

**Effective Followership Characteristics: Self-Regulation and Intercultural Communication
Competence**

A Thesis Presented for the
Master of Science
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Cassandra Ann Mellon
May 2016

Dedication

He who cannot be a good follower cannot be a good leader.

This thesis work is dedicated to all of those who have led me to become who I am. To my loving parents, through your constant worry, support, and dedication you have led me to find my passion, thank you. My grandparents, who taught me that respect, compassion, and a whole lot of grit goes a long way. A special feeling of gratitude to my grandmother, whose words led me to appreciate my experiences of being a follower by telling me “When someone else is the boss, they are the head. If they are the head, you be the neck, because the head can’t move without the neck.”

I also dedicate this work to my committee chair, Dr. Michelle Violanti. When you agreed to guide me through this journey I did not realize how much I was asking of you, how arduous this process would be, or how deeply I would come to respect and admire you. After our first meeting, I marveled at your uncanny ability to anchor my thoughts regarding the direction of this work. Through our journey, I have bombarded your email inbox, requested more of your time than I deserve, and I often surprised you with unannounced drop-in visits at your office. You always took the time to listen to my problems and offer me the expertise and guidance that was essential to the completion of this thesis—even while you were on vacation with your family! The genuine care and tailored approach you took to teaching me the lessons and insights of scholarly research must have been exhausting! For this, I am grateful beyond words and eternally in your debt. You are a remarkable leader and I am truly honored to be your follower. You are my hero.

To my youngest three stepchildren, Hudson, Sara, and Tom. Use your minds and follow your hearts to pave a path that is good and righteous. I will always love, support, and protect each of you.

Most of all, this work is dedicated to my husband, Mark. You've shown me that there are truly no limits to your love for me. Your confidence in me not only fueled my passion to pursue this work, but it also pushed me to test my abilities in higher education. You graciously allowed me to disrupt your sleep during late night or early morning hours to help me locate my thoughts and disentangle my words. When sleep deprivation stole my appetite for reason and blinded my judgment, you nourished me with knowledge. You kept me grounded with care and understanding, even when I refused to admit that I was floating towards a breakdown. The insurmountable sacrifices that you have made to inspire me, help me, and care for me are overwhelming. Thanking you will never be enough. Without you, I would be a famished soul without a home. Together, we will nourish a home filled with love, support, and protection. I will follow you anywhere, loving you with every piece of my soul for time and all eternity.

All my love,

Thank you.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude for my committee members, Dr. John Haas and Dr. Lisa Fall. Each of who has contributed greatly to the completion of this thesis as well as my growth throughout this graduate program. Dr. Haas, who has influenced me from the very beginning. His invaluable support and wise insights as my professor, mentor, supervisor, and friend led me to pursue higher education. He is the most earnest, joyful, and hard working human being to exist. He is an excellent leader who I am honored to follow. Thank you for believing in me, I am eternally grateful for your efforts! Dr. Fall, with her kind heart and attentive nature has always been eager and willing to help me understand the complexities of research and coursework. She has offered me the technical and editorial expertise that was essential to the completion of this thesis. I am beyond grateful for her constant encouragement and influence.

I must also express my gratitude and deep appreciation for Dr. Courtney Wright, who has always supported me. Her meticulous approach and radiating expertise has taught me incalculable lessons that are essential to understanding research and honing instructional dexterity. My growth and success as a scholar as well as an instructor would not have been possible without her influence and advanced intellect. She is an incredible leader. I could never thank you enough. I only hope to become half as brilliant and dedicated as you are.

I would also like to express my thanks and appreciation to my friends. Thank you for excusing my scant contact and social absences for the past two years. I am grateful for your continual understanding, encouragement, and votes of confidence. To the Roo Crew bar staff, with their thirsty hearts and starving wallets, each of who confidently followed me without fear and with no regrets. Thank you for giving me the opportunity that allowed my leadership skills to flourish. I am grateful too for the support and advice from my professors, supervisors, and Thornton Center Staff.

Thank you.

Abstract

Followership is a remarkably pervasive experience shared by all human beings who occupy the masses within national and global organizations. The purpose of the current study was to further knowledge and understanding of the followership construct by distinguishing a set of communicative characteristics that effective followers demonstrate—exploring the associations among perceptions of effective followership, self-regulation, and intercultural communication competence. This study examines whether self-regulation and co-cultural competence are characteristics of effective followership. Followership scholars suggest that followership research should develop followership characteristics based on variables focusing on the perceptions of followers in relation to leaders (Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014). As such, the present study examines perceptions of both leader and follower participants in an online survey. The results of this study reveal that self-regulation and co-cultural competence are characteristics that effective followers demonstrate. Moreover, followers perceive emotion regulation to be an important characteristic of followership effectiveness; however, leaders do not share this perspective. The results of this study also indicate that there is no difference between leaders and followers co-cultural competence abilities. Theoretical implications and future directions are discussed.

Keywords: *Effective Followership, Self-regulation, Co-Cultural Competence, Emotion Regulation, Leader-Follower Relationship*

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	5
Followership.....	5
Self-Regulation and Effective Followership	6
Goal-Setting Standards.....	7
Discrepancy Detection	8
Discrepancy Reduction	8
Intercultural Communication Competence	9
Motivation	9
Knowledge	10
Skills.....	12
Rationale.....	13
Chapter 3 Methodology.....	16
Participants	16
Procedures	18
Measures.....	18
Follower Effectiveness.....	18
Emotion Regulation.....	19
Self-Regulation.....	20
Co-Cultural Competence.....	20
Analysis.....	22
Chapter 4 Results	24
Hypothesis Tests.....	24
Chapter 5 Discussion	29
Follower Effectiveness.....	30
Leaders and Followers	33
Theoretical Implications.....	34
Limitations	38
Future Directions and Conclusion.....	41
List of References.....	44
Appendices	54
Appendix A	55
Appendix B	66
Vita.....	69

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of Descriptives for Measures Based on Follower and Leader Samples	24
Table 2. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Follower Effectiveness Based on Follower and Leader Samples.....	25
Table 3. Correlations and Descriptives for ratings of co-cultural competence, self-regulation, emotion regulation, and follower effectiveness Based on Follower and Leader Samples.....	28

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

All human beings are followers, which positions followership as a core concept of human interaction. In fact, followers comprise the majority of most populations (local, national, and global) and contexts (e.g., interpersonal and organizational). The difference between a follower and an effective follower is that an effective follower possesses the qualities that enable production of a desired outcome. However, followership research, which is of critical importance within the organizational context, significantly lags behind these people's experiences as if it is significantly less important than leadership. First, the extent of organizational successes and failures depends on the individuals' quality and effectiveness at achieving organizational goals. As such, senior-level executives consistently ranked effective followership and leadership to be equally important (Agho, 2009). Second, varying degrees of organizational effectiveness also rely on the dynamic interplay between leaders' and followers' joint actions toward goal achievement. Understanding how aspects of employee relations impacts goal attainment offers organizations valuable insight that is useful for efficient output as well as daily operations (i.e., expectations, procedures, and policies). Third, the employee composition within organizations is increasingly diverse with regard to cultural orientations (Ramthun & Matkin, 2012). Over the past two decades, the rising influx of diversity within national and international arenas commands attention to the increasing amount of intercultural interactions experienced by organizational members (Vanderpal & Ko, 2014). Regardless of cultural background, most will agree that all employees comprising organizations currently are, previously have been, or will experience being in the position of a follower again. Communication that occurs in the workplace is at the crux of what drives action within organizations, particularly relevant to accomplishing organizational goals (Keyton et al., 2013). As such, utilizing optimal

communication to maintain and enhance organizational output is a central concern, especially as organizations adapt to diversity. This highlights how much organizational effectiveness truly relies on a diverse set of employees to successfully complete tasks. Thus, the continual rise of diversification emphasizes the importance of the influence that culturally competent employees contribute to individual and collective outcomes that are at the core of the livelihood of work place settings as well as overall organizational success.

Currently, research within the field of followership is still in its earliest stages of development. Consequently, the small body of literature lacks theoretical and empirical testing. The present state of this budding area illuminates the importance of extending theoretically and empirically sound research built upon the foundational elements established from existing followership research. For example, followership research initially focused on understanding how different types of followers influence leadership (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). This role-based approach resulted in the development of followership typologies. Importantly, the outcomes of typological models offer follower behaviors such as motivation, willingness to engage, and proactivity (Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014). However, this string of research has yet to address three large gaps within the literature: (a) distinguishing a set of characteristics of the established follower behaviors, (b) identifying how followership influences leaders and, (c) understanding how followership influences the leadership process (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). Subsequently, researchers recently began to direct attention toward understanding the social-cognitive and affective processes shaping follower-leader relationships (Tee, Paulson, & Ashkanasay, 2013). The current study attempts to distinguish a set of effective followership characteristics applicable across a multitude of organizational contexts. Therefore, this study examines the association between followership characteristics (e.g., motivation, willingness to

engage, and proactivity) and communicative characteristics, including: (a) self-regulation, and (b) intercultural communication competence.

The proposed characteristics possess substantial relevance to follower behaviors as well as represent affective and social-cognitive aspects. To begin, self-regulation is broadly defined as “the exercise of control over oneself, especially with regard to bringing the self into line with preferred standards encompassing any efforts to alter inner states or responses” (Carver, 2004, p. 2). Self-regulation theory posits adjusting individual behaviors towards goal achievement derives from the processes of: (a) setting standards of behavior which facilitate goal expectations (i.e., goal-setting standards); (b) detecting discrepancies which occurs when a comparison between set standards and an individual’s current state (i.e., self-awareness) do not align; and (c) matching behaviors to the set standards (i.e., discrepancy reduction) (Carver, 1981; Tsui & Ashford, 1994). As such, self-regulation echoes the cognitive processing essential to balancing emotional and social aspects of an experience to produce behaviors aligned with the necessary actions involved in achieving organizational goals. Next, intercultural communication competence is broadly defined as the ability to interact effectively and appropriately with people from different cultural backgrounds (Jiao, 2014). Intercultural communication competence concerns social functioning, specifically, the ability to interact effectively and appropriately with others who are culturally diverse. Spitzberg’s (2000) integrative model is applicable as it depicts interactions as a dyadic process functioning based upon both parties’ motivations (i.e., affect), knowledge (i.e., cognition), and skills (i.e., behaviors) within a specific episode. The dyadic nature of the intercultural communication competence dimensions differ from previously discussed individually focused characteristics of followership. Therefore, intercultural communication competence is conceptualized as effective and appropriate interactions accomplishing the

objectives within a given situation between two or more people who, as a result of culture, have different cognitive, affective, and behavioral orientations (Arasaratnam, 2014; Spitzberg, 2009). The terminology “intercultural communication competence” is conceptually misleading as it conveys that international borders must be crossed to engage in this interaction. Moreover, the semantics shadowing this term place limitations on utilizing the full potential of the intercultural communication competence construct within the field of communication research. For example, Spitzberg (2000, p. 432) suggests, “Excluding interactions such as diplomacy or inter-organizational relations through document transfer, it is people who interact with one another, not cultures.” Thus, to enhance clarity and understanding of the current research, intercultural communication competence will be referred to as *co-cultural communication competence* throughout this study. As cultural diversity and globalization continue to rise, intercultural interactions are increasingly common experiences in business and daily life. Therefore, exploring effective followership characteristics to further understand how these unique qualities influence leadership as well as the leader-follower relationship process highlights their importance in contributing empirical and theoretical progression. Thus, the purpose of this study is to distinguish a set of communicative characteristics that effective followers demonstrate by exploring the associations among perceptions of effective followership, self-regulation, and intercultural communication competence.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Followership

Undoubtedly, the increasing flux of interest regarding followership and follower-centric approaches benefits progressive understanding into leadership research. Followership research lends insight toward the antecedents of organizational outcomes (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). However, the recent shift in followership interest has moved from initially serving as an attractive angle within the enormous body of literature regarding leadership into its own area of focus (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). As such, there is currently a small body of literature lacking theoretical and empirical testing, which leads to failing to establish specific communicative characteristics comprising effective followership. Currently, two methods for examining followership include role-based approaches and constructionist approaches (Oc & Bashshur, 2013; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Although there is a lack of conceptual agreement regarding the nature of the followership construct between these two perspectives, the budding body of literature provides fertile ground for theoretical and empirical advancement.

First, the role-based perspective identifies follower behaviors through typological models. Broadly, typologies assert that followers behave in ways that align with their role orientation or schema categorized by a salient behavior. Specifically, role-based approaches focus on how follower behaviors impact leader outcomes (Bjugstad, Thach, Thompson, & Morris, 2006). For example, scholars (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014) provide a comprehensive review of role-based approaches categorizing followers as passive, active, dominant, interactive, independent, or shifting in role. Behaviors of effective followership within the role-based approaches include accountable, obedient, motivated, willing to engage, courageous (i.e., giving honest feedback), influence tactics, and proactive (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). The most salient

behaviors relevant to the current research include motivation, willingness to engage, and proactive behaviors. First, motivation can be understood as both a process and an outcome in which self-motivation of effective followers is defined as the subjective experience of interest and effort exhibited toward a task (Smith, Wagaman, & Handley, 2009). Next, willingness to engage is defined as an active expression of the self physically, cognitively, and emotionally with others, which includes behaviors such as participating, cooperating, adapting, and problem solving (Carsten, Uhl-Bien, West, Patera, & McGregor, 2010; Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005). Lastly, proactive behavior is conceptualized as ways individuals take action in improving current circumstances or creating new ones (Belschak & Den Hartog, 2010; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). Proactive behaviors include voice (i.e., expressing ideas or concerns without being asked), influence tactics (i.e., strategies aimed at shaping or altering others' behaviors), and taking initiative (Carsten et al., 2010; Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

Second, the constructionist approach views followership as a social process where followership is the behavior that co-creates leader and follower outcomes through relational interactions between leader and follower (DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Fairhurst & Grant, 2010; Oc & Bashshur, 2013; Tee et al., 2013). In this light, "Followership is the characteristics, behaviors, and processes of individuals acting in relation to leaders. It is not general employee behavior" (Uhl-Bien, 2014, p. 96). This conceptualization illustrates the need to fill the literature gap regarding followership characteristics. Thus, the current study proposes self-regulation and intercultural communication competence as effective followership characteristics. The following literature review examines these communicative characteristics to illuminate relevant associations as well as offer better understanding of the proposed logic guiding this study.

Self-Regulation and Effective Followership

Regulating individual characteristics and behaviors is vital to effective followership within the organizational context. Goal-directed followers are perceived to be effective as well as engaging in proactive behaviors (Junker & Van Dick, 2014; Korsgaard, Meglino, Lester, & Jeong, 2010). Organizational goals prescribed to followers are optimally achieved when an individual organizes emotions and cognitions in a way that sparks motivation; the result is desired outcomes. Therefore, utilizing self-regulation to adapt behaviors aimed toward goal achievement is imperative to effective followership. Recent research suggests followership characteristics include self-motivation and willingness to engage (Bjugstad et al., 2006; Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2009). Effective followers achieve goals efficiently through the process of recognizing and utilizing internal motivations to complete tasks as well as actively participating in joint tasks. Therefore, the current research proposes that self-regulatory processes provide a logical explanation at the most basic level of understanding toward how followership behaviors, such as self-motivation and willingness to engage, are utilized effectively toward goal achievement.

Goal-setting standards. First, goals drive organizational behaviors by guiding individuals' cognition, emotion, and behavior (Fitzsimons & Bargh, 2004; Gollwitzer, Fujita, & Oettingen, 2004). Goals act as motivational tools informing cognitive processes to filter knowledge necessary in facilitating goal achievement behaviors and illuminating communication skills that will be perceived to be effective and appropriate within the given context. Self-regulatory capabilities determine the degree and specificity of behavioral standards followers set for themselves in achieving goals prescribed to them by leaders. Interestingly, the level of self-motivation guiding an individual's persistence toward goal achievement is a strong indicator of

successful self-regulation (Fitzsimons & Bargh, 2004). Thus, a followers' self-motivation is activated by prescribed goals where regulatory processes then guide cognitions to set behavioral standards toward goal attainment behaviors. However, the goal-setting standard is not the only regulatory process influencing motivations indicating successful self-regulation.

Discrepancy detection. The next phase of the self-regulation process is discrepancy detection, being able to recognize competing ideas in what is perceived to be effective and appropriate, and adapting behaviors to match set goals when divergence exists. Goals and self-motivation establish the distinction between an individual's current state and the motive to adapt behaviors toward obtaining set goals (Gardner et al., 2005). For self-regulation to occur, followers must assess the congruence between their current behaviors juxtaposed to set standards. However, self-regulation occurs when individuals successfully monitor their state in relation to the goal and then make desired adjustments (Vohs & Baumeister, 2004). Therefore, self-awareness plays an essential role within this phase of the regulatory process as it is defined as a "followers' knowledge of their end values, identity, emotions, motives, and goals" (Gardner et al., 2005, p. 359). Self-awareness affords the ability to more accurately compare an individual's current state in relation to set standards encouraging optimal outcomes (Vohs & Baumeister, 2004). Moreover, discrepancy detection reveals the degree of followers' self-motivation utilized in adapting behaviors in a manner to overcome divergences (i.e., discrepancy reduction), which inhibits goal achievement (Tsui & Ashford, 1994). Thus, the current study hypothesizes that effective followers will have high levels of self-regulation.

Discrepancy reduction. Lastly, self-regulation theory refers to discrepancy reduction as controlling adapted behaviors to reduce detected inconsistencies (Carver & Scheier, 1981). Goals are rooted in the act of willing, which highlights the relationship between followers' self-

regulation, self-motivation, and willingness to engage (Gollwitzer et al., 2004). For example, once goals activate the regulatory processes illuminating the extent of self-motivation, followers must be willing to engage in communicative behaviors that successfully reduce discrepancies impeding goal attainment. However, controlling behaviors can be hindered by other variables such as self-efficacy, self-awareness, and a lack of communication skills. Thus, communicative behaviors must be expressed competently to ensure individual as well as joint task efforts are aligned to accomplish prescribed goals victoriously. The current research proposes that intercultural communication competence serves as the bridge linking the space between regulated behaviors and the expression of the adapted behaviors.

Intercultural Communication Competence

The growing amount of diversity and globalization, within organizations nationally as well as worldwide, increasingly spikes the occurrence of experiencing intercultural interactions from occasionally to often daily. Importantly, the degree of effective followership relies on both the followers' and leaders' subjective perceptions. In short, it is the subjective judgments and efforts surrounding relational interactions that drive organizational output. Thus, communication finds itself at the core of followership, as in all human interactions, guiding individual and joint task outcomes.

Motivation. First, the motivation dimension of co-cultural communication competence includes affective aspects reflected in the ability to respect and welcome cultural differences during interactions (i.e., other-centeredness), a skill essential to managing diversity (Deardorff & Jones, 2012). Characteristics involved within this dimension include abilities such as managing self-esteem, cognitive flexibility (i.e., openness), initiative, genuine interest, and developing affective-cognitive congruence (Deardorff & Jones, 2012; Spitzberg, 2000; Spitzberg &

Changnon, 2009). The degree of outcome effectiveness within the leader-follower dyad relies on a mutual understanding of tasks, roles, and goals. Importantly, regardless of context, “feelings occur continuously throughout the attempt to reach an incentive” (Carver, 2004, p. 21).

Therefore, this implies that feelings are an inevitable aspect of goal pursuit, which emphasizes the importance of understanding how emotions influence an individuals’ ability to regulate a balance between affect and cognition to achieve goals. Interestingly, Epitropaki, Sy, Martin, Tram-Quon, and Topakas (2013) reveal recent research showing that affect directly impacts followers’ ability to influence others. Aligned with these findings, Tee et al. (2013) suggest followers affect leadership outcomes by performing actions guided by the interplay between cognition and affect. The implication of these findings suggests that affect serves as a key source of motivation that undermines effective behaviors demonstrated by followers. Thus, characteristics within the motivation dimension of co-cultural competence support the regulatory processing of followers by: (a) accounting for the influence of affective aspects during the interplay between affect and cognition, (b) harmonizing affect and cognition when pursuing goals, and (c) providing valuable insight toward how affective aspects are a source of motivation. Moreover, both affective and cognitive regulatory components serve to encourage effective follower behaviors vital to achieving a mutual understanding that is necessary for optimal goal obtainment (Lockwood, Seara-Cardoso, & Viding, 2014).

Knowledge. Second, the knowledge component of co-cultural communication competence includes cognitive aspects essential to effective followership. Broadly, this is represented by cultural awareness. Cultural awareness refers to the ability to recognize and understand the ways in which culture impacts one’s own as well as others’ perceptions during interactions (Chen, 2009). Said another way, cultural awareness is the knowledge of how to

analyze and process information when recognizing how preexisting cultural values, attitudes, and beliefs impact individual perceptions and behaviors in regards to executing tasks (Chen, 2009; Spitzberg, 2000). Therefore, the knowledge dimension stresses the importance of cognitive regulatory processing, particularly aspects of self-awareness and awareness of the other.

Characteristics within this dimension include procedural knowledge, willingness to share knowledge, information processing, knowledge of more than one perspective, and self-monitoring (Deardorff & Jones 2012; Spitzberg, 2000; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). As a result of increased cultural awareness, individuals tend to exhibit abilities such as respect for diversity (divergent perspectives), openness to uncertainty, nonjudgment, and willingness to communicate with others different from themselves (Dimitrov, Dawson, Olsen, & Meadows, 2014). These cognitive knowledge competencies, specifically self-awareness and self-monitoring, are key factors supporting the regulatory processes of goal-directed individuals. For example, Faber and Vohs (2004) indicate that maintaining self-regulation abilities toward goal-directed behaviors is dependent on an individual's capability to self-monitor as well as his or her degree of self-awareness. To further explain, Faber and Vohs (2004, p. 518) expound "To self-regulate, a person must monitor his/her current circumstances, which includes progression through the environment, tracking progress toward or away from the goal, and reevaluating desired outcomes. All of these tasks require a certain degree of self-awareness." Furthermore, the knowledge competency, willingness to communicate with others different from themselves, is directly associated with the effective followership characteristic, willingness to engage. Thus, the knowledge dimension of co-cultural competence serves to filter cognitive mechanisms that establish awareness between self and the other for followers to distinguish appropriate behavior; the motivation dimension balances affective and cognitive regulatory processes responsible for

developing and influencing followership behaviors (e.g., motivation, willingness to engage, and proactive behaviors) that effectively accomplish prescribed goals. The skills dimension of co-cultural competence utilizes these dimensions to purposefully execute actual behavioral skills.

Skills. Last, the skills dimension encompasses communicative behaviors that accomplish specific goals within a given context (Deardorff & Jones, 2012). Co-cultural communication competence skills include the ability to utilize knowledge and motivation during co-cultural interactions as reflected in performed competencies broadly perceived as social communication behaviors. Characteristics of this dimension include verbal and nonverbal communicative competencies such as empathy, interaction management, behavior flexibility (e.g., adaptability), identity management, listening, and message skills (Deardorff & Jones, 2012; Spitzberg, 2000; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). These skills serve as an outlet from which followers use aspects of motivation and knowledge relevant to particular contexts and relational partners to tailor communication in a manner that is mutually perceived to be competent by themselves as well as their relational partner. For example, research suggests effective followership behaviors include influence tactics and voice (i.e., proactive behaviors) (Lapierre, Bremner, & McMullan, 2012).

Communication not only drives relational interactions but also serves as a basis for forming or influencing individual judgments. Influencing another individual's judgments through proactive behaviors such as influence tactics and voice requires followers to express messages complementary to the mindset of the other to gain their attention and support. As such, this involves understanding the perceptions of the other person, a core aspect of empathy. Importantly, mutual understanding between relational partners is an outcome of empathy that can be used to heighten the degree of success of proactive efforts (Goldstein, Vezich & Shapiro, 2014; DeVignemont & Singer, 2006). Therefore, empathy is a skill that affords followers the

ability to tailor proactive behaviors that are optimally effective and appropriate with interactional partners in any given context. Additionally, the adaptive nature of the characteristics within the skills dimension of co-cultural competence supports self-regulatory processes of goal-directed followers. Self-regulatory competencies, such as the ability to endure a delay of gratification during goal pursuit, support adaptive social, cognitive, and emotional behaviors (Mischel & Ayduk, 2004). Thus, the skills dimension of co-cultural competence augments adaptive outcomes of self-regulation acting as the vehicle through which follower behaviors (i.e., motivation, willingness to engage, and proactive behaviors) are tailored to effectively and appropriately fit any given context.

Rationale

Followership is a proliferating concept that will continue to grow. The current study aims to contribute a more lucid understanding of followership by investigating the relationship between effective followership and a set of communicative characteristics (i.e., self-regulation and co-cultural competence). Certainly, the development of followership typologies (Carsten et al., 2010; Kelley, 1988; Shamir, 2007; and Sy, 2010) offers valuable insight toward followership behaviors as well as theoretical advancement. However, the previous overview of followership from role-based perspectives seemingly mirrors approaches to leadership research in the most basic typologies (e.g., transformational leadership, path-goal leadership, and authentic leadership). Importantly, researchers must remain true to the nature of the followership construct by “drawing insights from across all paradigmatic perspectives and findings of followership” (Uhl-Bien, et al., 2014, p. 100). Moreover, followership research should develop theoretical constructs of followership based on characteristics, behaviors, and outcomes, which includes variables focusing on the perceptions of followers in relation to leaders (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014).

This study further extends conceptual clarity by expanding on the notions set into motion from previous research regarding the need to distinguish between general employee behaviors and followership. Therefore, this study conceptualizes effective followership as the characteristics, behaviors, and processes of individuals acting in relation to leaders that produce desired outcomes. The current study seeks to further understand effective followership characteristics that encourage goal-directed behaviors, shared meaning, and mutual understanding within follower-leader relationships by investigating the interplay between psychological and emotional aspects. Therefore, the significance of the current study includes: (1) extending knowledge and understanding of effective followership characteristics, and (2) contributes necessary foundational pieces essential for advancing present and future followership theory.

The purpose of this study is to expand knowledge and understanding of the followership construct by investigating the associations between effective followership and a set of communicative characteristics, including self-regulation and co-cultural competence. Following calls for stronger conceptual and operational clarity (Carsten et al., 2010; Junker & Van Dick, 2014), the following study examines the perspectives of both leaders and followers. Followers provide information about what aspects of followership best match their experiences and leaders provide information about how they evaluate followership effectiveness. Thus, the following hypotheses are posed:

H1: Follower a) co-cultural competence, b) self-regulation, and c) emotion regulation predict follower effectiveness.

H2: Leader's perception of a) followers' self-regulation and b) followers' emotion regulation predict followers' effectiveness.

H3: Leaders are more co-culturally competent than followers.

H4: Follower self-regulation, follower emotion regulation, and follower co-cultural competence are positively related to each other.

H5: Leaders' co-cultural competence is positively related to ratings of followers' a) self-regulation, b) emotion regulation, and c) follower effectiveness.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

Participants

Participants in this study included students from a southeastern collegiate institution. Additionally, leaders were recruited by followers who completed the survey as well as through snowball sampling starting with the researcher's network ($N = 216$). All participants were at least 18 years of age 26.04 (SD 12.18, range 18 to 64) and participated voluntarily. All followers either were or had been in a position where someone else was the leader. All leaders had to meet the following criteria: (a) currently employed full time, (b) oversees a minimum of five employees and, (c) has maintained a leadership role for a minimum of one year.

Participants were initially recruited through the School of Communication Studies research pool. They had the option to complete the survey as a follower and/or recruit a leader to complete the leader version of the survey. Students must provide the leader with their five-digit code to receive credit for the leader completing the survey. If both the student and leader complete the survey, the student receives both research participation credits. If either the student or a leader associated with that student's number completes the survey, the student receives one participation credit. All credit was provided once the survey has closed in the research pool. There are multiple research options available to students through the research pool so there were alternatives if they choose not to participate in this study.

The data revealed that out of 264 participants, 48 did not complete the entire survey. As such, the total number of participants included in data analysis was 216, representing a mean age of 26.04 (SD 12.18, range 18 to 64). Therefore, data analysis included 137 follower participants representing a mean age of 19.5 (SD 2, range 18 to 28) and 79 leader participants representing a mean age of 37.24 (SD 14.01, range 19 to 64). Of the follower participants (35.8 percent male

and 64.2 percent female), 2.2 percent reported being currently employed full time, 38.7 percent reported being currently employed part-time, and 59.1 percent reported being currently a student. Follower participants who reported being employed were asked to indicate the length of time they had been employed since turning 18 years of age and the length of time they had maintained in their current position. Since turning 18 years of age, most participants (86 percent) reported being employed for two years or less, while the remaining 14 percent reported being employed for 10 years or less. The majority of participants (85.2 percent) reported working in their current position for two years or less; the remaining 14.8 percent reported they had maintained their current job for three-and-a half years or less. When follower participants were asked to indicate their highest level of education, over a quarter reported having a high school diploma (27.9 percent), the majority reported they had some college (66.2 percent), the remaining participants reported having an associate's degree (3.7 percent), a bachelor's degree (1.5 percent), or a graduate degree (.7 percent).

Of the leader participants, 43 percent are male and 57 percent are female. All leader participants included in this study reported they were currently employed full time, had maintained a leadership role for at least one year, and previously or currently oversee at least 5 employees. Leader participants were asked to indicate the length of time they had been employed since turning 18 years of age and the length of time they had maintained their current position. Since turning 18 years of age, most participants (86 percent) reported being employed for two years or less, while the remaining 14 percent reported being employed for 10 years or less. Over half of the participants (59 percent) reported working at their current position for five years or less, 15.4 percent reported working 6 to 10 years, 14.1 percent reported working 11 to 15 years, and the remaining 11.5 percent reported they had maintained their current job for 16 to 28 years.

When leader participants were asked to indicate their highest level of education, almost half reported having either a high school diploma (7.6 percent) or some college (34.2 percent), while the other half of participants reported having an associate's degree (7.6 percent), a bachelor's degree (21.5 percent), graduate degree (26.6 percent), and 2.5 percent chose not to answer.

Procedures

Follower respondents who chose to partake in the present study completed a questionnaire measuring their perceptions of whether emotion regulation and self-regulation are characteristics of effective followership. Additionally, they completed a self-reported measure assessing their co-cultural communication competence. Similarly, leader respondents completed a questionnaire measuring their perceptions of the followers' effectiveness, emotion regulation, and self-regulation. In addition, leader respondents completed a self-reported measure assessing their co-cultural communication competence. Demographic information included sex, age, education level, length of employment, and employment status. A copy of each survey can be found in Appendix A.

Measures

Follower effectiveness. Participants rated follower effectiveness using Walumbwa and Hartnell's (2011) job performance scale. The measure consists of 12 items utilizing a 5-point Likert-type response (1= needs improvement to 5= excellent) asking participants to rate the follower's effectiveness by measuring three aspects of job performance, including: personal initiative, self-direction, and innovation (Walumbwa & Hartnell, 2011). Follower participants were asked to respond to items based on their perception of whether or not statements reflect qualities of an effective follower. On the other hand, leader participants were asked to rate items in reference to a specific follower. Sample items include: "approaches his or her supervisor with

suggestions for improvement when he or she encounter problems at work” (personal initiative), “takes initiative to do whatever is necessary” (self-direction), and “finds improved ways to do things” (innovation). Validity was assessed by Walumbwa and Hartnell (2011) with a reported reliability of $\alpha = .84$. The scale was used in this study with seven rather than five options anchored by level of agreement (1= strongly disagree and 7= strongly agree). Reliability for Walumbwa and Hartnell’s (2011) job performance scale was highly reliable in both follower analyses (12 items; $\alpha = .885$) as well as leader analyses (12 items; $\alpha = .933$). The descriptive statistics and values of cronbach alpha for this scale for both the follower and leader sample groups are shown in Table 1.

Emotion regulation. The individual perception of emotion regulation (iER) scale developed by Curseu, Boros, and Oerlemans (2012) was used to measure emotion regulation (Berg, Curseu, & Meeus, 2014). The iER is a 7-item scale measuring individual perceptions of emotion regulation utilizing a 5-point Likert-type response (1= strongly agree to 5= strongly disagree) with a reported reliability $\alpha = .77$ (Berg, et al., 2014). The validity of this measure was assessed by Curseu et al. (2012). Sample items include: “generally have good control of my emotions” and “sometimes throw criticisms without considering other people’s feelings.” In this study, respondents could choose among seven levels of agreement with each statement. Reliability for Curseu, Boros, and Oerleman’s (2012) individual perception of emotion regulation (iER) scale was found to have strong reliability for leader data (7 items; $\alpha = .80$) and unreliable for follower data (7 items; $\alpha = .67$). However, reliability was increased to an acceptable level of .70 after deleting items for follower data. A total of three items were omitted to increase reliability for the follower sample, including: item 2, item 6 and item 7 ($\alpha = .72$). The

descriptive statistics and values of cronbach alpha for this scale for both the follower and leader sample groups are shown in Table 1.

Self-regulation. Leader participants' perceptions of follower self-regulation was assessed using the self-regulation scale (SRS), which was developed to measure an individual's self-regulation in relation to pursuing goals, specifically when an individual encounters obstacles and setbacks (Luszczynska, Diehl, Gutiérrez-Doña, Kuusinen, & Schwarzer, 2004). The SRS consists of seven items asking subjects to respond using a four-point Likert-type scale (0= not true at all to 4= completely true) with reported reliability of $\alpha = .77$ (Luszczynska et al., 2004). Reliability of this scale was found to be highly reliable in both follower analyses (7 items; $\alpha = .82$) as well as leader analyses (7 items; $\alpha = .88$). The validity of this measure was assessed by Luszczynska et al. (2004). For follower participants, the SRS was combined with the job performance scale asking respondents whether they perceived statements to reflect qualities of an effective follower using a true or false response. Sample items include: "After an interruption, I don't have any problem resuming my concentrated style of working" and "If an activity requires a problem-oriented attitude, I can control my feelings." This study provided six options to maintain the lack of a neutral option and also increase the potential variability. The descriptive statistics and values of cronbach alpha for this scale for both the follower and leader sample groups are shown in Table 1.

Co-cultural competence. The present study measured follower co-cultural communication competence utilizing a total of 30-items obtained from two existing measures to ensure adequate assessment of co-cultural competence. First, Arasaratam's (2009) intercultural communication competence instrument was utilized to measure co-cultural competencies, including: motivation, openness, interaction involvement, and attitude toward other cultures. The

measure contains 10 items asking subjects to agree or disagree on a 7-point, Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree to 7= strongly agree). The validity of this measure was assessed by Arasaratnam (2009) and the reported reliability was $\alpha = .77$. Sample items include: “I feel that people from other cultures have many valuable things to teach me” (attitude towards other cultures), “I feel more comfortable with people who are open to people from other cultures than people who are not” (interaction involvement), “I usually look for opportunities to interact with people from other cultures” (motivation), and “I find it easier to categorize people based on their cultural identity than their personality” (openness). Reliability of this scale was found to be unreliable for both follower analyses (10 items; $\alpha = .49$) as well as leader analyses (10 items; $\alpha = .37$); however, reliability was increased to an acceptable level of at least .70 by deleting items. For follower data, three items were deleted to increase reliability to an acceptable level including: item 2, item 9, and item 10 (7 items; $\alpha = .72$). For leader data, two items were deleted to increase reliability to an acceptable level including: item 6 and item 9 (8 items; $\alpha = .75$). The descriptive statistics and values of cronbach alpha for this scale for both the follower and leader sample groups are shown in Table 1.

Secondly, the intercultural effectiveness scale (IES) developed by Portalla and Chen (2010) consists of 20-items measuring verbal and nonverbal co-cultural communication skills, such as: behavioral flexibility, interaction relaxation, interactant respect, message skills, identity maintenance, and interaction management (Portalla & Chen, 2010). Items within the measure account for the co-cultural competence knowledge and skills dimensions. The validity of the measure was assessed by Portalla and Chen (2010) with a reported reliability $\alpha = .89$. Sample items include: “I find the best way to act is to be myself when interacting with people from different cultures” (behavioral flexibility), “I find it is easy to talk with people from different

cultures” (interaction management), “I always show respect for my culturally different counterparts during our interaction” (interactant respect), “I have problems with grammar when interacting with people from different cultures” (message skills), “I find I have a lot in common with my culturally different counterparts during our interaction” (identity management), and “I am able to express my ideas clearly when interacting with people from different cultures” (interaction management). Respondents indicated their level of agreement from one (strongly disagree) to seven (strongly agree). This scale was found to be highly reliable for both follower analyses (20 items; $\alpha = .88$) as well as leader analyses (20 items; $\alpha = .90$). The descriptive statistics and values of cronbach alpha for this scale for both the follower and leader sample groups are shown in Table 1. The IES and ICC scales were combined within both participant surveys (See Table 1).

Analysis

A factor analysis was conducted on the intercultural effectiveness and effective follower measures. A principal axis factoring analysis was conducted for the IES to determine whether the six-factor structure found in previous research (Portalla & Chen, 2010) held in the current study. The six-factor solution explained 58.8 percent of the variance yet did not align with the distinguished six intercultural effective behaviors assumed (i.e., 9 items loaded on the first factor and included behavioral flexibility, interaction relaxation, identity management, and interaction management items). When the data were allowed to determine the data structure, a four-factor solution explained 50.8 percent of the variance; however, two factors did not contain more than 3 items and all of them had multiple items from proposed subscales. Thus, the single factor solution yielded the largest number of item loadings at .70 or above explaining 58.8 percent of the variance and was used for subsequent co-cultural competence analyses.

A separate principal axis factoring analysis was conducted for the effective follower measure to determine whether the distinct three-factor structure found in previous research (Walumbwa & Hartnell, 2011) held in the current study. The three-factor solution explained 56.2 percent of the variance yet did not align with the distinguished effective follower behaviors assumed (i.e., 8 items loaded on the first factor and included innovation, self-direction, and personal initiative items). When the data were allowed to determine the data structure, a two-factor solution explained 48.02 percent of the variance; however, both factors had multiple items from proposed subscales with item loadings of .40 and above. Thus, the single factor solution yielded the largest number of item loadings at .70, even though it only explained 47.4 percent of the variance and it was used for subsequent follower effectiveness analyses.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

A summary of descriptive statistics and values of cronbach alpha for each scale used in this study for both follower and leader sample groups are shown in Table 1.

Table 1.

Summary of Descriptives for Measures Based on Follower and Leader Samples

Measures	Sample Groups							
	Follower ^a				Leader ^b			
	n	M	SD	α	n	M	SD	α
FE	134	52.96	8.13	.89	77	60.70	11.82	.93
iER	136	15.83	3.10	.72	78	35.21	5.84	.80
SRS	134	31.57	4.81	.82	77	30.77	4.57	.88
ICC	136	32.63	6.53	.72	78	37.24	14.01	.75
IES	134	98.65	14.86	.88	75	102.47	15.03	.90
CCC	133	131.14	12.75	.70	74	133.42	12.70	.74

Note. The variation in sample proportion is due to excluding cases listwise based on all variables in the procedure. Follower Effectiveness = Job Performance scale; iER = individual perceptions of emotion regulation; SRS = Self-Regulation Scale; ICC = Intercultural Communication Competence Scale; IES = Intercultural Effectiveness Scale; CCC = (IES scale + ICC scale).

a N = 137

b N = 79

Hypothesis Testing

To examine the first hypothesis, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted. H1 predicted that followers' self-reported ratings of co-cultural competence, self-regulation, and emotion regulation predict follower effectiveness. The regression results for H1 helped to determine how well the proposed three-variable model predicted follower effectiveness. As can be seen in Table 2 (regression results), the independent variables that

Table 2.

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Follower Effectiveness Based on Follower and Leader Samples

Variable	Group Samples							
	Follower Ratings				Leader Ratings			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t
CCC	.366**	4.524	.367**	4.615	—	—	—	—
SR	.298**	3.182	.300**	3.774	.510**	4.424	.644**	7.146
ER	.004	.043			.211	1.833		
R ²	.29		.21		.44		.42	
Adjusted R ²	.28		.21		.43		.41	
F	17.05**		25.77**		28.05**		51.07**	

Note.

** $p < .05$. * $p < .01$.

constituted model 1 were follower co-cultural competence (CCC), follower self-regulation (SR), and follower emotion regulation (ER) and the dependent variable was follower effectiveness.

Results of the regression indicated that follower co-cultural competence and self-regulation predicted follower effectiveness, while emotion regulation was not a statistically significant predictor of effective followership. However, results indicate that model 1 explained 28.2 percent of the variance in follower effectiveness, showing support for H1. Followers with higher scores on these scales were expected to have higher follower effectiveness scores (see Table 2). This suggests that follower co-cultural competence and follower self-regulation may better predict follower effectiveness.

Regression results for model 2 helped to determine whether follower co-cultural competence and follower self-regulation explained more variance than model 1 when predicting follower effectiveness (see Table 2). Results of this regression indicated that model 2 explained 20.6 percent of the variance in follower effectiveness, which was more than model 1. From a

follower perspective, emotion regulation is practically significant, but not statistically significant. H1 was supported.

To examine the second hypothesis (H2), a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted. H2 predicted that leaders' perceptions of follower self-regulation and follower emotion regulation predict follower effectiveness. As can be seen in Table 2, the independent variables that constituted model 3 were leaders' self-report ratings of co-cultural competence (CCC), leaders' ratings of follower self-regulation (SR), and leaders' ratings of follower emotion regulation (ER) while the dependent variable was leaders' ratings of follower effectiveness. Results of the regression showed that model 3 explained 42.6 percent of the variance in follower effectiveness. However, results of the regression also indicated that leaders' ratings of follower emotion regulation were not a statistically significant predictor of follower effectiveness. Leaders' ratings of follower self-regulation had a statistically significant positive regression weight, indicating leaders who rated followers as better self-regulators also rated them as more effective followers.

Leaders' ratings of follower self-regulation and excluding leaders' ratings of follower emotion regulation (i.e., model 4 in Table 3) may be better indicators of leaders' perceptions of follower effectiveness. Results of the regression indicated that model four explained 40.7 percent of the variance in follower effectiveness, which was less than model three. This revealed that leaders' perceived emotion regulation was neither statistically nor practically significant for predicting effective followership. Thus, H2 could not be supported.

The third hypothesis predicted that leaders are more co-culturally competent than followers. To test hypothesis three (H3), an independent samples *t*-test was conducted. The results revealed that leaders' mean co-cultural competence scores ($M = 133.42$, $SD = 12.70$) were

not statistically significantly greater than the follower co-cultural competence scores ($M = 131.14$, $SD = 12.75$), $t(205) = 1.24$, $p = \text{n.s.}$ This result reveals no difference between leader and follower co-cultural competence. Thus, H3 was not supported.

To test the fourth hypothesis, a bivariate correlation analysis was conducted. H4 predicted that follower self-regulation, emotion regulation, and co-cultural competence are positively related to each other. The correlation analysis showed statistically significant, moderate to strong relationships existed among all three variables (see Table 3). Results of the correlation analysis revealed strong correlations with statistical significance between follower self-regulation and follower emotion regulation, as well as follower self-regulation and follower co-cultural competence. Follower emotion regulation and follower co-cultural competence had a statistically significant moderate correlation. Thus, H4 was supported; follower self-regulation, follower emotion regulation, and follower co-cultural competence were positively related to each other.

The fifth hypothesis predicted that leaders' co-cultural competence is positively related to ratings of followers' a) self-regulation; b) emotion regulation; and c) follower effectiveness. To test hypothesis five (H5), a bivariate correlation analysis was conducted. Results of the correlation analysis indicated moderately strong, statistically significant correlations between leaders' co-cultural competence and ratings of follower self-regulation, ratings of follower emotion regulation, as well as leaders' ratings of follower effectiveness. Thus, H5 was supported; leaders' co-cultural competence was positively related to ratings of followers' a) self-regulation; b) emotion regulation; and c) follower effectiveness.

Table 3.

Correlations and Descriptives for ratings of co-cultural competence, self-regulation, emotion regulation, and follower effectiveness Based on Follower and Leader Samples

Variable	CCC	SR	ER	FE	M	SD
CCC	–	.400**	.534**	.338**	133.42	12.70
SR	.326**	–	.629**	.650**	30.77	4.57
ER	.319**	.564**	–	.545**	35.21	5.84
FE	.447**	.423**	.312**	–	59.70	11.82
M	131.14	31.57	15.73	52.96		
SD	12.75	4.81	3.10	8.13		

Note. Correlations for Follower participants (N = 137) are presented below the diagonal. Correlations for Leader participants (N = 79) are presented above the diagonal. Means and standard deviations for the follower sample are shown in the horizontal rows. Means and standard deviations for the leader sample are shown in the vertical columns. Follower ratings are self-report for all constructs. Leader ratings are self-report for the CCC construct while ratings for the remaining constructs are leader ratings of a specific follower. CCC = co-cultural competence (IES scale + ICC scale); SR = Self-Regulation; ER = Emotion regulation; FE = Follower Effectiveness scale.

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Undoubtedly, all individuals who comprise the human population share the experience of being a follower. Individuals who are not currently in follower positions have been, or will likely experience being, in the position of a follower again. Research is beginning to give followership the undivided attention it has humbly earned. The purpose of this study was to extend knowledge and understanding of effective followership characteristics as well as contribute valuable insight toward present and future followership theory.

A social constructionist perspective was utilized, viewing followership as a social process where followership is the behavior that co-creates leader and follower outcomes through relational interactions between leader and follower (DeRue & Ashford, 2010; Fairhurst & Grant, 2010; Oc & Bashshur, 2013; Tee et al., 2013). From this lens, followers who are able to produce desired outcomes demonstrate “the characteristics, behaviors, and processes of individuals acting in relation to leaders. It is not general employee behavior” (Uhl-Bien, 2014, p. 96). The purpose was to examine followership characteristics (i.e., self-regulation and co-cultural competence), which included aspects of effectiveness, to establish a more distinct difference between the communicative characteristics underlying the behaviors demonstrated by general employees and by effective followers. As such, effective followership was conceptualized as the characteristics, behaviors, and processes of individuals acting in relation to leaders to produce desired outcomes. Ultimately, conceptual clarity of the followership construct in a more observable and measurable manner was the goal.

Three characteristics of effective followership were proposed based upon three prevalent follower behaviors found across the followership literature (Epitropaki et al., 2013). The usual suspects of follower behaviors included: self-motivation, willingness to engage, and proactivity.

A review of the literature revealed substantial relevance among these follower behaviors and the proposed follower characteristics tailored to aspects of effectiveness. Therefore, the findings of this study extend the literature by distinguishing a set of effective followership characteristics relevant for research within both the organizational and interpersonal contexts. Specifically, the findings of this study contribute empirical support valuable to building the theoretical underpinnings of followership. Moreover, this study answers three calls to research, which include: (a) unveiling a distinct set of underlying follower characteristics based on previously established follower behaviors that are used widely across the literature, (b) focusing attention on understanding the social-cognitive and affective processes shaping follower-leader relationships, and (c) further elucidating the nature of leader–follower relationships (Oc & Bashshur, 2013; Tee et al., 2013).

Follower Effectiveness

Hypothesis four and hypothesis five predicted that there would be statistically significant associations among self-regulation, emotion regulation, co-cultural competence, and follower effectiveness from both follower and leader perspectives. These predictions were strongly supported. From the followers' perspective, results of the study indicate that followers with more self-regulation, emotion regulation, and co-cultural competence were more effective. Similarly, results revealed that leaders who were more co-culturally competent believed followers with more self-regulation and emotion regulation were more effective followers. Taken together, these results indicate that self-regulation, emotion regulation, and co-cultural competence are characteristics related to both follower and leader perceptions of effective followership. However, understanding whether these characteristics predicted effective followership was of particular interest.

Hypothesis one (H1) and hypothesis two (H2) proposed that followers' self-regulation, emotion regulation, and co-cultural competence predicted follower effectiveness. These findings held for H1; however no statistical significance was found for H2. Results of the study indicate that from the followers' perspective, self-regulation, emotion regulation, and co-cultural competence are characteristics that predict follower effectiveness. Specifically, self-regulation and co-cultural competence were stronger predictors of follower effectiveness than emotion regulation. These associations support the interplay between self-regulation theory and the co-cultural competence construct further advocating for the notion that self-regulation theory lacks the ability to fully address the impact of affect during the regulatory processes of goal-directed behaviors (Csikszentmihalyi & Nakamura, 1999; Faber & Vohs, 2004; Forgas & Vargas, 1999). Output occurs when organizational members are high in personal abilities (i.e., skills) and also challenged by environmental opportunities. Affect signals how well or poorly someone is doing, which provides contextual information necessary for the cognitive mechanisms to distinguish discrepancies between self and another as well as being responsible for adapting goal-directed behaviors (DeBernardis, Hayes, & Fryling, 2014; Vohs & Baumeister, 2004). As such, experiencing affect serves as a motivational cue alerting individuals of when they should align goal-directed behaviors (e.g., discrepancy detection), which in turn, informs their knowledge competencies to update how they adapt behavioral alignments to match the desired effectiveness of competing goal pursuits (e.g., discrepancy reduction). The current study suspected co-cultural competence supports self-regulation abilities of goal-directed followers by: (1) increasing awareness of the presence and influence of affect during the attempt to regulate affect and cognition; and (b) harmonizing affect and cognition to align with goal pursuit to effectively accomplish prescribed goals. Within social situations, emotions have the power to influence

reactions, experiences, and cognition, which can complicate the regulatory processes that direct thought and behavior to align subsequent actions with goal-directed behavior (Larsen & Prizmic, 2004). As such, developing affective-cognitive congruence, managing self-esteem, and initiative are qualities within the motivation dimension of the co-cultural competence construct that seem to reinforce and enhance the degree of an individual's ability to self-regulate (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). Thus, the strong associations between self-regulation, emotion regulation, and co-cultural competence found in this study signal support for this notion by addressing the interplay among these variables to further explain how affect impacts regulatory processing.

On the other hand, leaders tend to view follower self-regulation as a strong predictor of follower effectiveness; however, emotion regulation was not a predictor of follower effectiveness. Interestingly, followers tend to view emotion regulation as an important quality of being an effective follower while leaders do not share this same viewpoint. One possible explanation for this finding is that leaders assume emotion regulation is a job expectation of effective followers (Sy, 2010). Leaders expect the emotional outbursts of general employees to occur; however, effective employees are expected to perform with more control. Given that emotion regulation predicted effective followership for follower perceptions within the current study, it is plausible that followers and leaders have similar expectations of effectiveness. For example, Carsten et al., (2010) found proactive followers: (1) perceive themselves as effective employees and (2) assume that one of their responsibilities as a follower includes regulating the emotions of themselves as well as the emotions of other organizational members (e.g., team members, clients, their own supervisors, etc.). This implies that both leaders and followers assume maintaining emotional control is a pre-requisite of effectiveness. Therefore, this finding highlights one way that the current study can benefit future recent research efforts aimed toward

advancing a more lucid understanding of how social-cognitive (e.g., self-regulation) and affective (e.g., emotion regulation) processes function within the followership construct and the leader-follower dynamic.

Leaders and Followers

Hypothesis three predicted that leaders were more co-culturally competent than followers. This prediction was not supported; results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in co-cultural competence levels between followers and leaders. Co-cultural competence is important to all relationships and levels of organizations. As such, this finding provides valuable insight toward understanding the differences between co-cultural competence within organizational membership as well as the nature of the leader-follower relationship. Importantly, these implications are suggestive within the context of the leader-follower relationship and a broader organizational context. Ultimately, the results highlight the importance of social cognitive (e.g., self-regulation and co-cultural competence) and affective processes (e.g., emotion regulation) in followership as well as the leader-follower relationship (Junker et al., 2014; Oc & Bashshur, 2013; Tee et al., 2013).

Intercultural competence literature calls for more of a focus on relationship building to examine relational aspects that extend beyond the individual such as: (a) how individuals define identity in relation to others, (b) the role and importance of interpersonal equality, (c) the skills necessary to develop these interpersonal connections, and (d) the implications of a relational focus toward the short and long term operational output of organizations more oriented toward the individual rather than the collective (Deardorff, 2009). The current study's finding suggests that regulatory processes are the raw individual components involved in cultivating the interpersonal bonds that foster a sense of connection and equality necessary in encouraging

individuals to define identity in relation to others, which then these shared relational identities expand within a collective. Moreover, it is plausible that there is no difference between leaders' and followers' co-cultural competence because co-cultural competence is a necessary aspect of achieving goals (e.g., individual, joint, team, and organizational levels) regardless of member position (e.g., leader or follower) and task (e.g., individual, joint, or team). It is the co-culturally competent contributions of organizational members that intertwine to collectively determine the degree of organizational effectiveness and success. Shared identity among employees increases organizational commitment, effectiveness, and satisfaction (Gardner et al., 2005). Thus, the increase of diversity within national and global work place settings stresses the value of co-cultural competence within all levels of relationships at all levels of the organization (e.g., dyadic and group co-worker relationships, leader-follower relationships, leader-leader relationships, etc.). This finding holds tremendous benefit for future research seeking to further elucidate the nature of co-culturally competent dyads as well as the outcomes (e.g., individual, relational, group, and organizational) that occur from these relationships. Further, the implications of such research bolsters the necessary understanding required to develop and maintain optimal day-to-day operations by lending insight toward aspects regarding employee training and hiring that cannot be overlooked, especially with the ongoing rise of diversification.

Theoretical Implications

It is no secret that positions of leadership and followership hold very different levels of power. Typically, leaders maintain more legitimate power within organizations (Raven & French, 1958). However, results of the current study indicate that co-cultural competence is important to all relationships and all levels of organizations. This implies leader-follower units who share certain characteristics can effectively achieve organizational goals by using the power

inequities that exist within organizations. Intercultural scholars Martin & Nakayama (2015) offer guiding notions to further understand how leader and follower co-cultural competence can influence dyads as well as the organization. First, this approach suggests that the similarities and differences within leaders' and followers' co-cultural competence traits (i.e., motivation, knowledge, and skills), as well as the degree of the power inequality that exists within the organization, are easier to differentiate when they are set into motion within the organizational, relational, or larger contexts (Martin & Nakayama, 2015). A follower and a leader may both have the same characteristics; however, they tend to use that characteristic or competency in different ways to pursue goal attainment.

To explain this notion, literature based in self-regulation theory focusing on goal activation is used in combination with research aimed toward the emotional influence of followership grounded in social identity theory. For example, research suggests that effective followers can influence the collective emotions of organizational members when there is heightened identification between group members and the effective follower (Tee et al., 2013). Effective followers can either promote or suppress the collective emotions of organizational members who have a shared sense of identity within the workplace. Additionally, it can be inferred that members who have a sense of shared identity also share a sense of communal orientation. As such, goals can be automatically activated within individuals who possess communal relationship orientations when they are either prescribed goals or when they observe goal pursuit as a social responsibility behavior (Fitzsimons & Bargh, 2004). Moreover, leaders may not possess greater personal power than followers. Therefore, when organizational members have a sense of shared identity with an effective follower more than a leader, it would seem plausible for leader-follower pairs to work together to enhance employees' drive to achieve

goals, communicate organizational changes, or influence organizational climate. When the leader-follower pair shares the same characteristic, such as co-cultural competence, the follower partner may be more equipped with the knowledge of what actions will be appropriate and effective to influence other member while the leader partner may be more equipped with the knowledge of what actions will be appropriate and effective to influence upper-level leaders. This type of teamwork fosters a supportive climate providing heightened opportunities for effective outcomes from both leaders and followers, which then produces an increase in positive attitudes, commitment, trust in the organization, and trust in leadership among organizational members (Gardner et al., 2005). When effective leader-follower pairs work together, they can positively impact organizational climate.

The power relations are key to the dialectical approach as it allows voices more or less influence in the construction of social reality (Martin & Nakayama, 2015). Therefore, these findings reveal how the power inequality between leader and follower positions affords effective leader-dyad units who share the same characteristics, such as co-cultural competence, the opportunity to use their co-cultural competence similarities or differences to produce desired outcomes within the workplace environment. Empirical support for the influence tactics proactive followers demonstrate led much of the most recent research among followership scholars to utilize social identity theory, attachment style theory, and implicit followership theories to investigate how followers influence leader outcomes (Hinojosa, McCauley, Randolph-Seng, & Gardner, 2014; Oc & Bashshur, 2013; Tee et al., 2013).

Indeed, there may be moments when leaders and effective followers can capitalize on power inequalities to influence organizational members towards accomplishing organizational goals. For example, results of this study found that followers tend to view emotion regulation as

an important quality of being an effective follower, yet leaders do not share this same viewpoint. Carsten et al. (2010) found that proactive followers tend to assume that one role of being a follower includes regulating the emotions of themselves as well as the emotions of other organizational members (e.g., team members, clients, their own supervisors, etc.). Additionally, Junker et al. (2014) found employees within organizations tend to allow effective followers to influence their perceptions more than leaders because they identify more with the effective follower based on job rank. These studies suggest that employees are more likely to adopt influence messages from effective followers rather than leaders. Importantly, the dialectical approach to intercultural communication competence addresses that this type of outcome could also venture toward the dark side by recognizing that “individuals are not equal in their power relations in that some social realities are created in the interests of some, over other social realities that might benefit others” (Martin & Nakayama, 2015, p. 19). Overall, effective followers as well as leader-follower dyads could use their individual and joint influence power to create socially constructive or destructive behaviors within organizational members.

The power inequalities within leader-follower relationships tend to shift, configuring and reconfiguring as relational partners influence each other, the organization, and as other forces influence the leader-follower dyad at the dyadic and individual level (Martin & Nakayama, 2015). The power inequality within the organization sets the initial tone for the degree of power imbalance within leader-follower dyads. However, a dialectical approach accounts for the inevitable shifts in context that occur. Understanding the outcomes resulting from leader-follower relationships when both partners share essentially equivalent amounts of the same trait is critical to future followership theory. Therefore, a dialectical approach can further elucidate the nature of leader-follower relationships despite contextual complexities that lend insight

toward understanding: (1) how both partners within leader-follower dyads can share the same trait yet use that quality to produce different outcomes, (2) capitalize on differences within shared traits to influence different outcomes of each other, and (3) maximize the effectiveness associated with co-producing outcomes within broader contexts.

Regardless, this line of research advocates that interactants' individual identity consists of various qualities among national, ethnic, or racial boundaries that are involved and interrelated during intercultural interactions (Martin & Nakayama, 2015). The current study echoes this notion within the proposed perspective of co-cultural competence. The specific label "intercultural communication competence" is conceptually misleading as it conveys international borders must be crossed to maintain this characteristic. As a result, the semantics shadowing this term place restrictions of utilizing the intercultural communication competence construct to only research individuals or contexts where international or cultural boundaries have been met. Therefore, the conceptual assumptions of the co-cultural competence construct between these two arguments are in agreement.

Limitations

One limitation of the research is the measures used to assess co-cultural competence and emotion regulation (IES, ICC, and iER scales). It was anticipated that combining the intercultural effectiveness scale (IES) and intercultural communication competence (ICC) scales to assess participants' co-cultural competence would provide a more meaningful representation of this characteristic. However, it is plausible that this had a reverse effect, convoluting the inferences established while analyzing the results from hypotheses testing. The ICC scale only met an acceptable level after omitting at least three items during reliability testing; additionally, the factor loading for the IES was not consistent with previous research findings. This could have

skewed data by producing divergent conceptual and operational assessments of participants' co-cultural competence. Similarly, the emotion regulation instrument met acceptable reliability levels after omitting two items for analyses conducted using the follower sample; however, this may have only skewed data for the follower sample. Future research would benefit from conducting further analyses regarding the reliability and validity of both the ICC and IES scales.

Another limitation of the current study involves the design and small sample size. Both leader and follower samples were relatively small. Furthermore, the design restricted the research from fully assessing the relationship between leader-follower dyads. All measures for the follower sample were self-report assessments whereas only leader co-cultural competence was self-report; leader participants were asked to answer the remainder of the survey based on their perceptions of a specific employee. Therefore, the small sample sizes and mixed perspective survey evaluations may limit the generalizability of the findings within this study. Future research armed with this knowledge should expand sample size, demographics, and conduct analyses using paired samples to obtain a more full representation of effective followership that spans across industries.

A final limitation of the current study involves the exclusion of investigating the role of empathy. Empathetic abilities may influence the degree of outcome effectiveness within leader-follower dyads that rely on a mutual understanding of tasks, roles, and goals. Empathy has previously been defined as the experience or ability to feel the affective, subjective experience of another person as well as the cognitive processing of the particular experience (Gerdes, Lietz, & Segal, 2011). However, this conceptualization fails to adequately explain the interdependence between affective and cognitive aspects of empathic behaviors. Given that research suggests self-regulation theory fails to fully address the role of affect during regulatory processing and

followers affect leadership outcomes by performing actions guided by the interplay between cognition and affect, empathy may be an imperative characteristic of effective followership (Csikszentmihalyi & Nakamura, 1999; Forgas & Vargas, 1999; Tee et al., 2013).

Previous research reveals that empathy is a common quality found among the various co-cultural competence models; however, these findings include empathy as subcomponent of co-cultural competence locating competence within an individual's possession, which presents gaps within the literature, including: (a) empathy as a subcomponent of co-cultural competence has not been operationalized or conceptualized with much specificity or validity, (b) assessment and analysis of emerging relational perspectives require understanding of competencies (i.e., empathy) located in the interaction as well as competencies (i.e., empathy) located within the individuals involved in the interaction process (Deardorff, 2009; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). The findings of the current study underscore the importance of understanding effective follower characteristics that account for affective and cognitive functioning as well as the interaction between these mechanisms (i.e., self-regulation and co-cultural competence). It is plausible that co-cultural competencies, such as developing affect-cognition congruence, occurs through a more lucid conceptual and operational definition of empathy. For example, recent social-neuroscience research using positron emission tomography (PET), found empathy to consist of the interplay among three processes: (a) affective sharing, (b) cognitive capacity to perspective take, and (c) regulatory processes that reinforce the divide between self and other awareness (Decety & Jackson, 2006). First, affective sharing is the ability to feel the emotional state of another (Gerdes et al., 2011). Second, cognitive perspective-taking is the cognitive capacity to internalize another's thoughts, feelings, or internal state to the degree of assessing the reasons driving that particular experience (DeBernardis et al., 2014; DeVignemont & Singer, 2006).

Lastly, the ability to mutually understand the logic compelling the emotional reactions of another requires an individual to maintain a divide between the assessment of his or her own experience in that interaction and that of the shared experience (i.e., self and other awareness) (DeVignemont & Singer, 2006; Gerdes et al., 2011).

Regarding empathy, the co-cultural competency of developing affect-cognition congruence is the process that manages the divide facilitating a clear distinction between an individual's own emotions or experience and those shared with another, which then supports the regulatory processes of adapting effective and appropriate responses (Calkins, 2004; Decety & Jackson, 2006). Therefore, the empathic process of effective followers in relation to the leader-follower dyad includes: (a) having the ability to feel the emotional state of a leader (which may or may not include sharing that emotional state), which gives rise to, (b) the capability to assess reasoning or logic driving the leaders' state, and (c) utilizing co-cultural competence abilities to promote mutual understanding by establishing a distinction between self and a leader's experience, which in turn determines the information and degree of self-regulation needed to align (i.e., detect discrepancies) as well as adapt (i.e., reduce discrepancies) goal-directed behaviors. In this light, empathy solidifies the interplay between self-regulation and co-cultural competence. Therefore, it may be beneficial to not assume empathy is too similar to other constructs by focusing efforts toward: (a) expanding conceptual and operational clarity of empathy, (b) understanding the association among empathy, self-regulation, and co-cultural competence, and (c) developing empirical and theoretical contributions to build followership, self-regulation, and co-cultural competence theory from a relational perspective.

Future Directions

Future research examining leader-follower pairs should consider placing emphasis on exploratory experiments to expand the currently sparse amount of empirical and theoretical contributions regarding the interpersonal aspects within the broader organizational context. Perhaps, focusing attention on analyzing the characteristics and behaviors of effective leader-follower partners that influence each other as well as the relationship is a lucrative starting point. Consequently, this area of investigation is of considerable importance to extend knowledge and understanding of the organizational outcomes associated with the ways in which followers and leaders influence each other. Within this framework, research should direct attention to elucidating the organizational outcomes that occur when the individuals comprising leader-follower relationships have congruent characteristics.

Theoretical constructs that previously used seeking knowledge and understanding of this association include: social identity theory, attachment style theory, and implicit followership theories (Hinojosa et al., 2014; Oc & Bashshur, 2013; Tee et al., 2013). Specifically, the findings of the current research suggest it may be advantageous to consider these associations by gearing theoretical and empirical efforts toward a more dyadic perspective. Certainly, contributions within this area will serve as the pioneers necessary to lend greater insight toward the development and construction of present and future followership theory.

Followership has been cloaked under leadership research for far too long. Research is just beginning to give followership the undivided attention it has humbly earned. The present study follows the call of followership pioneers fueling the efforts to further gain knowledge and understanding of the followership construct (Carsten et al., 2010; Epitropaki et al., 2013; Fairhurst & Grant, 2010; Hinojosa et al., 2014; Junker et al., 2014; Oc & Bashshur, 2013; Sy,

2010; Tee et al., 2013; Uhl-Bien et al., 2013). The present study sought to distinguish a set of communicative characteristics demonstrated by effective followers by examining whether leader and follower perceived self-regulation and co-cultural competence were characteristics of effective followership. Results of the study reveal that self-regulation and co-cultural competence are characteristics associated with effective follower behavior. In addition, followers tend to see emotion regulation as a characteristic of an effective follower; however, leaders do not share this same view. Moreover, there was no statistical significance between leaders and followers co-cultural competence abilities. This indicates that co-cultural competence is an important ability within all relationships and at all levels within organizational contexts. This study extends the research calling for further clarity of the followership construct. As such, the findings presented in this study contribute to further understanding the characteristics of an effective follower, which are vital pieces useful in developing present and future followership theory. Future research should use the foundation that has been set to heighten insights about the followership structure. As such, research will contribute to fueling our understanding the nature of the leader-follower relationship. It is this collection of work that will further develop a followership theory true to the nature and understanding of effective followership.

References

- Agho, A. O. (2009). Perspectives of senior-level executives on effective followership and leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 16, 159–166.
doi:10.1177/1548051809335360
- Ainsworth, S. E., & Baumeister, R. F. (2013). Cooperation and fairness depend on self-regulation. *Behavioral & Brain Sciences*, 36, 79-80. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X12000696
- Arasaratnam, L. A. (2009). The development of a new instrument of intercultural communication competence. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 20, 2–20.
- Arasaratnam, L. A. (2014). Ten years of research in intercultural communication competence (2003 - 2013): A Retrospective. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 35, 5–17.
- Belschak, F. D., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2010). Pro-self, prosocial, and pro-organizational foci of proactive behaviour: Differential antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 83, 475–498. doi:10.1348/096317909X439208
- Berg, W. d., Curseu, P. L., & Meeus, M. T. (2014). Emotion regulation and conflict transformation in multi-team systems. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 25, 171–188. doi:10.1108/IJCMA-05-2012-0038
- Bjugstad, K., Thach, E. C., Thompson, K. J., & Morris, A. (2006). A fresh look at followership: A model for matching followership and leadership styles. *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management*, 7, 304–319.
- Brunton, M., & Jeffrey, L. (2014). Identifying factors that influence the learner empowerment of international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 43, 321–334.
doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.10.003

- Calkins, S. D. (2004). Early attachment processes and the development of emotional self-regulation. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 324–339). New York: NY. Guilford Press.
- Carsten, M. K., Uhl-Bien, M., West, B. J., Patera, J. L., & McGregor, R. (2010). Exploring social constructions of followership: A qualitative study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 543–562.
doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.01
- Caruso, D. R., & Mayer, J. D. (1998). *A measure of emotional empathy for adolescents and adults*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1981). *Attention and self-regulation*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Carver, C. S. (2004). Self-regulation of action and affect. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 13–39). New York: NY. Guilford Press.
- Cervone, D., Mor, N., Orom, H., Shadel, W. G., & Scott, W. D. (2004). Self-efficacy beliefs and the architecture of personality. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 188–210). New York: NY. Guilford Press.
- Chen, G. (2009) Intercultural communication competence. In S. W. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory*. (pp. 530–533). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. doi: 10.4135/9781412959384.n201
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Nakamura, J. (1999). Emerging goals and the self-regulation of behavior. In R. S. Wyer, C. S. Carver, & M. Scheier (Eds.), *Perspectives on Behavioral Self-regulation* (pp. 107–118). Mahwah, N.J.: Psychology Press.

- Curşeu, P. L., Boroş, S., & Oerlemans, L. A. (2012). Task and relationship conflict in short-term and long-term groups: The critical role of emotion regulation. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 23, 97–107. doi: 10.1108/10444061211199331
- Deardorff, D.K. (2009). Synthesizing conceptualizations of intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence* (pp. 264–269). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Deardorff, D. K., & Jones, E. (2012) Intercultural competence: An emerging focus in international higher education. In D. K. Deardorff, H. De Witt, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of international higher education*. (pp. 283–304). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Decety, J., & Jackson, P. L. (2006). A social-neuroscience perspective on empathy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15, 54-58. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2006.00406.x
- DeBernardis, G. M., Hayes, L. J., & Fryling, M. J. (2014). Perspective taking as a continuum. *Psychological Record*, 64, 123–131. doi: 10.1007/s40732-014-0008-0
- 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.2010.53503267
- DeVignemont, F., & Singer, T. (2006). The empathic brain: How, when and why? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10, 435–441. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2006.08.008
- Dimitrov, N., Dawson, D. L., Olsen, K. C., & Meadows, K. N. (2014). Developing the intercultural competence of graduate students. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 44(3), 86–103.

Doherty, R. W. (1997). The emotional contagion scale: A measure of individual differences.

Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 21, 131–154.

Epitropaki, O., Sy, T., Martin, R., Tram-Quon, S., & Topakas, A. (2013). Implicit leadership and followership theories “in the wild”: Taking stock of information-processing approaches to leadership and followership in organizational settings. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 858–881. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.005

Faber, R. J., & Vohs, K. D. (2004). To buy or not to buy?: Self-control and self-regulatory failure in purchase behavior. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 509–536). New York: NY. Guilford Press.

Fairhurst, G. T., & Grant, D. (2010). The social construction of leadership: A sailing guide.

Management Communication Quarterly, 24, 171–210. doi: 10.1177/0893318909359697

Fitzsimons, G. M., & Bargh, J.A. (2004). Automatic self-regulation. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 151–170). New York: NY. Guilford Press.

Forgas, J.P., & Vargas, P.T. (1999). Affect, goals, and the self-regulation of behavior. In R. S. Wyer, C. S. Carver, & M. Scheier (Eds.), *Perspectives on Behavioral Self-regulation* (pp. 119–146). Mahwah, N.J.: Psychology Press.

Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). Can you see the real me?: A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 343–372. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.003

- Gerdes, K. E., Lietz, C. A., & Segal, E. A. (2011). Measuring empathy in the 21st century: Development of an empathy index rooted in social cognitive neuroscience and social justice. *Social Work Research, 35*, 83–93.
- Goldstein, N. J., Vezich, I. S., & Shapiro, J. R. (2014). Perceived perspective taking: When others walk in our shoes. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 106*, 941–960. doi: 10.1037/1a0036395
- Gollwitzer, P. M., Fujita, K., & Oettingen, G. (2004). Planning the implementation of goals. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 211–228). New York: NY. Guilford Press.
- Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 28*, 3–34. doi: 10.1016/j.riob.2008.04.002
- Hinojosa, A. S., Davis McCauley, K., Randolph-Seng, B., & Gardner, W. L. (2014). Leader and follower attachment styles: Implications for authentic leader–follower relationships. *Leadership Quarterly, 25*, 595–610. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.12.002
- Hurwitz, M., & Hurwitz, S. (2009). The romance of the follower: Part 2. *Industrial & Commercial Training, 41*, 199–206. doi:10.1108/00197850910962788
- Jiao, X. (2014). Cultivating intercultural communication competence through culture teaching. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies, 4*, 1492–1498. doi: 10.4304/tpls.4.7.1492-1498
- Junker, N. M., & Van Dick, R. (2014). Implicit theories in organizational settings: A systematic review and research agenda of implicit leadership and followership theories. *Leadership Quarterly, 25*, 1154–1173. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.09.002
- Kelley, R. E. (1988). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business Review, 66*, 142–148.

- Keyton, J., Caputo, J. M., Ford, E. A., Fu, R., Leibowitz, S. A., Liu, T., & Wu, C. (2013). Investigating verbal workplace communication behaviors. *Journal of Business Communication, 50*, 152–169. doi: 10.1177/0021943612474990
- Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M., Lester, S. W., & Jeong, S. S. (2010). Paying you back or paying me forward: Understanding rewarded and unrewarded organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 277–290. doi: 10.1037/a0018137
- Larsen, R. J., & Prizmic, Z., (2004). Affect regulation. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 40–61). New York: NY. Guilford Press.
- Laurent M., L., Nicholas L., B., & Alicia D., M. (2012). Strength in numbers how employees' acts of followership can influence their manager's charismatic leadership behavior. *Zeitschrift Fur Psychologie, 220*, 251–261. doi: 10.1027/2151-2604/a000119
- Lockwood, P. L., Seara-Cardoso, A., & Viding, E. (2014). Emotion regulation moderates the association between empathy and prosocial behavior. *Plos ONE, 9*(5), 1–6. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0096555
- Luszczyńska, A., Diehl, M., Gutiérrez-Doña, B., Kuusinen, P., & Schwarzer, R. H. (2004). Measuring one component of dispositional self-regulation: Attention control in goal pursuit. *Personality & Individual Differences, 37*, 555–566. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2003.09.026
- Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2015). Reconsidering intercultural (communication) competence in the workplace: A dialectical approach. *Language & Intercultural Communication, 15*, 13–28. doi:10.1080/14708477.2014.985303

- Mischel, W. & Ayduk, O. (2004). Willpower in a cognitive-affective processing system. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 99–129). New York: NY. Guilford Press.
- Oc, B., & Bashshur, M. R. (2013). Followership, leadership and social influence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 919–934. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.006
- Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 365–392. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070141
- Portalla, T., & Chen, G. (2009). The development and validation of the intercultural effectiveness scale. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Communication Studies, University of Rhode Island, Rhode Island, United States.
- Ramthun, A. J., & Matkin, G. S. (2012). Multicultural shared leadership: A conceptual model of shared leadership in culturally diverse teams. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 19, 303–314. doi: 10.1177/1548051812444129
- Raven, B. H., & French, J. P. (1958). Group support, legitimate power, and social influence. *Journal of Personality*, 26, 400–409. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1958.tb01595.x
- Shamir, B. (2007). From passive recipients to active co-producers: Followers' roles in the leadership process. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. Bligh, C. & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *Followers-Centered Perspectives on Leadership* (pp. ix–xxxix). Greenwich, CT: IAP.
- Smith, J. L., Wagaman, J., & Handley, I. M. (2009). Keeping it dull or making it fun: Task variation as a function of promotion versus prevention focus. *Motivation & Emotion*, 33, 150–160. doi: 10.1007/s11031-008-9118-9

- Spitzberg, B. H. (2000). A model of intercultural communication competence. In L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (9th ed., pp. 375-387). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Spitzberg, B. H. (2009). Axioms for a theory of intercultural communication competence. *Annual Review of English Learning and Teaching*, 14, 69–81.
- Spitzberg, B. H. & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence* (pp. 2–52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Spreng, R. N., McKinnon, M. C., Mar, R. A., & Levine, B. (2009). The Toronto empathy questionnaire: Scale development and initial validation of a factor-analytic solution to multiple empathy measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91, 62–71. doi: 10.1080/00223890802484381
- Sy, T. (2010). What do you think of followers?: Examining the content, structure, and consequences of implicit followership theories. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 113, 73–84. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.06.001
- Sze, W. M. (2007). Gender and cultural differences in the empathy-altruism hypothesis among university students in Hong Kong. Research Project in Psychology. Retrieved from <http://lbms03.cityu.edu.hk/oaps/ss2007-4708-wms591.pdf>.
- Tee, E. Y., Paulsen, N., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2013). Revisiting followership through a social identity perspective: The role of collective follower emotion and action. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 902–918. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.002
- Tsui, A. S., & Ashford, S. J. (1994). Adaptive self-regulation: A process view of managerial effectiveness. *Journal of Management*, 20, 93–121.

- Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 83-104. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.007
- Vohs, K.D., & Baumeister, R. F. (2004). Understanding self-regulation: An introduction. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 1–9). New York: NY. Guilford Press.
- Vohs, K.D., & Ciarocco, N. J. (2004). Interpersonal functioning requires self-regulation. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.). *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 392–407). New York: NY. Guilford Press.
- Walumbwa, F. O., & Hartnell, C. A. (2011). Understanding transformational leadership-employee performance links: The role of relational identification and self-efficacy. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 84, 153–172. doi: 10.1348/096317910X485818

Appendices

Appendix A

LEADER QUESTIONNAIRE

Intercultural Communication Competence

PART ONE

Instructions: Below is a list of statements concerning communication. Please indicate **YOUR** level of **agreement** with each statement in reference to yourself. Select a space that best represents your level of agreement from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

1. I find it is easy to talk with people from different cultures.
Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

2. I am afraid to express myself when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

3. I find it is easy to get along with people from different cultures.
Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

4. I am not always the person I appear to be when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

5. I am able to express my ideas clearly when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

6. I have problems with grammar when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

7. I am able to answer questions effectively when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

9. I use appropriate eye contact when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

10. I have problems distinguishing between informative and persuasive messages when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

11. I always know how to initiate a conversation when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

12. I often miss parts of what is going on when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

13. I feel relaxed when interacting with people from different cultures.
Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

14. I often act like a very different person when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

15. I always show respect for my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

16. I always feel a sense of distance with my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

17. I find I have a lot in common with my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

18. I find the best way to act is to be myself when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

19. I find it is easy to identify with my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

20. I always show respect for the opinions of my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

21. I often find it difficult to differentiate between similar cultures (Ex: Asians, Europeans, Africans, etc.).

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

22. I feel that people from other cultures have many valuable things to teach me.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

23. Most of my friends are from my own culture.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

24. I feel more comfortable with people from my own culture than with people from other cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

25. I find it easier to categorize people based on their cultural identity than their personality.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

26. I often notice similarities in personality between people who belong to completely different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

27. I usually feel closer to people who are from my own culture because I can relate to them better.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

28. Most of my friends are from my own culture.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

29. I usually look for opportunities to interact with people from other cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

30. I feel more comfortable with people who are open to people from other cultures than people who are not.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

Effective Follower

PART TWO

Think of someone you manage and answer the following questions about that person. Place his or her initials here _____.

Instructions: The following contains statements about follower characteristics. Please indicate how much you agree with each statement. Select a space that best represents your level of agreement from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

1. This employee comes up with new ideas.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

2. This employee works to implement new ideas.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

3. This employee finds improved ways to do things.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

4. This employee creates better processes and routines.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

5. This employee comes up with new, original ideas for handling work.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

6. This employee redesigns job tasks for greater effectiveness and efficiency.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

7. This employee takes initiative and does whatever is necessary.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

8. This employee goes against established policies and procedures if he or she thinks it will result in meeting broader organizational goals.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

9. This employee submits suggestions to improve work.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

10. This employee approaches his or her supervisor with suggestions for improvement when he or she encounters problems at work.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

11. This employee searches for the cause of work problems he or she encounters.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

12. This employee changes something in his/her work in order to improve it.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

Emotion Regulation

1. My employee sometimes throws out criticism without consideration for their co-worker's feelings.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

2. When my employee is feeling down, he/she can make myself feel better.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

3. It is difficult for my employee to calm down quickly when he/she gets mad.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

4. My employee is generally able to influence how individual members felt.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

5. During group tasks, my employee compliments his/her co-workers when they do something well.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

6. My employee generally has a good control of their emotions.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

7. When my employee experiences positive emotions, he/she knows how to make them last.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

Self-Regulation

1. This employee can concentrate on one activity for a long time, if necessary.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

2. If this employee is distracted from an activity, he/she has no problem coming back to the topic quickly.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

3. If an activity arouses this employee's feelings too much, he/she can calm themselves down so they can continue with the activity soon.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

4. If an activity requires a problem-oriented attitude, this employee can control his/her feelings.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

5. This employee can control their thoughts from distracting him/her from the task at hand.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

6. After an interruption, this employee has no problem resuming his/her concentrated style of working.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree *e*

7. This employee stays focused on a goal and does not allow anything to distract from his/her plan of action.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

Demographic Questions

PART THREE

Please provide the following demographic information.

1. Biological Sex: ☐ Male
 ☐ Female

2. Age: _____

3. What is your highest level of education?

- ☐ High School Diploma
- ☐ Some College
- ☐ Associate's Degree
- ☐ University Degree (Bachelor's)
- ☐ Some Graduate School
- ☐ Graduate Degree
- ☐ Other

4. Type in below, how long you have been employed since turning 18 years of age:

5. Please indicate your current employment status:

- ☐ Full Time
☐ Part Time
☐ Retired
☐ Unemployed
☐ Other

6. Have you maintained a leadership role for at least one year or more? ____ Yes ____ No

7. Type in below, how long have you have been employed in your current position?

8. Please type in below, the maximum number of employees you previously or currently oversee. Please answer in reference to the job in which you supervised the MOST employees.

FOLLOWER QUESTIONNAIRE

Intercultural Communication Competence

PART ONE

Instructions: Below is a list of statements concerning communication. Please indicate **YOUR** level of **agreement** with each statement in reference to yourself. Select a space that best represents your level of agreement from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

1. I find it is easy to talk with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

2. I am afraid to express myself when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

3. I find it is easy to get along with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

4. I am not always the person I appear to be when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

5. I am able to express my ideas clearly when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

6. I have problems with grammar when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

7. I am able to answer questions effectively when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

9. I use appropriate eye contact when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

10. I have problems distinguishing between informative and persuasive messages when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

11. I always know how to initiate a conversation when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

12. I often miss parts of what is going on when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

13. I feel relaxed when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

14. I often act like a very different person when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

15. I always show respect for my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

16. I always feel a sense of distance with my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

17. I find I have a lot in common with my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

18. I find the best way to act is to be myself when interacting with people from different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

19. I find it is easy to identify with my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

20. I always show respect for the opinions of my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

21. I often find it difficult to differentiate between similar cultures (Ex: Asians, Europeans, Africans, etc.).

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

22. I feel that people from other cultures have many valuable things to teach me.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

23. Most of my friends are from my own culture.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

24. I feel more comfortable with people from my own culture than with people from other cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

25. I find it easier to categorize people based on their cultural identity than their personality.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

26. I often notice similarities in personality between people who belong to completely different cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

27. I usually feel closer to people who are from my own culture because I can relate to them better.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

28. Most of my friends are from my own culture.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

29. I usually look for opportunities to interact with people from other cultures.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

30. I feel more comfortable with people who are open to people from other cultures than people who are not.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

Effective Follower

1. As a follower, I come up with new ideas.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

2. As a follower, I work to implement new ideas.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

3. As a follower, I find improved ways to do things makes to be more effective.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

4. As a follower, I create better processes and routines.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

5. As a follower, I come up with new, original ideas for handling work.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

6. As a follower, I redesign job tasks for greater effectiveness and efficiency.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

7. As a follower, I take initiative and do whatever is necessary.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

8. As a follower, I go against established policies and procedures if I thinks it will result in meeting broader organizational goals are performing effectively.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

9. As a follower, I submit suggestions to improve work as an important part of what makes me effective.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

10. As a follower, I approach my supervisor with suggestions for improvement when he or she encounters problems at work.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

11. As a follower, I search for the cause of work problems I encounter.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

12. As a follower, I change something in my work in order to improve it.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

Emotion Regulation

1. I sometimes throw out criticism without consideration for my co-worker's feelings.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

2. When I am feeling down, I can make myself feel better.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

3. It is difficult to calm down quickly when I get mad at my co-workers.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

4. I am generally able to influence how individual members felt.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

5. During team tasks, I compliment my co-workers when we do something well.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

6. I generally have a good control of my emotions.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

7. When I experience positive emotions, I know how to make them last.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

Self-Regulation

1. As a follower, I can concentrate on one activity for a long time, if necessary.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

2. As a follower, if I am distracted from an activity, I do not have any problem coming back to the topic quickly.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

3. As a follower, if an activity arouses too many feelings, I can calm themselves down so that I can continue with the activity soon.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

4. As a follower, if an activity requires a problem-oriented attitude, I can control my feelings.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

5. As a follower, I control my thoughts from distracting myself from the task at hand.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

6. After an interruption, as a follower, I do not have any problem resuming my concentrated style of working.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

7. As a follower, I stay focused on goals and do not allow anything to distract me from my plan of action.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

Demographic Questions**PART TWO**

Please provide the following demographic information.

1. Biological Sex: ☐ Male
 ☐ Female
 ☐ Prefer not to answer

2. Age: _____

3. What is your highest level of education?

- ☐ High School Diploma
- ☐ Some College
- ☐ Associate's Degree
- ☐ University Degree (Bachelor's)
- ☐ Some Graduate School
- ☐ Graduate Degree
- ☐ Other

4. Type in below, how long you have been employed since turning 18 years of age:

5. Please indicate your current employment status:

☐ Full Time

☐ Part Time

☐ Student

☐ Other

6. Are you currently employed? ☐ Yes

☐ No

7. Type in below, how long have you have been employed in your current position?

Appendix B

INFORMATION STATEMENT LEADER

INTRODUCTION: You are invited to participate in a research study about followership in the workplace. The purpose of this study is to examine the perceptions of leaders and followers toward effective followership characteristics, including: self-regulation and intercultural communication competence. Leader participants must fulfill the following:

- Must be 18 years or older to participate.
- Employed full time
- Oversee at least 5 followers
- Obtained a leadership position for at least one year.

If you do not meet these criteria, close your browser and discontinue participation in this survey.

INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPANTS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE STUDY:

You will be administered an online survey. The survey will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. The online survey results will only be accessible by the researchers. Your answers are completely anonymous and will only be used for research purposes. All data will be kept on password protected devices to maintain confidentiality. The Qualtrics software collects IP addresses when people complete the survey. It is possible that someone could identify through this IP address; however, to minimize the likelihood of this happening all IP addresses will be removed from the data before they are downloaded from the Qualtrics server.

RISKS: There are no foreseeable risks, greater than those encountered in everyday life, involved with participating in this research. It is possible someone could access the Qualtrics software and determine the IP addresses from which this survey was completed.

BENEFITS: This research will help broaden scholarly literature regarding followership and leadership as well as increase information known about the communication characteristics that are being investigated by the researchers.

CONFIDENTIALITY: The information you provide will be kept confidential. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to the persons conducting the study. No reference will be made in oral or written reports that could link participants to this study. Identifying information will not be collected.

CONTACT INFORMATION If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study,) you may contact the researchers: Cassandra Ray at cmellon2@vols.utk.edu, and (865) 314-0578 OR Michelle Violanti at violanti@utk.edu and (865) 974-7072. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, contact the Office of Research Compliance Officer at (865) 974-7697.

PARTICIPATION Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be destroyed.

CONSENT: By clicking the NEXT button, I acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age, have read the above information, fulfill the leader criteria above, and agree to participate in this study.

INFORMATION STATEMENT FOLLOWER

INTRODUCTION: You are invited to participate in a research study about followership in the workplace. The purpose of this study is to examine the perceptions of leaders and followers toward effective followership characteristics, including self-regulation, and intercultural communication competence. Follower participants must fulfill the following:

- Must be 18 years or older to participate
- Been in a situation where someone else was the leader.

If you do not meet these criteria, close your browser and choose another option from the research participation pool.

INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPANTS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE STUDY: You will be administered an online survey. The survey will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. The online survey results will only be accessible by the researchers. Your answers are completely anonymous and will only be used for research purposes. All data will be kept on password protected devices to maintain confidentiality. The Qualtrics software collects IP addresses when people complete the survey. It is possible that someone could identify through this IP address; however, to minimize the likelihood of this happening all IP addresses will be removed from the data before they are downloaded from the Qualtrics server.

RISKS: There are no foreseeable risks, greater than those encountered in everyday life, involved with participating in this research. It is possible someone could access the Qualtrics software and determine the IP addresses from which this survey was completed.

BENEFITS: This research will help broaden scholarly literature regarding followership and leadership as well as increase information known about the communication characteristics that are being investigated by the researchers.

CONFIDENTIALITY: The information you provide will be kept confidential. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to the persons conducting the study. No reference will be made in oral or written reports that could link participants to this study. Identifying information will not be collected.

CONTACT INFORMATION If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study), you may contact the researchers: Cassandra Ray at cmellon2@vols.utk.edu, and (865) 314-0578 OR Michelle Violanti at violanti@utk.edu, and (865) 974-7072. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, contact the Office of Research Compliance Officer at (865) 974-7697.

PARTICIPATION Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be destroyed.

CONSENT: By clicking the NEXT button, I acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age, have read the above information, fulfill the follower criteria above, and agree to participate in this study.

VITA

Cassandra Ann Mellon was born June 18, 1988 in Knoxville, Tennessee to Bill Mellon Jr. and Hsin-Wen Chang. She is the older sister of Amanda Mellon. Having grown up between both Knoxville and Taiwan, Cassandra developed her ability to speak fluent English and Mandarin Chinese. Her bilingual ability and abroad experiences are at the crux of her research interest regarding followership and intercultural communication. She graduated from Farragut High School in 2006. As an undergraduate, she transferred enrollment from Pellissippi State Community College to the Communication & Information (CCI) in 2010. She majored in Communication Studies with a minor in Business while maintaining an active involvement within the Knoxville community. Cassandra earned a Bachelor of Arts in Communication from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in 2012. In August 2014, she entered the CCI graduate program. During this time, she committed to a number of different responsibilities and internship opportunities. She served as both a Graduate Teaching Associate for the School of Communication Studies as well as a student-athlete mentor for the UT Athletic Department. Cassandra graduates with a Master's of Science degree in Communication in May 2016. She is eager to continue her academic pursuits with the University of Tennessee's CCI Ph.D. program in August 2016.