1. Working on our team, I was clear on how much authority I had.

2. The aims of my role were clear.

3. In this team, rules for how to work together were clear.

4. I was clear on what my responsibilities were.

5. I was clear on what was expected of me.

6. The explanation of what needed to be done was clear.

Strongly disagree- 1, Somewhat disagree- 2, Neither agree nor disagree- 3, Somewhat agree- 4, Strongly agree- 5

Appendix N
Team Satisfaction Scale

Satisfaction with the Team Scale
1. Taken as a whole, I was satisfied with the composition of our design team.
2. Taken as a whole, things went pleasantly within our design team.
3. I was satisfied with our final ranking during the group task.
4. If I ever had to participate in a similar project again, I would like to do it with this team.
### Appendix O

Team Effectiveness Questionnaire (TEQ)

#### Role

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Team members clearly understood their roles.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team members understood one another's roles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Everyone valued what each member contributed to the team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Team members avoided duplication of effort and made sure they were clear about who was doing what.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overlapping or shared tasks and responsibilities do not create problems for team members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree- 1, Somewhat disagree- 2, Neither agree nor disagree- 3, Somewhat agree- 4, Strongly agree- 5

#### Team process

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Team problem solving resulted in effective solutions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. We addressed and resolved issues quickly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The group meeting was very productive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree- 1, Somewhat disagree- 2, Neither agree nor disagree- 3, Somewhat agree- 4, Strongly agree- 5
### Team relationships

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Team members appreciated one another's unique capabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Team members were effective listeners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Communication in our group was open and honest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Members of our team trusted each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Team members helped one another deal with problems or resolve issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>We were able to work through differences of opinion without damaging relationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Team members displayed high levels of cooperation and mutual support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree- 1, Somewhat disagree- 2, Neither agree nor disagree- 3, Somewhat agree- 4, Strongly agree- 5

### Problem solving

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Team members took personal responsibility for the effectiveness of our team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Team members maintained a can-do approach when they encountered frustrating situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>We spent very little time complaining about things we could not control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Team members looked and gave each other constructive feedback.

20. Team members were sure about what was expected of them and took pride in a job well done.

21. Team members considered how their actions would impact others when deciding what to do.

**Passion and commitment**

1. Working in our team inspired people to do their best.

2. My team had a strong sense of accomplishment relative to our work.

3. People were proud to be part of our team.

4. Team members went beyond what is required and did not hesitate to take initiative.

5. My team was proud of its accomplishments.

Appendix P
Leader Satisfaction Measure

Rate your satisfaction of your team’s leader based on the following (Consideration and Initiation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- How the leader supported the members’ input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- The team leader’s friendliness and approachableness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- How the leader incorporated the group’s approval in the final ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- The team leader’s appreciation towards the team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- The team leader’s fairness to team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- How the team leader directed the team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- How the leader made decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- How the leader assigned group members particular tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- How the leader let the group members know what is expected of them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- I liked the team leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very Satisfied- 5, Satisfied- 4, Neutral- 3, Dissatisfied- 2, Very Dissatisfied- 1
1-5= Consideration
6-9= Initiation
### Appendix Q

**Appreciation from the Leader**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I felt appreciated by the leader for what I contributed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I was able to contribute at a high level of productivity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I was listened to by the leader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I received encouragement and affirmation from the leader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I trusted the leader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I enjoyed working with this leader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I was respected by the leader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Organizational Leadership Assessment, with permission from Laub, J. A. (1998), Marion, IN: Center for Life Calling and Leadership, Indiana Wesleyan University
Appendix R
Debriefing

I. Thank you for participating in this study.

Please read below with care. You can ask questions at any time, now or later. You can talk to other people before you fill in this form.

Title: Shared Leadership in Group Tasks
Study Number: IRB-FY19-20-1787 - SS

When you consented to participate in our study, we described its goal as the following:
To provide focus groups to assist a New York City company to choose a candidate for an open job position while we also studied various leadership styles.

The PI can give you the complete original consent document to read again, if you have questions about it.

In the study today, you completed a number of questionnaires and did a number of other tasks. Do you have any idea what we were really looking for in this study? Do you have any idea what we were hypothesizing in this study? Please list any ideas on the form we have given you. Please also write anything you think about what the study was actually about?

II. Now we would like to tell you the purpose of this study.

We did not fully disclose our true purpose when we told you this, as an essential part of studying something else. We were not actually looking at real candidates or choosing a leader based upon merit. The job candidates and posting were fictitious, and the leader for the task was chosen randomly. What we were truly interested in was to grasp the knowledge and reaction of college group members when operating on a task with varying shared leadership styles. First, there was an inquiry of the current comprehension of leadership and how they viewed leadership within their group. Additionally, the study is designed to measure the presents of psychological territory infringement (PTI) within the team's leader. Finally, there is an in-depth analysis of the follower's team satisfaction, team effectiveness, role clarity, leadership satisfaction, and appreciation.

This incomplete disclosure was necessary because if we tell people outright what we are studying, it might affect their behavior. Thus, we had to conceal the real purpose of the experiment until now.

What about the risks & benefits described in the original (deceptive) consent document?

All the risks and benefits described in the original consent are still present in the real study. There are no additional risks associated with participating in this study. Surveys will not ask any questions aside from views about leadership and the group task. There is no anticipated physical, psychological, or social effects with this study. There are no direct benefits for participating in
this study. The field of psychology will benefit from this study through helping to fill a gap in research about one’s understanding of shared leadership in teams. It will also help the field clarify and refine how leadership and shared leadership is measured.

**Risks you weren’t told about before:**
There are no risks, in addition to those discussed above, in the real study.

**Benefits you weren’t told about before:**
There are no benefits, in addition to those discussed above, in the real study.

**III. There are some final things we need to talk to you about.**

We have lots of people participating in this study or similar studies both during this semester and across the next few semesters. The success of this study requires that the people who participate have no idea in advance what the study is about and that we are really interested in whether the audience affects the goals people set. What this means is that I need you not to say anything about the study to anyone else. Why?

If you talk to others about the purpose of the study it would be the same as I told them at the beginning all about the purpose of the study. Their responses wouldn’t be spontaneous and natural. So you discuss this study with others, we wouldn’t have enough valid data to draw any conclusions about how people naturally behave in this situation. In short, the study would be wasted; your time would be wasted and our time would be wasted.

What this means is after you leave this door we are asking you to not discuss the details of this experiment.

If anybody asks you about the experiment, just tell them that it was an experiment on how groups make decisions and on the understanding of leadership.

**I hope you see why it is important not to tell anyone the purpose of the experiment.**
We have tried to make this experiment as interesting as possible for you. Please resist any temptation to talk about this experiment.

So will you promise not to say anything about the experiment?

a. Yes  
b. No

**IV. Can I leave the study now, even though I’ve already been a participant?**

Yes, you can always leave the study and have your data removed from the study. This debriefing consent form is giving you the opportunity to choose whether you want to participate, now that you know the real reasons why the study is being conducted. If you do not wish to participate anymore, your data will be purged from the research entirely, except for this debriefing consent.
Who will know that you are in this study?

As we promised in the original consent, you will not be linked to any presentations. Only your other groupmates may know that you participated in this study. We encourage all of our participants to keep the identity of their group members private. Your professor will not know who participated in this study. We will keep who you are confidential. All personal information will be de-identified using a unique code. You should know that New Jersey requires that any person having reasonable cause to believe that a child has been subjected to child abuse or acts of child abuse shall report the same immediately to the Division of Child Protection and Permanency. None of these protections have been changed.

Do you have any questions about this study, or about the deception involved?
Christine Griffith (Co-Principal Investigator)
griffithc2@montclair.edu
OR
Catrina Notari (Co-Principal Investigator)
notaric1@montclair.edu
OR
Pasquale Tosto (Co-Principal Investigator)
tostop1@montclair.edu
OR
Dr. Valerie Sessa (Faulty Sponsor)
sessav@mail.montclair.edu

Do you have any questions about your rights as a research participant?
Phone or email the IRB Chair, Dr. Dana Levitt, at 973-655-2097 or reviewboard@montclair.edu.

It is okay to use my data in other studies:
  a. Yes
  b. No

By clicking "Yes" below I verify that I have had all the points on this form explained to me, and I had the opportunity to ask questions about the true purpose and experimental manipulations that took place in this study.
  a. Yes
  b. No

Now that you have learned the true and full purpose of the current study and know about the actual manipulations that took place as part of this study, will you wish to have your data included in this research project?
  a. Yes
  b. No
Appendix S
Age Demographics

Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Bar chart showing age demographics]
Appendix T
Ethnicity Demographics

Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity

Frequency

Ethnicity
Appendix U
College Year Demographics

Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Pie chart showing college year demographics]
Appendix V
Gender Demographics

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Pie chart showing gender demographics]