CHAPTER 10

FORMAL LEADERSHIP IN WORKPLACE MEETINGS

Joseph E. Mroz, Emanuel Schreiner and Joseph A. Allen

ABSTRACT

Meetings are an integral function in organizations where interaction between leaders and their employees and thus, leadership, happens. A small but growing area of research within the larger workplace meetings domain has started to focus on the role of leaders in promoting effective and satisfying meetings. This chapter provides an overview of research to date on workplace meetings and leadership, and the authors identified seven studies that paired the two areas. The number of publications focusing on meetings and leadership is increasing, with the older papers largely dedicated to qualitative investigations of leader behaviors associated with successful meetings, whereas the more recent papers take a more theoretical and quantitative approach, yet are nonetheless largely isolated from one another. Next, the authors review five theories of leadership (full range of leadership, charismatic leadership, servant leadership, exploitative leadership, and followership), and relate each of the theories to workplace meetings, with a key focus on how the theory may impact subordinates' perceptions of meetings as well as the utility of meetings for team and organizational functioning. The authors propose seven areas throughout the chapter that future research could explore to extend knowledge about how leadership operates in meetings and how meetings are an important aspect to consider with respect to leadership theories. Primary theoretical contributions are the integration of existing work on leadership and meetings and theoretically based propositions for future research.

Keywords: Workplace meetings; transformational leadership; charismatic leadership; exploitative leadership; followership; leadership theories

Managing Meetings in Organizations
Research on Managing Groups and Teams, Volume 20, 209–230

ISSN: 1534-0856/doi:10.1108/S1534-085620200000020016

INTRODUCTION

As mentioned in the previous chapters, workplace meetings are an inevitable constant of nearly every employee's work experience, and they occur in almost every job and organization for a variety of purposes such as sharing information, discussing ongoing projects, solving problems, and making decisions (Allen, Beck, Scott, & Rogelberg, 2014). Employees in the United States attend approximately 25–55 million meetings every day (Keith, 2015; Newlund, 2012), and the average employee spends about six hours each week in pre-scheduled meetings alone (Rogelberg, Scott, & Kello, 2007). Thus, it is not surprising that a full 72% of managers' and executives' workweeks are spent on meeting related activities (Porter & Nohria, 2018). These figures indicate that meetings are a core function in organizations where interaction between leaders and their employees and thus, leadership, happens (Allen, Lehmann-Willenbrock, & Rogelberg, 2015). Meetings are challenging in this regard, because different interests of leaders and employees meet in an environment characterized by synchronous communication, limited time, and oftentimes with additional attendees present. The leadership style adopted is a key factor that can influence if an open exchange takes place, how the leader is perceived, and whether the meeting results are accepted by all parties involved (Mroz, Yoerger, & Allen, 2018). Effective meetings, in turn, are related to higher team productivity and organizational success (Allen & Rogelberg, 2013; Kauffeld & Lehmann-Willenbrock, 2012). The overarching aim of the present chapter is exploring what is known and what needs to be known concerning leadership in workplace meetings.

Leadership – traditionally defined as the intentional influence of one person on one or many others – touches, in one form or another, every single aspect of everyone's life (Bass, 2008; Yukl, 2002). It is, therefore, not surprising that a multitude of approaches to the phenomenon of leadership and the source of its effects exist, ranging from thoughts about the person of the leader to leader behaviors to situational theories, among others. Besides more traditional concepts presenting a top-down view of the leadership process, more recently, the role of followers has garnered increasing attention in leadership research as well (Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014). The follower, in for-profit organizations often a hierarchical employee of the leader, is seen as an active contributor to the leadership process instead of a simple recipient who is being influenced by the leader.

The topic of leadership in organizations is one of the most long-lasting and heavily researched areas within organizational psychology and management. New leadership theories are often developed following events in world history like the rise of ethic-oriented leadership styles following the financial crisis of 2008 (Lemoine, Hartnell, & Leroy, 2019). Research has paired leadership with nearly every other conceivable topic relevant to organizational life (Bass, 2008; Hiller, DeChurch, Murase, & Doty, 2011) and beyond (e.g., work–family effects; Tang, Kwan, Zhang, & Zhu, 2016). Despite the abundance of attention paid to the role of leaders and leadership with respect to employee attitudes (e.g., cynism; Bommer, Rich, & Rubin, 2005; engagement; Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004; or organizational commitment; Kinicki & Vecchio, 1994), individual (e.g., Waldmann, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990), team (e.g., Knipfer,

Schreiner, Schmid, & Peus, 2018), and organizational (e.g., Liden, Wayne, Liao, & Meuser, 2014) performance, and many other areas (Bass, 2008; Hiller et al., 2011; Yukl, 2002), there have been relatively few scientific investigations that have paired leadership behavior and the broader literature on workplace meetings.

Focusing on this gap has the potential to advance leadership theory as well as meetings theory and practice. Meetings represent a key occasion where leadership takes place, and they are a particularly challenging situation for leaders who have to act under direct scrutiny from their employees, while reacting in real-time to new ideas, developments, and employee feedback. As such, this chapter has two primary purposes. First, we provide an overview of research to date on workplace meetings and leadership, with the goal of creating the first comprehensive review of the topic. Second, we review impactful theories of leadership that have specific relevance to the meeting context, and we provide a clear set of propositions and future directions on how those theories can be paired with workplace meetings.

LEADERSHIP IN WORKPLACE MEETINGS

A large amount of workplace meetings are led by a manager (Keith, 2015). How the leader behaves in and conducts the event is critical to having a successful, productive meeting (Perkins, 2009). The importance of the leader to meeting success, and the extensive amount of time managers spend in relation to meetings (upward of 80%; Rogelberg et al., 2007), has stimulated research on functional and dysfunctional leadership behaviors in meetings. As part of our ongoing research on workplace meetings, we have maintained a database of meetings-related articles, and we update it continuously as we discover or publish new articles. That database of peer-reviewed articles, excluding book chapters, formed the basis for this review on meetings and leadership. We also searched for new articles following procedures outlined by Short (2009) and Landis (2016) for conducting literature searches. In the remainder of this section, we review all published articles with a focus on the combination of meetings and leadership. Table 10.1 displays all the meetings and leadership articles reviewed in this chapter.

Two early papers were qualitative intervention studies designed to improve leaders' ability to conduct meetings. Perkins (2009), after extensive observations of individuals classified as expert meeting leaders, developed an executive coaching program to improve meeting leadership skills among executives. Through observing leaders before participating in the training program and after, Perkins (2009) found that the most successful leaders tended to ask questions, summarize, and poll for consensus frequently, whereas unsuccessful leaders disagreed, attacked, or shared information infrequently. Similarly, Myrsiades (2000) reported on a successful meeting training program that taught managers to lead meetings as *facilitators* rather than *bosses*. The leader's role, from this perspective, is to establish goals for the meeting, encourage everyone to participate, summarize, move the discussion through the agenda, and keep discussion on-topic.

Two empirical papers support the work of the earlier qualitative, intervention studies. First, Van der Haar, Koeslag-Kreunen, Euwe, and Segers, (2017) investigated leader communicative behavior in command-and-control teams, which

Table 10.1. List of Articles Examining Leadership and Workplace Meetings Identified in the Literature Search.

Authors	Key Purpose
Perkins (2009)	Reports on executive coaching program designed to improve meeting leadership skills
Myrsiades (2000)	Details a training program to improve meeting facilitation skills
Van der Haar et al. (2017)	Identifies key meeting structuring behaviors among leaders of high-performance emergency command-and-control teams
Malouff et al. (2012)	Codes the frequency of leadership behaviors in meetings and associated the frequencies with attendee perceptions of meeting productivity and effectiveness
Mroz et al. (2018)	Compares participative versus directive leadership styles in meetings with respect to attendee ratings of leader warmth and competence when conducting meetings
Lehmann-Willenbrock et al. (2015)	Investigates how transformational leadership can improve team functioning in meetings
Odermatt et al. (2016)	Examines initiating structure versus providing consideration leadership behaviors as a function of attendee perceptions of meeting effectiveness

are multidisciplinary gatherings of emergency responders. The authors proposed that leaders of these multidisciplinary teams must take deliberate steps to initiate structure in order to organize team processes and support team learning, while taking care not to *overstructure* the workings of the team. An overstructured team, in this case, might stifle organic learning and communication among members that occurs during meetings. Therefore, the primary goal of their paper was to identify structuring behaviors characteristic of leaders of high-performance emergency command-and-control teams. Van der Haar et al. (2017) recorded simulation exercises that were designed to prepare the team for real emergency management scenarios. These exercises included two team meetings. The meeting leader's behaviors were coded into 10 distinct verbal structuring behaviors. These behaviors included orienting the team toward a goal, clarifying comments, repeating a question, making a procedural suggestion or asking a procedural question, summarizing general information, summarizing a decision, asking a team member a question, asking the whole team a question, and managing time.

Highly effective leaders more frequently engaged in all structuring behaviors than less effective leaders (Van der Haar et al., 2017). However, there was no benefit of a leader asking procedural questions. Importantly, the most effective leaders changed their approach to structuring between the first and second meeting, such that the first meeting included more structuring behaviors and the second included fewer behaviors. Structure, therefore, seems to help a team respond well when it is under time pressure (as in the first simulation meeting), but too much structure hinders success when the team must develop new responses to novel situations.

Second, Malouff, Calic, McGrrory, Murrel, and Schutte (2012) coded the behavior of leaders in 60 organizational meetings not related to training or a formal presentation and associated the frequency of leader behaviors with attendees' perceptions of meeting productivity and effectiveness. Attendees were asked to complete measures of satisfaction and effectiveness (productivity) of the meeting

immediately after the meeting ended. The meetings occurred in a variety of organizations and industries. An observer live-coded 19 leadership behaviors as present or absent in the meeting. In this case, coding refers to identifying if the behavior occurred and the extent to which the behavior occurred, rather than counts of the actual behaviors over the course of the meeting. Behaviors included distributing an agenda during the meeting or in advance of the meeting, arriving before the start of the meeting, starting on time, greeting members, following the agenda, speaking succinctly, moving the meeting along, encouraging participation in general and in decision making, offering compliments, offering thanks, summarizing, smiling, asking open-ended questions, being respectful, doing something entertaining or interesting, being positive about the organization, and summarizing results of the meeting near the end. Four leader behaviors were positively associated with attendees' perceptions of meeting satisfaction and productivity: moving the meeting along, encouraging participation in general, encouraging participation in decision making, and summarizing decisions made during the meeting. Being positive about the organization and summarizing an attendee's comments were only related to attendee satisfaction. On the other hand, arriving before the start of the meeting, speaking succinctly, and smiling multiple times were only related to perceptions of meeting productivity.

Researchers also explored how specific leadership styles and influential conceptualizations of leadership more generally function in the meeting context from participative versus directive leaders (Mroz et al., 2018), to transformational leaders (Lehmann-Willenbrock, Meinecke, Rowold, & Kauffeld, 2015), to providing consideration or initiating structure (Odermatt et al., 2016). Mroz et al. (2018) demonstrated via a survey of actual meeting attendees and an experiment that meeting attendees viewed participative meeting leaders as warmer and more competent than directive meeting leaders. Participative meeting leaders encouraged others to participate and share their thoughts, whereas directive leaders assigned tasks and goals. Across all meeting types studied (decision making, information sharing, and problem-solving meetings) attendees viewed participative versus directive leaders as warmer and more competent at conducting meetings.

From the lens of transformational leadership, Lehmann-Willenbrock et al. (2015) investigated the social dynamics explaining why certain leader behaviors improve team functioning in meetings. Using a sample of 30 video-recorded meetings from two organizations, researchers coded transformational leadership style and verbal interactions among the team within the framework of the act-4teams coding scheme (Kauffeld, Lehmann-Willenbrock, & Meinecke, 2018). Transformational leadership improved team meeting success by boosting problem-solving communication among team members, but only to the extent that leaders focused on solutions. When leaders proposed ideas and solutions, the team followed with similar statements, and counterproductive behaviors (such as complaining, going off-topic, and criticizing others) were reduced.

Contrary to several other papers (e.g., Malouff et al., 2012; Myrsiades, 2000; Perkins, 2009; Van der Haar et al., 2017), Odermatt et al. (2016) reported that meeting leader consideration was positively related to perceptions of meeting effectiveness, but initiating structure was not. Authors gathered data from 63 team

meetings and asked half the meeting attendees to rate the behaviors of the leader and the other half to rate meeting processes and outcomes. Results indicated that leader consideration was positively associated with perceived meeting satisfaction and that relational meeting procedures mediated this effect. Considerate leadership behaviors contributed to enhanced meeting satisfaction by improving perceptions of the frequency of relational meeting procedures such as having open discussions, listening to one another, and coming to a consensus on decisions. One reason for the conflicting findings may be differences in method. Odermatt et al. (2016) collected leader behaviors and attendee perceptions of the meeting from the meeting attendees, whereas other studies examined actual leader behaviors.

Although these studies provide an important start in investigating leadership in meetings, many questions remain. For example, what leadership theories apply to the meeting context most explicitly and why? How does the meeting context impact the choice of leadership style within a meeting context (e.g., participative vs directive in a noisy vs quiet meeting space)? How do differences in diversity (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, etc.) impact different stylistic approaches to leading meetings generally? Do different types of meetings require different types of leaders? These questions and others drive the subsequent review of leadership theories and meeting context issues. We now turn our attention to the leadership theories to set the stage for a discussion of meetings and leadership to further ideas for moving the research and practice of meetings forward in answering some of the forgoing questions.

LEADERSHIP THEORIES

The goal of the following overview is not to provide a comprehensive review of all leadership theories that have been introduced in the (recent) literature. In fact, the proliferation of leadership theories – an old but consistent issue in leadership research (Lord, Day, Zaccaro, Avolio, & Eagly, 2017; Meuser et al., 2016) – makes such an endeavor almost impossible. Neither does this section try to exhaustively cover those that are being presented. Rather, our aim is to remind the reader of the core tenets of the selected leadership theories to allow for an informed consideration of the propositions that are presented at the end of our discussion of each theory. We focus on theories of leader behavior because the observable nature makes leaders' behavior a direct and most salient source of leadership influence. The interested reader is referred to the literature listed in Table 10.2 as starting point to dive deeper into the respective theories.

We selected the leadership theories covered in this section based on their prominence in the scientific literature, recent trends in leadership research, and the aim to cover a diverse selection of behavioral leadership theories. The leadership theories in this section are: The Full Range of Leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990, 1994), Charismatic Leadership (House & Howell, 1992), Servant Leadership (Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008), and Exploitative Leadership (Schmid, Pircher Verdorfer, & Peus, 2019). In addition, we introduce a more follower-centric perspective on leadership that considers leadership to only be possible if followership

Table 10.2. Overview of Included Leadership Theories.

Theory	Leadership Styles and Description	Key References
Full range of leadership	*Transactional* leadership focuses mostly on the exchange of something important between leader and follower. *Transformational* leadership aims to provide motivation and empowerment to followers and to strive after collective, higher-reaching goals. *Laissez-faire* leadership is characterized by passivity and lack of action	Bass and Avolio (1990), Judge and Piccolo (2004), and Podsakoff et al. (1990)
Charismatic leadership	*Socialized* leaders empower their employees to contribute toward collective goals and foster open communication. *Personalized* leaders use their personal allure to exploit their employees through authoritarian behavior to serve their own interests	Howell (1988) and Conger and Kanungo (1998)
Servant leadership	*Servant* leaders are caring and concerned about others and seek to improve individuals, the organization, and wider society. The leader acts in accordance with a strong moral purpose	Eva et al. (2018) and Parris and Peachey (2013)
Exploitative leadership	*Exploitative* leaders are destructive and act out of self-interest. Their main goal is to promote their own agendas and self-interests by exploiting their employees	Schmid et al. (2019)
The role of followers	*Followership* research focuses on followers' identity and behavior in the construction of leadership and their impact on leaders	DeRue and Ashford (2010) and Uhl-Bien et al. (2014)

is also taking place (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). For each theory, we first present a short overview followed by concrete propositions regarding the application of the described behaviors in meetings.

Full Range of Leadership

The full range of leadership model is considered to be one of the most researched leadership models to date (e.g., Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). It has its beginning with Burns (1978) writing on the distinction between managers, who have influence in organizations by holding positions of power, and the more charismatic leaders, who influence and motivate others through an appealing vision and trust. Thus, the full range of leadership model brought back the feeling that there is something more to leadership than simply

the mechanistic view of previous theories (e.g., contingency theories, Fiedler, 1964; House, 1971) and recognized the importance of emotions, morals, and symbols for leadership effectiveness, making it immensely popular (Yukl, 2002). The elements of transformational and transactional leadership were described in form of a scientific theory, that was later expanded to include laissez-faire leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990, 1994). The latter is defined as the absence of leadership and is generally considered to be ineffective and even harmful in some situations (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). Transformational and transactional leadership are often seen as complementary constructs that are both necessary to reach intended goals, with transformational leaders able to bring about increased employee performance beyond the expected results from the mere exchange relationship of transactional leadership – the so-called "augmentation hypothesis" (Waldman et al., 1990). Transactional leadership behaviors are considered to be effective in stable environments with low task complexity, low need to innovate, and a preference toward risk avoidance, while transformational leadership is focused on shaping the future and seeking opportunities, often by challenging the status quo.

Transactional leadership focuses mostly on the exchange of something important between leader and follower, like employees' performance for the rewards controlled by leaders or mutual support (Burns, 1978). It consists of three dimensions (Bass & Avolio, 1990): *Contingent reward* relies on clearly defined mutual expectations between employees and leader. Leaders set forth well-defined goals and employees have a clear understanding of the rewards they can expect if these goals are met. *Leadership by exception-active* means that the leader ensures that processes and procedures run without disruptions and is willing to take corrective measures, if needed. On the other hand, *leadership by exception-passive* describes a leader who only intervenes if there is a problem or demanding issue. It is characterized to a large extent by passivity of the leader.

Transformational leadership's aim is to provide motivation and empowerment to followers and to strive after collective, higher-reaching goals (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Burns, 1978). The professional and personal development of employees plays an important part as leaders prepare their followers to take over new tasks in the future. Bass and Avolio (1990) describe transformational leadership to consist of four dimensions, although other notable conceptualizations with different numbers of dimensions exist (e.g., Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004) The dimension of *individual consideration* is about individual support and encouragement for employees. The leader acts as a coach or mentor for his or her employees. By delegating tasks, providing opportunities for participation in decision-making processes, and providing constructive feedback, leaders give their employees chances for individual learning and development. The leader is well familiar with each employee and knows their strengths, development needs, and wishes. *Intellectual stimulation* promotes creative thinking among employees. The leader questions assumptions and processes and is an advocate of openness in thinking. Leaders encourage employees to create their own solutions to work challenges. *Inspirational motivation* is visible in the communication of forward-looking visions and overarching goals. The leader has an idea of future developments, derives concrete goals from them and thus places

day-to-day tasks in a larger context. Leaders inspire their employees to strive toward the goals set and provide support. *Idealized influence* describes the extent to which leaders demonstrate qualities and abilities that are worth admiring, and the extent to which they inspire employees time and again. The leader acts as an important role model. Leaders' words and deeds match, they walk the talk, and are willing to take on more than the employees.

The full range of leadership model has been researched in a variety of organizational contexts and levels (Bass, 2008). All four dimensions of transformational leadership and contingent reward have been found to be related to leader effectiveness, although the latter's relationship with effectiveness is usually smaller (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). The remaining two dimensions of transactional leadership have not shown consistent results with leader effectiveness (Lowe et al., 1996). Employees' trust toward their leaders represents a core mediating mechanism for the influence of transformational leadership (e.g., Braun, Peus, Weisweiler, & Frey, 2013). The behaviors described by the full range of leadership model show this same pattern of results for most outcomes focused on employee performance, well-being, and also innovation in different context and across cultures (e.g., Bass, 2008; Den Hartog et al., 1999; Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Full range of leadership and workplace meetings. Aspects of the full range of leadership model have already been studied in the meeting environment. Lehmann-Willenbrock et al. (2015), for example, found that transformational leaders stimulate team success by improving problem-solving communication between team members and by proposing solutions, which prompted team members to do the same at the expense of complaining, going off-topic, or criticizing others. However, that paper investigates only a small component of the full range of leadership model, and much work remains to be done to explore how the model may function with respect to leadership in meetings.

Given that the full range of leadership includes a necessary interplay between transformational behaviors and transactional behaviors, both should be considered within the context of meetings. From the transformational perspective, there is some evidence that such behaviors are beneficial to meeting success when they occur while the team is not under a severe time pressure, but rather when the team must react to novel situations and environments (Van der Haar et al., 2017). It is possible that the moderating effect of the team's environment and task complexity – stable vs unstable, low vs high complexity, low vs high-risk tolerance, etc. – is a key factor driving some of the conflicting findings in the meeting leadership domain. For example, Odermatt et al. (2016) found that initiating structure was not related to meeting satisfaction or perceived performance, yet Van der Haar et al. (2017) reported that structuring behaviors were very important for team success and learning. In addition, numerous papers suggest that key aspects of transformational leadership, such as providing support and encouragement and generally behaving in a participative mindset, are positively related to improved attendee perceptions of meetings (Mroz et al., 2018; Odermatt et al., 2016; Yoerger, Crowe, & Allen, 2015).

One key difference between these studies is that some explored routine meetings in low-pressure environments (e.g., Odermatt et al., 2016), whereas the other explored meetings of emergency responders in a high-pressure situation across

multiple time points (Van der Haar et al., 2017). The combination of these papers and the full range of leadership leads us to the following proposal:

> *P1*. Situational factors regarding the complexity of a team's task and external pressures for action moderate the relationship between the full range of leadership and meeting outcomes (i.e., satisfaction and effectiveness), such that transformational behaviors are most effective in unstable situations compared to stable situations, whereas transactional behaviors are most effective in stable versus unstable situations.

Charismatic Leadership

Charismatic leadership is closely related to the dimensions of transformational leadership (House & Howell, 1992; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Both locate the source of leaders' influence in their emotionally appealing behavior that provides a sense of meaning to employees as opposed to transactional leadership's rational approach focused on mutual exchange (Mumford, Antes, Caughron, & Frierich, 2008; Shamir et al., 1993; Walter & Bruch, 2009). A core distinction to transformational leadership is that charisma is often seen as a personal quality of an individual leader while the vision that is core to transformational leadership describes a desirable end-state and can be transferred between leaders (Judge, Woolf, Hurst, & Livingston, 2006). According to charismatic leadership theory, leaders are able to move employees away from self-interest toward a focus on collective goals (House & Howell, 1992; Shamir et al., 1993). They motivate employees to follow the leader's mission even if it requires considerable sacrifices. This is done by creating a collective identity among employees and making the work necessary to achieve the leader's mission appear meaningful. Charismatic behavior offers insights into leaders' values and self-concept leading employees to attribute extraordinary qualities to the leader (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). A charismatic communication style characterized as dynamic, vivid, and expressive is key (Judge et al., 2006). Employees' confidence and trust in the leader, their adoption of the leader's values, and their emotional relationship are core elements of charismatic leadership.

Two prototypical categories of charismatic leaders have been defined, although they are not exclusive (Howell, 1988; Howell & Shamir, 2005; Popper, 2002; Samnani & Singh, 2013). *Socialized charismatic leaders* empower their employees to contribute toward collective goals and foster open communication. Employees derive their own identity and values from the leaders' mission through the process of social identification. They actively participate in the shaping of the team values and goals and critically evaluate the leaders' mission and related behaviors. Thus, employees' acceptance of their leaders is dependent on the leader's behavior matching the ethical standards and values of the employees. *Personalized charismatic leaders*, on the other hand, use their personal allure to exploit their employees through authoritarian behavior to serve their own interests. Employees' identification with the person of the leader (instead of the mission and values they represent) increases their dependence on the leader and opens them up to manipulation. Employees put their leaders on a pedestal and are more prone to blind obedience going so far as to exert group pressure on fellow employees to conform

to the leaders' goals. Even if not originally intended, the idolization in personalized charismatic relationships can push leaders to disregard ethical consideration in their behavior due to a resulting sense of omnipotence. Thus, socialized charismatic relationships are generally considered to be beneficial for employee performance and well-being, while personalized charismatic relationships represent the dark side of charisma and are likely to have harmful consequences.

Charismatic leadership and workplace meetings. Charismatic leadership presents unique challenges when applied to workplace meetings. A socialized charismatic leader who leads employees to commit to a shared vision and a policy of open communication may create a meeting environment with few counterproductive behaviors (e.g., complaining, criticizing, and expressing disinterest of futility), to the extent that the leader avoids those behaviors. Some evidence for this suggestion exists in that leaders who focused on providing ideas and solutions stimulated the same behavior among team members (Lehmann-Willenbrock et al., 2015), and this relationship may be strengthened when the leader is charismatic.

One key question that must be answered before examining charismatic leadership behaviors in meetings, however, is what are the specific behaviors of charismatic leaders in meetings? The behaviors may partially align with the values of the leader, team, and organization, and there is also likely to be considerable overlap with the meeting behaviors of transformational leaders (Shamir et al., 1993).

Personalized charismatic leadership will likely manifest itself in meetings in a much different manner when compared to socialized charismatic leadership. Personalized charismatic leaders obtain and maintain their power by building employees' dependence on the leader, which can sometimes result in unethical behavior and discord among a team (Howell & Shamir, 2005). A team that is largely obedient to an individual leader, rather than to the vision or mission espoused by that leader, may be especially prone to quashing dissent and enforcing conformity. This different dynamic among the team and the leader could have significant consequences for meetings and meeting processes. We propose the following:

> *P2*. Teams led by personalized charismatic leaders in meetings will engage in fewer behaviors representative of open dissent and reasoned disagreement, which could result in lower team performance outcomes from the meeting, especially when the task is unclear or novel.

Servant Leadership

A morally focused leadership style is servant leadership. In contrast to other leadership concepts, servant leadership focuses on creating valuable outcomes for the multiple stakeholders of a leader (Lemoine et al., 2019). Greenleaf's (1997) original idea was based on his conviction that leaders needed to be more caring and concerned about others to improve organizations and the society at large. In line with other leadership styles based in morality, servant leadership is related to positive employee outcomes (e.g., Liden et al., 2008; Tang et al., 2016). This includes also aspects of employees' lives not connected directly with their performance at work (e.g., work–family positive spillover). Uniquely to servant leadership, it has also been found to lead to a customer-focused culture in organizations

(e.g., Chen, Zhu, & Zhou, 2015; Liden et al., 2014) which confirms its focus on the benefit of internal as well as external stakeholders.

While different descriptions of servant leadership exist, many agree that its core is represented by an other-orientation prioritizing the individual needs of stakeholders that stems from the self-concept of the leader (Eva, Robin, Sendjaya, van Dierendonck, & Liden, 2018; Liden et al, 2008; van Dierendonck, 2011). The leader is a servant first, which is seen as a precondition of accepting responsibility for the development and success of employees. Humility and authenticity have been named as key aspects of servant leadership as has the ability to understand others' perspectives and show empathy. Servant leaders' aim is to establish long-lasting relationships in an effort to get to know their employees and ensure transparency in their dealings. Finally, stewardship is commonly mentioned as an element of servant leadership. Leaders are both role models and caretakers holding their organization in trust.

Empirical studies on servant leadership have employed a variety of different measures. Nonetheless, results generally agree that it represents an effective approach to improve employee and organizational success and well-being alike (Parris & Peachey, 2013; van Dierendonck, 2011). According to Parris and Peachey's (2013) systematic review, servant leadership supports trust, justice, and collaboration in teams, thereby enhancing team and leader effectiveness. The positive work climate created by servant leaders in turn fosters employees' well-being. A core tenet of servant leadership stating that employees of servant leaders feel encouraged to also adopt a servant approach to their interactions at work has received support as well. This not only increases helping behavior toward their colleagues but also improves customer experiences (e.g., Hunter et al., 2013; Liden et al., 2014; Newman, Schwarz, Cooper, & Sendjaya, 2017).

Servant leadership and workplace meetings. Servant leaders likely engage in behaviors before and during the meetings that demonstrate this form of leadership. For example, before the meeting, a servant leader would want to ensure the meeting room has adequate space, seating, lighting, and is generally comfortable (Greenleaf, 1977). Additionally, they may want to ensure the meeting has a purpose, and may be more attentive to the agenda as that will impact who should or should not be included in the meeting generally. Further, during the meeting, the notion of humility and stewardship begin to be integral behaviors by servant leaders. Assuming they are the meeting leader (or an involved attendee), they are stewards of others' time in the meeting (Rogelberg, 2019). As such, they will endeavor to ensure the meeting runs smoothly from a time perspective, including starting/ending on time and running the meeting agenda according to time stamps, when provided.

Assuming the aforementioned behaviors do emerge from servant leaders, then they are essentially doing best practices as it pertains to two major areas of meeting research. First, they would be attempting to design the meeting effectively (Cohen, Rogelberg, Allen, & Luong, 2011). Previous work on meeting design characteristics suggests that providing comfort and support (technical features, etc.) is important. That is, designing meetings effectively includes the physical space and the logistical patterns (Cohen et al., 2011). Second, as stewards of

others' time, servant leaders who lead meetings would recognize meeting lateness as a problem and seek to mitigate it (Allen, Lehmann-Willenbrock, & Rogelberg, 2018). The work by Allen et al. (2018) confirms that late meetings are less satisfying, effective, and group performance suffers. Therefore, by both caring about the design and being stewards of others, servant leaders may augment meeting experiences of themselves and others. Thus, the following proposition is furthered:

> *P3*. Servant leadership is positively related to meeting outcomes, particularly when servant leaders design their meetings well and are stewards of others' time.

Exploitative Leadership

On the opposite end of the leadership spectrum included in this overview lies exploitative leadership (Schmid et al., 2019). The argument that negative interactions and events have a stronger impact on individuals than positive ones (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer, & Vohs, 2001), called "negativity bias" in social research, warrants the inclusion of at least one theory of destructive leadership describing behaviors with potentially harmful consequences (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). We selected exploitative leadership to represent the "dark" side of leadership because it is lower in its degree of open hostility compared to more aggressive behaviors covered by other theories (e.g., abusive supervision; Schyns & Schilling, 2013; Tepper, 2000), but is likely much more prevalent in organizations (May, Peus, & Frey 2010). Exploitative leadership represents a form of destructive leader behavior based in leader self-interest as opposed to the hostile abuse of employees, for example, through humiliation and intimidation, or organization-directed destructive behavior like theft (Schmid, Pircher Verdorfer, & Peus, 2018; Schyns & Schilling, 2013). The main goal of exploitative leaders is to promote their own agendas and self-interests by exploiting their employees, whose only value to the leader is as a means to an end (Schmid et al., 2019). Leaders use the results of their employees' work to distinguish themselves and might even present it as their own. Leaders feel entitled to the work achievements of their employees, even if they did not contribute to them (De Cremer & Van Dijk, 2005; Stouten & Tripp, 2009). A development of subordinate employees does not take place, as they might leave the leader thereby losing their usefulness or even turn into competitors in the leader's advancement. Exploitative leadership is potentially less obvious to recognize than other destructive leader behaviors, as leaders might even act friendly in direct interactions with employees and encourage higher performance, while appropriating their work to further the leader's own aspirations behind the employees' backs.

Exploitative leadership includes five dimensions (Schmid et al., 2019): The first, *genuine egoistic behaviors*, includes a leader's assumption that he or she is naturally entitled to benefit from employees' work and that the leader's goals are more important than those of the employees. *Taking credit*, the second dimension, indicates that leaders do not share praise and pass others' work of as their own. Leaders *exerting pressure* burden their employees with undue workloads without considering their needs in an effort to reach their own goals, often doing so in an excessively encouraging way. *Manipulating*, the fourth dimension,

includes deceptive leader behaviors and leaders playing their followers off against each other. The final dimension, *undermining development*, describes how leaders might underchallenge followers passing on only repetitive and tedious tasks to prevent the career advancement of employees who are useful to them.

Exploitative leader behaviors are detrimental to employees' performance and well-being. They can increase the risk of burn-out in employees, lower employees' satisfaction and commitment to their organization, and push employees to commit deviant acts that actively damage their work and that of their colleagues (Schmid et al., 2019). Negative affect and turnover intentions have been found to be related to exploitative leadership as well (Schmid et al., 2018). Schmid et al. (2018) argue that employees with exploitative leaders might blame the leaders for their bad relationship, an external attribution, while other destructive leadership styles commonly result in employees blaming themselves. This could lead to significantly different behavioral reactions of employees faced with exploitative leaders. Particularly, different forms of workplace deviance might follow, with retaliatory behaviors like knowledge hiding and increases in self-interest being more likely for employees with exploitative leaders (Bamberger & Bacharach, 2006).

Exploitative leadership and workplace meetings. Exploitative leadership has the potential to severely impact employees' experiences of workplace meetings. There are two avenues that an exploitative leader may take with respect to meetings. First, the leader may use the meeting space to, in a sense, *enact* the five dimensions of the style of leadership by taking credit for others' work, assigning an undue amount of work (or assigning impossible goals) to individual employees or the team in a meeting, manipulating employees to engage in conflict with one another, and, in general, cementing power over employees. In this situation, the leader's behaviors are detrimental to the well-being and performance of the team. However, the leader's poor behaviors can also "infect" the behavior of individual team members, thereby promoting additional sources of counterproductive behaviors in the meeting environment. Meetings with this form of exploitative leader are likely to be especially toxic, not productive in achieving goals or making decisions, and generally a site for the team and leader to act out their negativity and conflict. In this case, we propose:

> *P4*. Meetings led by exploitative leaders will be characterized by counterproductive behaviors (from the leader and team), ultimately leading to poor perceptions of meeting satisfaction and meeting effectiveness, in addition to objectively poor meeting outcomes.

The second avenue an exploitative leader can follow in meetings is more subtle and may be less obvious. In this case, the leader acts friendly and encourages high performance with respect to the team and individual subordinates in a meeting. However, after the meeting, the leader seeks to undermine employees in other ways, reducing or changing decisions made in the meeting. In this case, it is possible that employees could view meetings as satisfactory, and there may be relatively few instances of counterproductive behaviors within the meeting context. However, the meetings themselves – and what happens during them – may ultimately have little impact on the work or performance of individuals and the

team. Specifically, decisions may appear to be made and settled within the meeting, and then the follow through on those decisions will be lacking, or the leader my unilaterally change the decision after the meeting without proper consultation or information sharing with employees. Thus, meetings become less effective at accomplishing the aims original ascribed to them due to the leadership style deployed by the leader.

> *P5*. Meetings led by exploitative leaders who engage in *undermining* and *manipulative* behaviors after the meeting will be characterized by positive interactions in the meetings, but actions agreed to in the meeting will have little follow-through.

The Role of Followers

Leadership theories have traditionally focused on the person or behavior of the leader, treating the follower merely as a recipient of leadership (Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). As such, employee outcomes like performance, satisfaction, or well-being are very common in leadership research (Hiller et al., 2011), but little is known about employees' follower behaviors and their influence. With a shifting research lens away from leader traits and toward leadership as a process, over the years, scholars have recognized that leadership can only exist in the interaction between leaders and followers (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Only recently, attention has turned toward the study of followership in itself (Carsten, Uhl-Bien, West, Patera, & McGregor, 2010; Sy, 2010). There are two common approaches to this research (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014): On the one-hand, the role-based approach considers the influence that followers have on leader performance or well-being – essentially a reversal of the research lens (Shamir, 2007). This requires the development of constructs and measures that currently only exist from a leader perspective with a new referent (e.g., shifting from perceived leader support to perceived follower support). The constructionist approach, on the other hand, sees leadership as being created by the interactions between leaders and followers (DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Nieberle & Braun, 2019). Thus, next to leader behaviors there are also follower behaviors that either facilitate or hamper the existence of leadership. This latter approach also explicitly recognizes that organizational superiors might show follower behaviors in their interactions with organizational subordinates, who might act as leaders. Leadership is seen as detached from an organizational hierarchy (for a comprehensive review see Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

This interest in the follower side has led to research into implicit followership theories (Sy, 2010) and renewed interest in implicit leadership theories (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004) in an effort to determine the characteristics of prototypical or ideal leaders and followers. With followers seen as active actors, followership behaviors have also received research attention. In their review, Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) present four categories of behaviors: obedience and subordination, resistance, proactive behaviors, and influence tactics. If leaders' and followers' understandings of their own and the other parties' roles do not match and the behaviors shown are not in accordance with expectations, followers experience stress and dissatisfaction (Carsten et al., 2010). The recognition of followers as active actors

has also sparked interest into their strategic behavior, particularly actions driven by dark traits like narcissism (Schyns, Wisse, & Sanders, 2018).

DeRue and Ashford (2010) argue that who is leader and who follower is determined through interaction with an actor claiming either a leader or follower role and the others granting that role by recognizing it and adjusting their own role to fit. Should the claiming and granting not fit together, leadership is not constructed. An experimental study found evidence, that observers' ratings of leadership of the leader differ depending on whether the follower accepted the leadership claim or not (Marchiondo, Myers, & Kopelman, 2015). On the other hand, this approach allows for flexible changes in one person's identity detaching the organizational position from the role inhabited in a specific situation. An interesting question hereby is whether every person has leader and follower roles as part of their own identity and how easily it is to switch between these (Braun, Zheng, & Lord, 2019; Sy & McCoy, 2014).

Although empirical research on followership is limited, first results are encouraging. Leroy, Anseel, Gardner, and Sels (2012) found that authentic followership is positively related to followers' work performance and this relationship is strengthened in the presence of authentic leadership. Thus, a congruent approach of leaders and followers toward their work appears particularly beneficial. Carsten and Uhl-Bien (2013) found that followers' strong belief that leadership is co-produced by leaders and followers lowers their obedience to an unethical leader request.

The role of followers and workplace meetings. Much of the research that has paired workplace meetings and leadership has taken a decidedly top-down approach toward the operationalization of leadership. This approach views leadership as something that happens *to* followers, yet, as the increasing focus on followers in the leadership domain suggests, the dynamic interplay between follower and leader is what may truly create "leadership." For example, the constructionist approach views leadership as being created by the interactions *between* leaders and followers, and there are follower behaviors that either facilitate or hamper the existence of leadership (DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Nieberle & Braun, 2019).

Their experience in meetings is likely to influence individuals' identity. We argue, that someone who receives the opportunity to take on a leader role in multiple meetings may over time include an element of leader identity into their overall self-concept. Hierarchical supervisors within organizations who grant such roles to their employees may, thus, contribute to their employees' personal development. In addition, we expect that agreement as to who takes on a leader role and who a follower role within a meeting greatly influences the meeting's effectiveness and the satisfaction of the participants. Too many leaders, no leader, or disagreement may well lead to aimlessness and confusion. This is not to say that the roles may not fluidly adjust throughout a meeting, but that the claiming and granting within the meeting participants needs to match (DeRue & Ashford, 2010) for a successful meeting to take place.

As one of the primary sites wherein followers and leaders interact, workplace meetings may be a particularly relevant space to explore how the behavior of followers can enhance or undermine leaders in meetings. Of particular importance in the relationship between followers and their leader is the state of agreement and clarity among all involved as to the specific *roles* of the leaders and followers.

All participants will bring their own implicit expectations of leaders and followers to the meeting (Epitropaki, & Martin, 2004; Sy, 2010). Following from Uhl-Bien et al.'s (2014) review, follower behaviors vis-á-vis leaders include obedience and subordination, resistance, proactive behaviors, and influence tactics. If leaders and followers do not share a similar expectation of followers' behavior, the followers may experience stress and dissatisfaction (Carsten et al., 2010). In a meeting environment, alignment between leader and follower role expectations is especially important, as misalignment could lead to unproductive or conflict-prone meetings. For example, suppose a subordinate views that their appropriate role in a meeting is to agree with the leader, listen, and only offer thoughts when specifically and directly asked. The leader, on the other hand, may view the role of subordinates in meetings as characterized by the open and honest exchange of thoughts and ideas. In this case, the leader may not prepare or strategize ways to directly request for subordinates to participate, as it is something expected and assumed. As such, we propose:

> *P6*. Misalignment between leaders' and followers' expectations for their respective roles in meetings will be associated with decreased meeting satisfaction and effectiveness.

P6 speaks to the alignment between leader and follower expectations in meetings. However, the fact that leaders and followers *agree* does not mean that they are in agreement on the most effective behaviors in meetings. Indeed, some follower behaviors, such as obedience and subordination (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), may negatively affect the objective quality of meetings, as openly exchanging ideas and sharing information are critical components of solving problems and making high-quality decisions (Lehmann-Willenbrock, Beck, & Kauffeld, 2016). Therefore, we propose the following, that seeks to extend *P6*.

> *P7*. Follower behaviors of obedience and subordination will be negatively related to meeting effectiveness, especially in problem solving and decision-making meetings when sharing alternative viewpoints is especially important. This effect will be moderated by leader–follower alignment on role expectations such that the relationship will be more strongly negative when followers and leaders *disagree* about whether followers should be obedient and subordinate versus when leaders and followers agree.

CONCLUSION

Leadership in meetings represents a small but growing area of research within the broader realm of workplace meetings (itself a small and growing area of inquiry). In this chapter, we reviewed work to-date that fuses leadership and various aspects of the meeting experience. Workplace meetings between leaders and their followers are one of the primary occasions where leadership occurs between a leader and *multiple* followers concurrently. In addition, meetings represent an interesting context in which to study followership or shared leadership, as there are multiple followers interacting with one another and the formal leader at the same time (in most meetings).

From our review, research pairing meetings and leadership is limited, as we identified seven studies for review in this chapter. Some of these papers (Malouff et al., 2012; Myrsiades, 2000; Perkins, 2009) are more qualitative in nature, focusing on specific leadership behaviors related to conducting successful meetings. These papers largely avoided discussions on leadership theory, and were instead ground-up, observational approaches. Other papers (Lehmann-Willenbrock et al., 2015; Mroz et al., 2018; Odermatt et al., 2016; Van der Haar et al., 2017) explored leadership and meetings from a theoretical and quantitative viewpoint, yet the papers are largely independent of on another and do not directly – and perhaps even indirectly – contribute to a shared and specific "meetings and leadership" body of knowledge. Overall, the research pairing leadership and workplace meetings is fragmented. We hope that by exposing readers to the current work on meetings and leadership in addition to well-researched, broad leadership theories, researchers will begin to coalesce around a set of topics and remaining unanswered questions.

To help guide future research pairing leadership and meetings, we provided several propositions throughout this chapter. To do that, we selected several prevalent and actively-researched theories from the leadership domain to which an injection of a meetings-specific lens could be beneficial to understanding the leadership theory *and* how leadership is enacted in meetings. We examined the full range of leadership model, charismatic leadership, servant leadership, exploitative leadership, and followership, and we derived testable propositions that reflect how the study of each of those theories could continue with a focus on workplace meetings. Although this chapter represents the first systematic pairing of workplace meetings and leadership research, and we have identified a few areas for additional inquiry through the propositions, many other fruitful areas remain to join the two literatures.

Lastly, from our review of the meetings research and prevalent leadership theories, we are also able to generate practical recommendations for managers and leaders who facilitate meetings. Leaders should allow attendees to be a part of the decision-making process in meetings (Mroz et al., 2018), actively encourage everyone to participate (Malouf et al., 2012), and intervene to disrupt dysfunctional communication patterns (Odermatt et al., 2016).

REFERENCES

Allen, J. A., Beck, T., Scott, C. W., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2014). Understanding workplace meetings: A qualitative taxonomy of meeting purposes. *Management Research Review*, *37*, 791–814. doi:10.1108/MRR-03-2013-0067

Allen, J. A., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Rogelberg, S. G. (Eds.). (2015). *The Cambridge handbook of meeting science*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Allen, J. A., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2018). Let's get this meeting started: Meeting lateness and actual meeting outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*, 1008–1021. doi:10.1002/job.2276

Allen, J. A., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2013). Manager-led group meetings: A context for promoting employee engagement. *Group & Organization Management*, *38*, 543–569. doi:10.1177/1059601113503040

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 261–295. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00030-4

Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 801–823. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.09.003

Bamberger, P. A., & Bacharach, S. B. (2006). Abusive supervision and subordinate problem drinking: Taking resistance, stress and subordinate personality into account. *Human Relations*, *59*, 723–752. doi:10.1177/0018726706066852

Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, & managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, *4*, 231–272.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, *5*, 323–370. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.5.4.323

Bommer, W. H., Rich, G. A., & Rubin, R. S. (2005). Changing attitudes about change: Longitudinal effects of transformational leader behavior on employee cynicism about organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*, 733–753. doi:10.1002/job.342

Braun, S., Peus, C., Weisweiler, S., & Frey, D. (2013). Transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and team performance: A multilevel mediation model of trust. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *24*, 270–283. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.11.006

Braun, S., Zheng, X., & Lord, R.G. (2019, May). Who will I be if I'm betwixt and between? A review and extension of the literature on identity dynamics. Presented at the 19th Congress of the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology, Turin, Italy.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Carsten, M. K., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2013). Ethical followership: An examination of followership beliefs and crimes of obedience. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *20*, 49–61. doi:10.1177/1548051812465890

Carsten, M. K., Uhl-Bien, M., West, B. J., Patera, J. L., & McGregor, R. (2010). Exploring social constructions of followership: A qualitative study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*, 543–562. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.015

Chen, Z., Zhu, J., & Zhou, M. (2015). How does a servant leader fuel the service fire? A multilevel model of servant leadership, individual self identity, group competition climate, and customer service performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*, 511–521. doi:10.1037/a0038036

Cohen, M. A., Rogelberg, S. G., Allen, J. A., & Luong, A. (2011). Meeting design characteristics and attendee perceptions of staff/team meeting quality. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *15*, 90–104. doi:10.1037/a0021549

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

De Cremer, D., & Van Dijk, E. (2005). When and why leaders put themselves first: Leader behaviour in resource allocations as a function of feeling entitled. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *35*, 553–563. doi:10.1002/ejsp.260

Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Abdalla, I. A., ... & Akande, B. E. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 219–256. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00018-1

DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. J. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*, 627–647. doi:10.5465/amr.35.4.zok627

Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2004). Implicit leadership theories in applied settings: Factor structure, generalizability, and stability over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 293–310. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.2.293

Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2018). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *30*, 111–132. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004

Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leader effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 149–190). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.

Hiller, N. J., DeChurch, L. A., Murase, T., & Doty, D. (2011). Searching for outcomes of leadership: A 25-year review. *Journal of Management*, *37*, 1137–1177. doi:10.1177/0149206310393520

Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. (2008). An examination of "nonleadership": From laissez-faire leadership to leader reward omission and punishment omission. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*, 1234–1248. doi:10.1037/a0012875

House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *16*, 321–339. doi:10.2307/2391905

House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *3*, 81–108. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(92)90028-E

Howell, J. M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: Socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *The Jossey-Bass management series. Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 213–236). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, *30*, 96–112. doi:10.5465/amr.2005.15281435

Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Perry, S. J., Witt, L. A., Penney, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013). Servant leaders inspire servant followers: Antecedents and outcomes for employees and the organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *24*, 316–331. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.12.001

Judge, T. A., Fluegge Woolf, E., Hurst, C., & Livingston, B. (2006). Charismatic and transformational leadership: A review and an agenda for future research. *Zeitschrift für Arbeits-und Organisationspsychologie [German Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology]*, *50*, 203–214. doi:10.1026/0932-4089.50.4.203

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 755–768. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Kauffeld, S., & Lehmann-Willenbrock, N. (2012). Meetings matter: Effects of team meetings on team and organizational success. *Small Group Research*, *43*, 130–158. doi:10.1177/1046496411429599

Kauffeld, S., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Meinecke, A. L. (2018). The advanced interaction analysis for teams (act4teams) coding scheme. In E. Brauner, M. Boos, & M. Kolbe (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of group interaction analysis* (pp. 422–431). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Keith, E. (2015, December 4). *55 million: A fresh look at the number, effectiveness, and cost of meetings in the U.S.* [Blog]. Lucid Meetings. Retrieved from https://blog.lucidmeetings.com/blog/fresh-look-number-effectiveness-cost-meetings-in-us

Kinicki, A. J., & Vecchio, R. P. (1994). Influences on the quality of supervisor–subordinate relations: The role of time-pressure, organizational commitment, and locus of control. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *15*, 75–82. doi:10.1002/job.4030150108

Knipfer, K., Schreiner, E., Schmid, E., & Peus, C. (2018). The performance of pre-founding entrepreneurial teams: The importance of learning and leadership. *Applied Psychology*, *67*, 401–427. doi:10.1111/apps.12126

Landis, B. (2016). Personality and social networks in organizations: A review and future directions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *37*, 107–121. doi:10.1002/job.2004

Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., Beck, S. J., & Kauffeld, S. (2016). Emergent team roles in organizational meetings: Identifying communication patterns via cluster analysis. *Communication Studies*, *67*, 37–57. doi:10.1080/10510974.2015.1074087

Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., Meinecke, A. L., Rowold, J., & Kauffeld, S. (2015). How transformational leadership works during team interactions: A behavioral process analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *26*, 1017–1033. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.07.003

Lemoine, G. J., Hartnell, C. A., & Leroy, H. (2019). Taking stock of moral approaches to leadership: An integrative review of ethical, authentic, and servant leadership. *Academy of Management Annals*, *13*, 148–187. doi:10.5465/annals.2016.0121

Leroy, H., Anseel, F., Gardner, W. L., & Sels, L. (2015). Authentic leadership, authentic followership, basic need satisfaction, and work role performance: A cross-level study. *Journal of Management*, *41*, 1677–1697. doi:10.1177/0149206312457822

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*, 1434–1452. doi:10.5465/amj.2013.0034

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 161–177. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006

Lord, R. G., Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Eagly, A. H. (2017). Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*, 434–451. doi:10.1037/apl0000089

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *7*, 385–425. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90027-2

Malouff, J. M., Calic, A., McGrory, C. M., Murrell, R. L., & Schutte, N. S. (2012). Evidence for a needs-based model of organizational-meeting leadership. *Current Psychology*, *31*, 35–48. doi:10.1007/s12144-012-9129-2

Marchiondo, L. A., Myers, C. G., & Kopelman, S. (2015). The relational nature of leadership identity construction: How and when it influences perceived leadership and decision-making. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *26*, 892–908. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.06.006

May, D., Peus, C., & Frey, D. 2010. Negative Führung: Merkmale, Konsequenzen und Bezüge zu konstruktiver Führung [Negative leadership: Characteristics, consequences and relation to constructive leadership]. Presented at the 7th Workshop of the Section for Work and Organizational Psychology of the German Psychological Society, Münster, Germany.

Meuser, J. D., Gardner, W. L., Dinh, J. E., Hu, J., Liden, R. C., & Lord, R. G. (2016). A network analysis of leadership theory: The infancy of integration. *Journal of Management*, *42*, 1374–1403. doi:10.1177/0149206316647099

Mroz, J. E., Yoerger, M., & Allen, J. A. (2018). Leadership in workplace meetings: The intersection of leadership styles and follower gender. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *25*, 309–322. doi:10.1177/1548051817750542

Mumford, M. D., Antes, A. L., Caughron, J. J., & Friedrich, T. L. (2008). Charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leadership: Multi-level influences on emergence and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 144–160. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.002

Myrsiades, L. (2000). Meeting sabotage: Met and conquered. *Journal of Management Development*, *19*, 870–885. doi:10.1108/02621710010379182

Newlund, D. (2012, June 19). Make your meetings worth everyone's time. *USA Today*. Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/USCP/PNI/Business/2012-06-20-PNI0620biz-career-getting-aheadPNIBrd_ST_U.htm

Newman, A., Schwarz, G., Cooper, B., & Sendjaya, S. (2017). How servant leadership influences organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of LMX, empowerment, and proactive personality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *145*, 49–62. doi:10.1007/s10551-015-2827-6

Nieberle, K., & Braun, S. (2019, May). Co-creating leadership? A qualitative study of the dynamic relational processes in teams. Presented at the 19th Congress of the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology, Turin, Italy.

Odermatt, I., König, C. J., Kleinmann, M., Nussbaumer, R., Rosenbaum, A., Olien, J. L., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2016). On leading meetings. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *24*, 189–200. doi:10.1177/1548051816655992

Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2013). A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *113*, 377–393. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1322-6

Perkins, R. D. (2009). How executive coaching can change leader behavior and improve meeting effectiveness: An exploratory study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *61*, 298–318. doi:10.1037/a0017842

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *1*, 107–142. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7

Popper, M. (2002). Narcissism and attachment patterns of personalized and socialized charismatic leaders. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *19*, 797–809. doi:10.1177/0265407502196004

Porter, M. E., & Nohria, N. (2018). How CEOs manage time. *Harvard Business Review*, *96*(4), 41–51.

Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 329–354. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.009

Rogelberg, S. G. (2019). *The surprising science of meetings*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rogelberg, S. G., Scott, C., & Kello, J. (2007). The science and fiction of meetings. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *48*(2), 18–21.

Samnani, A. K., & Singh, P. (2013). When leaders victimize: The role of charismatic leaders in facilitating group pressures. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *24*, 189–202. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.10.006

Schmid, E. A., Pircher Verdorfer, A., & Peus, C. V. (2018). Different shades–different effects? Consequences of different types of destructive leadership. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*, 1289. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01289

Schmid, E. A., Pircher Verdorfer, A., & Peus, C. (2019). Shedding light on leaders' self-interest: Theory and measurement of exploitative leadership. *Journal of Management*, *45*, 1401–1433. doi: 10.1177/0149206317707810

Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *24*, 138–158. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001

Schyns, B., Wisse, B., & Sanders, S. (2018). Shady strategic behavior: Recognizing strategic behavior of dark triad followers. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *33*, 234–249. doi:10.5465/amp.2017.0005

Shamir, B. (2007). From passive recipients to active co-producers: Followers' roles in the leadership process. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. C. Bligh, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *Follower-centered perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R. Meindl* (pp. ix–xxxix). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, *4*, 577–594. doi:10.1287/orsc.4.4.577

Short, J. (2009). The art of writing a review article. *Journal of Management*, *35*, 1312–1317. doi:10.1177/0149206309337489

Stouten, J., & Tripp, T. M. (2009). Claiming more than equality: Should leaders ask for forgiveness?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*, 287–298. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.03.002

Sy, T. (2010). What do you think of followers? Examining the content, structure, and consequences of implicit followership theories. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *113*, 73–84. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.06.001

Sy, T., & McCoy, T. (2014). Being both leaders and followers: Advancing a model of leader and follower role switching. In L. M. Lapierre & M. K. Carsten (Eds.), *Followership: What is it and why do people follow* (pp. 121–140). Bingley: Emerald.

Tang, G., Kwan, H. K., Zhang, D., & Zhu, Z. (2016). Work–family effects of servant leadership: The roles of emotional exhaustion and personal learning. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *137*, 285–297. doi:10.1007/s10551-015-2559-7

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*, 178–190. doi:10.5465/1556375

Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*, 83–104. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.007

Van der Haar, S., Koeslag-Kreunen, M., Euwe, E., & Segers, M. (2017). Team leader structuring for team effectiveness and team learning in command-and-control teams. *Small Group Research*, *48*, 215–248. doi:10.1177/1046496417689897

Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of management*, *37*, 1228–1261. doi:10.1177/0149206310380462

Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Adding to contingent-reward behavior: The augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. *Group & Organization Studies*, *15*, 381–394. doi:10.1177/105960119001500404

Walter, F., & Bruch, H. (2009). An affective events model of charismatic leadership behavior: A review, theoretical integration, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, *35*, 1428–1452. doi:10.1177/0149206309342468

Yoerger, M., Crowe, J., & Allen, J. A. (2015). Participate or else!: The effect of participation in decision-making in meetings on employee engagement. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *67*, 65–80. doi:10.1037/cpb0000029

Yukl, G. A. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.