

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

THE DYNAMICS OF SHARED LEADERSHIP

TAYLOR LENDER  
SPRING 2018

A thesis  
submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements  
for baccalaureate degrees in English and Psychology  
with honors in Psychology

Reviewed and approved\* by the following:

Samuel T. Hunter  
Associate Professor of Psychology  
Thesis Supervisor

Jeffrey Love  
Associate Teaching Professor  
Honors Adviser

\* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

## ABSTRACT

Shared leadership is an emerging style that involves a team of leaders. This leadership construct can help minimize the demands of leadership and increase leadership effectiveness. Since shared leadership is a relatively new topic, there has been minimal research conducted on shared leadership, and specifically, the construction and dynamics of shared leadership teams. This study presents a field study that explores the dynamics of leadership in terms of trust, relational transparency, and viability. We hypothesized that leaders who rate their leader teammates high on transparency also rate their leader teammates high on trust. We also hypothesized that perceived trust among shared leadership teams is positively correlated with perceived viability. Our results indicated support for our first hypothesis; perceived relational transparency among shared leadership teams did positively correlate with perceived trust. Our second hypothesis was not supported. We conducted multivariate linear regression analysis to test our third hypothesis that female, outdoor leaders positively correlated with adoption of transactional leadership style, while male outdoor leaders positively correlated with adoption of transformational leadership style. Our results did not indicate support for the third hypothesis. These results provide insight into the dynamics of shared leader teams that may be useful for the training of these teams.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
Chapter 1 Shared Leadership.....	1
Chapter 2 Dynamics of Shared Leadership.....	8
Chapter 3 Leadership Style.....	11
Transformational Leadership.....	12
Transactional Leadership.....	13
Gender.....	15
Chapter 4 Outdoor Leadership.....	17
Chapter 5 Methods.....	19
Measures.....	23
Chapter 6 Results.....	25
Chapter 7 Discussion.....	27
Chapter 8 Limitations and Future Research.....	30
Appendix A Adaptation of Neider, Schriesheim, & Chester (2011) Relational Transparency .....	34
Appendix B Adaptation of Marlowe & Nyhan (1992) Trust.....	35
Appendix C Adaptation of Tekleab, Quigley, & Tesluk’s (2009) Viability.....	36
Appendix D Adaptation of Avolio, Bass, & Jung (1999) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-MLQ-Form 6S.....	37
Appendix E Gender.....	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	39

## LIST OF TABLES

*Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients*

	M	SD	(1)	(2)	(3)
Viability (1)	8.46	2.06	--		
Trust (2)	43.08	6.76	-0.234	--	
Relational Transparency (3)	17.83	2.77	-0.196	<b>0.600**</b>	--

*Note.* N=50. \* p <.05. M = mean, SD = Standard Deviation

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Rachel Heinen, my thesis mentor, for her guidance throughout this endeavor. Her contributions to this paper and mentorship has taught me about all aspects of the research process. Without her guidance, this paper simply would not be possible. I would also like to thank Dr. Sam Hunter for his support and guidance throughout this process. I would also like to thank members of the Leadership and Innovation Lab would offered me support and encouragement through the data collection portion of this project. Lastly, I would like to offer my gratitude to all family and friends who provided moral support throughout this process.

## Chapter 1

### Shared Leadership

Leadership structure typically has been understood as hierarchical with one leader having authority over followers (Yammarino, Salas, Serban, Shirreffs, & Shuffler, 2012). The tradition of studying leadership as one leader enforcing a top-down style of authority started in the 1800s (Pearce & Conger, 2002). The Industrial Revolution prompted the empirical study of leadership. Two researchers, Henri Fayol and Max Weber established that organizations needed a unity of command, meaning one person would oversee all actions of laborers (Pearce & Conger, 2002). The concept of unity of command established that leaders were separate from followers, and this ideal became the foundation for future research on leadership. In the 1920s, researcher, Mary Follett, introduced *the law of situation* (Pearce & Conger, 2002). Follett argued that the person with the most expertise regarding a particular situation should become the leader (Pearce & Conger, 2002). While Follett, Fayol, and Weber all agreed that one person should be a leader, Mary Follett introduced the idea that leadership could be transferable. By suggesting that leadership was an activity that could be taken on, Follett began to establish the theory that would later support shared leadership (Pearce & Conger, 2002).

After Follett's study, the idea of shared leadership still was not empirically studied by many researchers throughout the majority of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Pearce & Conger, 2002). Most researchers studied the idealized, a heroic version of traditional leadership (Fletcher & Käufer, 2002). Recent literature calls for more studies on shared leadership to address issues in the modern workplace because leadership roles are increasing in complexity and demand (Pearce & Conger, 2002). To explain, technology has revolution the workplace. Companies are capable of reaching a larger audience, hiring more people, and expanding communication to a global scale (Pearce & Conger, 2002). This technology-driven shift allows companies to become larger and more complex, which increases the demand for multiple teams to tackle projects and issues within one organization. While organizational structure values teams to be able to work efficiently, traditional leadership still is pervasive. CEOs are expected to

have the capabilities and expertise to solve large-scale problems quickly. Realistically, one person is not capable of quickly solving many complex, diverse problems (Pearce & Conger, 2002). Due to the high-speed, technology-drive, globalized workplace, the demands of leadership are immense and require multiple leaders to feasibly and successfully lead in modernized organizations (Yammarino et al., 2012).

Within the past few years, research has considered shared leadership as a possible solution to alleviate the challenges of the traditional, singular leadership structure (Eckman, 2006). Shared leadership is defined as members of the team sharing responsibility to complete the functions of leadership (Yammarino et al., 2012). In addition to Mary Follett, other researchers throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century laid out the foundations of shared leadership. In the 1960s, researchers, Bowers and Seashore (1966) conducted a research study where they found that multiple team members could have leadership influence over a team, and they called this idea ‘mutual leadership’ (Pearce & Conger, 2002). After this, it was not until the 1990s that researchers started to empirically research shared leadership (Pearce & Conger, 2002).

Even though the framework of shared leadership is rooted in research over the past century, shared leadership still is considered a relatively new concept in terms of empirical research. A recent meta-analysis reported that researchers, Mathieu, Heffner, Goodwin, Salas, and Cannon-Bowers, (2000) thought that effective shared leadership behavior possibly could promote trust within the team and increase cooperation with in a team, but this notion was not empirically tested (as cited by Wang, Waldman, & Zhang, 2014, p. 191). While there is some consensus on the potential of shared leadership to increase effectiveness, researchers still do not know what types of leadership styles best construct a shared leader team (Wang et al., 2014). As a whole, researchers know that shared leadership could help team effectiveness but the dynamics of shared leadership are unclear. Therefore, this paper aims to clarify empirical understanding of shared leadership teams.

When leaders share power and decision-making authority, the overall effectiveness of the team is the responsibility of all shared leadership team members and not the responsibility of just one leader

(Yammarino et al., 2012). Each member of a leadership team is able to contribute a unique set of knowledge, skills, and various competencies that have the potential to build a highly effective team of leaders (Drescher & Garbers, 2016; Ensley, Hmieleski, & Pearce, 2006). Overall, shared leadership makes the task of leading more manageable, and in turn, can minimize leader burn out and stress while increasing leadership effectiveness and satisfaction (Drescher & Garbers, 2016; Hmieleski, Cole, & Baron, 2012; Wood & Fields, 2007). According to meta-analyses, shared leadership is predictive of favorable outcomes for leading teams, such as team effectiveness and performance (Yammarino et al., 2012; Drescher & Garbers, 2016; & Wang et al., 2014).

Despite a rising amount of interest in the topic of shared leadership, the amount of empirical research on shared leadership is minimal. Likewise, there are still challenges that arise when understanding how to divide leadership responsibilities (Yammarino et al., 2012). In a meta-analysis regarding collectivist leadership, the researchers acknowledge that shared leadership inherently requires leaders to shift and share power (Yammarino et al., 2012). Shared leadership teams must learn how to shared power and authority. Relinquishing and reacquiring power between team members can be difficult to coordinate and understand without causing conflict within the shared leader team. Therefore, clear boundary conditions must be present for effectiveness (Yammarino et al., 2012). Furthermore, individual leaders gather information about the entire team and situation at different times. Therefore, leaders must master finding the appropriate time to be transparent with their fellow leaders regarding information about the rest of the team (Yammarino et al., 2012). Overall, there are complex challenges regarding the relational dynamics within shared leadership teams, and the present paper aims to shed light on some of the many factors that influence dynamics between shared leadership teammates.

## Chapter 2

### Dynamics of Shared Leadership

#### *Trust*

Shared leader teams are faced with the challenge of shifting power at appropriate times (Yammarino et al., 2012). Even though learning how to share power is essential to shared leadership, there has been little to no empirical research conducted on what helps leaders manage this challenge (Yammarino et al., 2012). In a recent meta-analysis on trust in relation to leadership, researchers examined trust divided into two different dimensions of cognitive trust and affective trust (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; McAllister, 1995). Cognitive trust was grounded in reliability while affective trust reflected a relationship where people cared about one another's wellbeing (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Even though the researchers were discussing traditional, hierarchical forms of leadership, the researchers acknowledged that participative decision making could demonstrate a leader's trust in participants. Dirks & Ferrin (2002) found evidence that trust is significantly related to attitudinal and behavioral outcomes in followers. So far, researchers have found evidence that trust is important to workplace relationships between followers and leaders, but there has been little empirical research on trust within shared leader teams. Trust among shared leader teammates could be an important element to mitigate the challenges of sharing power within shared leader teams. Therefore, this paper aims to clarify how trust works in shared leader teams.

#### *Transparency*

Researchers, Norman, Avolio, and Luthans (2010) conducted a field experiment that explored how leader transparency relates to followers' perceived trust. In this study, trust is defined as the willingness to be vulnerable (as cited by Norman, Avolio, and Luthans, 2010, p. 351). The researchers used Webster's definition of transparency, "obvious, readily understandable, clear, candid, and lucid" (Norman, Avolio, & Luthans, 2010, p. 352). The researchers found that transparent leaders increase trust amongst participants (Norman, Avolio, & Luthans, 2010). Even though these findings focus on the

relationship between leaders and participants, these results might translate to shared leader teams.

Leaders who are transparent with their leader teammates could increase trust amongst the leader team. If transparency can increase trust between shared leader teammates, the team could improve on sharing power by trusting that their leader teammate is doing his or her job correctly. A better understanding of transparency in relation to trust is needed to clarify the dynamics of shared leader teams. Therefore, this study will see if transparency among leaders will increase trust in shared leader teams.

*H1: Perceived relational transparency among shared leadership teams is positively correlated with perceived trust.*

In other words, leaders who rate their shared leadership teams as high on relational transparency will also rate these shared leadership teams as high on trust.

### ***Viability***

Shared leadership teams are likely to be constructed once organizations increase in complexity and size, so shared leader teams are likely to have to work together for a period of time to solve these complex issues (Yammarino et al., 2012). Share leader teammates should want to work together if they are required to do so by the organization. In a paper by Balkundi, Basness, & Michael (2009), researchers called this viability and defined viability as “the willingness to remain in a team” (p. 313). The researchers argue that teams do not want to work together in the future if they experience conflict (Jehn & Mannix, 2001). Jehn and Mannix (2001) also noted that group atmosphere greatly effects how groups handle conflict. In their study, group atmospheres that fostered open discussion and valued trust reduced overall group conflict. Balkundi, Barsness, and Michael (2009) found that teams that experienced lower levels of conflict increased team viability. Therefore, if transparency increases trust, and trust decreases shared team leadership conflict, then an increase of trust might increase viability among shared leader teams. This paper will help clarify if perceived trust in shared leadership teams relates to viability.

*H2: Perceived trust among shared leadership teams is positively correlated with perceived viability.*

In other words, leaders who rate their shared leader teams as high on trust will also rate these shared teams as high on viability.

## Chapter 3

### Leadership Style

Although leaders in shared leadership teams need to share power and authority among one another, this does not necessarily mean they need to adopt the same leadership style. Leaders can vary distinctly in their leadership style, particularly when they adopt either a transformational or transactional approach (Northouse, 2016). Transformational and transactional leadership styles are two styles of leadership that are frequently discussed in current literature (Northouse, 2016). According to Burns (1978), he established leadership as those who account for their followers needs (as cited by Northouse, 2016, p. 162). From that definition of leadership, another researcher established the term transformational leadership (Downtown, 1973). Transformational leaders are characterized by understanding and caring for their followers' needs and goals (Northouse, 2016). These leaders have high moral standards for themselves and their followers. Along with establishing high ethical standards, transformational leaders are charismatic and communicate long-term goals for the future of the organization. A unique characteristic of transformational leadership is that leaders are committed to developing their followers by motivating them to surpass their own developmental goals. For example, Mohandas Gandhi is a famous example of a transformational leader who communicated a clear vision of a better future. Gandhi was extremely moral and challenged his followers to work towards a that future despite incredible obstacles (Northouse, 2016).

The counterpart to transformational leadership is transactional leadership. This style of leadership is characterized by leaders who treat leadership as an exchange process between themselves and their followers (Northouse, 2016). According to Kuhnert (1994), leaders who are transactional do not focus on follower development or follower needs (as cited by Northouse, 2016, p.171). To get followers to perform, the leader will exchange rewards or punishments based on follower performance. According to Northouse (2016), many politicians who promise lower taxes in exchanges for votes are common examples of transactional leaders.

Lastly, laissez-faire leadership is discussed when talking about transformational or transactional leadership. This style of leadership is essentially non-leadership (Northouse, 2016). Laissez-faire leaders do not interact with followers, participate in decision-making, and are not present figures in an organization (Northouse, 2016). For the purpose of this paper, laissez-faire leadership will not be considered because there are many behaviors or actions to study. Rather, this paper will consider transformational and transactional leadership.

### **Transformational Leadership**

Transformational leaders transform both their followers and organization as a whole (Northouse, 2016). This leadership style positively correlates with follower motivation, as transformational leaders focus on addressing the individual needs of the followers (Northouse, 2016). These leaders are characterized as having high moral standards and focus on follower development. Transformational leaders will exhibit the four dimensions of transformational leadership including: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Northouse, 2016).

#### *Idealized Influence*

This factor of transformational leadership emphasizes morality. These leaders rate high on charisma, and their followers see these leaders as role models. Furthermore, transformational leaders are usually excellent at public speaking and easily convey their vision for the future. Their followers respect, listen, and aspire to model their behavior (Northouse, 2016).

#### *Inspirational Motivation*

Another aspect of the transformational leadership style is inspirational motivation. These leaders motivate their followers by communicating a clear, shared vision of the future where the team's goals are accomplished. Also, transformational leaders outline a clear set of expectations for their followers that define the path toward their goal (Northouse, 2016).

#### *Intellectual Stimulation*

Transformational leaders do not just tell their followers what to do. Rather, the transformational leader understands that followers are capable to address problems in their own way. These leaders encourage independent thinking and challenge followers to offer new strategies, ideas, or creative solutions to problems that arise, which results in engaged followers (Northouse, 2016).

#### *Individualized Consideration*

Transformational leaders offer individualized support and guidance to their followers. When a follower is challenged by a task, the leader listens and comes up with strategies to help the followers overcome difficult situations. Overall, transformational leaders demonstrate individual consideration when they help develop individual followers (Northouse, 2016).

### **Transactional Leadership**

Dissimilar to transformational leadership, transactional leadership does not focus on individual follower development (Northouse, 2016). This style of leadership emphasizes the exchange between leaders and followers in relation to task completion. Transactional leadership is made up of two dimensions: contingent reward and management-by-exception (Northouse, 2016).

#### *Contingent Reward*

Transactional leaders clearly define what tasks need to be completed within certain timeframes. The leader motivates the followers to complete the tasks by outlining rewards and offering incentives. Basically, if the followers put forth effort and successfully complete the tasks, then the leader will grant rewards for the followers' achievements (Northouse, 2016).

#### *Management-by-Exception*

Transactional leaders monitor their followers and offer feedback, corrective criticism, and negative reinforcement (Northouse, 2016). To explain, if a follower did not complete a task on time, the leader would not give the follower his or her reward. Furthermore, if a follower was completing tasks in an incorrect way, the transactional leader would inform the follower that the task was not done correctly.

Within the management-by-exception factor, there are two main approaches: passive and active. A transactional leader that used management-by-exception in an active manner would offer negative feedback as the followers were making mistakes (Northouse, 2016). If the leader waited until after the followers consistently made mistakes to give criticism, this transactional leader would be using management-by-exception in a passive manner (Northouse, 2016).

Overall, transactional leadership focuses on giving rewards for task and goal completion but does not focus on individual follower growth or development. According to a meta-analytic review, there are few studies that look at management-by-exception effectiveness, but contingent-reward was predictive of the individual task performance of followers (Wang, Oh, Courtright, & Colbert, 2011). Therefore, transactional leaders could lead teams to reach task-related goals, while transformational leadership could lead team members to perform tasks that improve overall experience and outcomes. This research also acknowledged that there was some overlap between transactional and transformational leaders (Wang et al., 2011). In other words, all transformational leaders have to be transactional to some extent (Wang et al., 2011).

Both transformational and transactional leaders are goal-oriented. The key difference between transactional and transformational leadership is that transformational leaders focus on personal development of followers (Northouse, 2016). According to Bennis and Nanus (1985), transformational leaders establish trust in their followers by creating a community through a shared vision (as cited in Northouse, 2016, p. 172). To achieve this, transformational leaders have a deep understanding of their own strengths and weakness and manage their weakness well (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Avolio & Gibbons, 1988). Researchers, Kouzes and Posner (2002), support the notion that transformational leaders must role model desired behavior and encourage followers by acknowledging when followers perform well (Northouse, 2016). Transformational leaders must have adequate social skills to be able to understand group needs and lead followers to accept an organization's ideals (Northouse, 2016). Overall,

transformational leaders must have a more complex understanding of themselves and their followers, while transactional leaders do not engage in the social complexities of a leader follower relationship.

Even though the literature on transactional and transformational leadership acknowledges the success of both styles, researches still do not know to what extent leaders should act in a transformational or transactional manner in a shared leadership team. As previously mentioned, shared leadership allows individuals within the leader team to divide aspects of leadership. This allows individual to assume responsibilities that best align with their skills. Naturally, individuals tend to lead in either a transformational or transactional style. Shared leadership teams could be constructed to include both transactional and transformational leaders to capitalize on the benefits of each style within a leader team.

### **Gender**

There has been a stream of research investigating whether there are gender differences in the adoption of these two styles of leadership. If having a team of both transformational and transactional leaders could be beneficial in a shared leader team, understanding who is more likely to lead in a transactional and transformational way could help construct leader teams. In one meta-analysis of gender and leadership style, researchers found that women tended to adopt a transformational style while men were reported adopting a transactional leadership style (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Engen, 2003). Even though women displayed behaviors that aligned with the dimensions of transformational leadership, particularly individualized consideration, women in the meta-analysis also used contingent-reward significantly more than men did in the study (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Engen, 2003). Therefore, women displayed behaviors that aligned with both transformational and transactional leadership. With that being said, men used the management-by-exception tactic of transactional leadership, both passive and active, more than women in this paper.

These results align with stereotypical gender characteristics. Stereotypes deem that women are supposed to be better at interpersonal tasks while men are meant to be more task-oriented (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). In another meta-analysis, researchers found that men and women demonstrate these

stereotypical behaviors in both laboratory and assessment center settings. In organizational settings, women led in both a more interpersonal-oriented and more task-orientated way than men in this study (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Therefore, the setting in which men and women lead can affect which leadership style they adopt. Some leaders have to lead in more high-risk environments other than laboratory or corporate settings. While Eagly and Johnson (1990) demonstrate that context may influence gender and the adoption of leadership style, the researchers do not address if unique, high-risk settings, such as outdoor leadership, influence leadership style.

## Chapter 4

### Outdoor Leadership

Leadership of outdoor adventure-based programs differs from other contexts of leadership in that leaders must teach specific outdoor skills, account for the safety of the group in extreme environments, and promote the development of followers (Ewert, 1989; as cited by Hayashi & Ewert, 2006, p. 223). Outdoor leadership demands both task-oriented and relationship-oriented behavior of leaders, so researchers, Hayashi & Ewert (2006), suggest that gaining a better understanding of outdoor leadership through the lens of transactional and transformational leadership could be useful. Even though many outdoor leadership organizations have both male and female leaders, gender differences among transformational and transactional leadership style adoption has not been empirically examined in the context of outdoor leadership.

Outdoor leaders must prioritize different goals than those who lead in a more traditional context. Outdoor leaders focus on developing followers to reach their personal goals on outdoor trips (Hayashi & Ewert, 2006). This goal of outdoor leaders aligns well with the goals of transformational leaders. In addition, outdoors leaders must prioritize safety. According to a meta-analytic review by researchers Byrnes, Miller, and Schafer (1999), women tended to demonstrate less risk-taking behavior than men. Therefore, female outdoor leaders could prioritize safety more than male leaders in the same context. Outdoor leaders also prioritize teaching less experienced followers how to perform an outdoor activity, which focuses on follower development (Hayashi & Ewert, 2006). Therefore, researchers of outdoor leadership argue that both transformational and transactional leadership is necessary to complete all task-oriented and interpersonal-oriented duties. In order to ensure that tasks get complete, whether those tasks are meant to facilitate learning technical skills, following safety protocol, or encouraging increased communication, transactional leadership could be especially beneficial in an outdoor leadership context (Byrmer & Gray, 2006). Additionally, transformational leadership would help facilitate participant

personal development and growth in an outdoor leadership context (Byrmer & Gray, 2006). Overall, both transactional and transformational leadership are useful in an outdoor leadership environment.

As previously mentioned, women were reported adopting transformational leadership styles, and researchers understand that the context of leadership can influence the adoption of leadership style (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Engen, 2003; Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Since outdoor leadership requires completing an extensive list of tasks, our researchers predict that women will adopt a transactional style in an outdoor leadership setting to ensure that safety-measures and other task-oriented elements of the trip are completed. Inversely, our researchers think that men will adopt a transformational style of leadership to address the developmental goals of outdoor leadership.

*H3a: Female, outdoor leaders positively correlate with adoption of transactional leadership style.*

*H3b: Male, outdoor leaders positively correlate with adoption of transformational leadership style.*

## Chapter 5

### Methods

#### Present Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relational dynamics in shared leadership teams, as well as gender differences in the adoption of leadership styles in an outdoor leadership context. First, we predicted that certain relational variables would show positive outcomes in shared leadership teams, such that relational transparency would predict trust among shared leadership teams, and that trust would be predictive of viability among leaders. We also predicted that gender differences would arise in the adoption of a transformational versus a transactional leadership style, such that male leaders would adopt a more transformational leadership style and female leaders would adopt a more transactional leadership style. Overall the results of this study will give researchers a better understanding of the role of relational dynamics and gender in shared leadership teams when leading outdoor excursion teams.

#### Participants

The researchers recruited participants from an outdoor orientation program in the Northeastern region of the United States to participate in this field study. This organization runs backpacking programs for first year university students in affiliation with a large, public university. There was a total of 33 backpacking leaders who participated in some aspect of the study. Of the 33 backpacking leaders, 25 leaders, ages 19-23, participated in the optional quantitative survey. Ten of these participants were male (40%), 14 were female (56%), and one person preferred not to report gender (4%). For race, 24 out of 25 participants identified as white, and one person identified as 'other'.

#### *Training*

The backpacking orientation organization trained all participants in outdoor leadership for two months. The organization's training program taught participants, hard skills including how to properly set up camp, cook in the backcountry, and navigate the trail properly. The training program also taught leaders about backcountry ethics that are meant to protect the environment from camping impact. The

leaders were trained in risk management and discussed soft skills. The soft skills included practicing listening skills, being responsive to follower needs, and communicating effectively with followers. Furthermore, all leaders had a minimum of wilderness first aid and CPR training. All participants had the same leadership, technical skill, and risk management training from the same organization prior to leading backpacking teams.

### *Construction of Teams*

Upper management constructed shared leadership teams after the initial outdoor leadership training course. Each team had at least one male and one female per shared leadership team. There was a total of either two leaders or three leaders per team. Twenty-five of the leaders participated in the optional, online survey. After cleaning the data, only 19 of the responses were complete enough to consider the data analysis portion of this study. The orientation program had three consecutive weeks of programming with multiple groups backpacking each week. Some leaders led during just one trip, some led for two trips by working two weeks, and some leaders lead all three trips. During each week, the leaders were in a different shared leader team, and these shared leader teams were either dyads or triads. Over the course of the three weeks, of the 19 participants, 11 dyads and 5 triads were able to be studied.

### *Trip Structure*

The leader teams led 5-day long backpacking trip in backcountry forests and each team was responsible for no more than 12 followers per trip. Since this backpacking program served as an orientation for college students, all the followers were incoming freshman at the affiliated university. Leaders were expected to complete the trip successfully by teaching the followers how to backpack, address concerns and questions about university-life, and motivate all followers to complete the trip.

### *Leader Task Responsibilities*

The leaders within the leader team were responsible for many task-related jobs. For example, the leaders taught followers the basics of setting up a campsite which includes: building trap forts for shelter, hanging bear bags in trees to store food, and designating a kitchen and separate bathroom area. The

leaders also showed followers how to properly pack their packs. The leaders taught the followers how to purify water and how to stay hygienic in the backcountry. Furthermore, the leaders taught the followers how to cook using gas camping stoves and other tools in backcountry.

#### *Leader Interpersonal Responsibilities*

In addition to completing various task-oriented jobs, leaders were responsible for addressing questions and concerns regarding university-life. The leaders facilitated a debriefing session at the end of each day. During these debriefing sessions, followers asked questions about university-life, and the leaders provided answers and advice. Also, the leaders discussed the events of the day and addressed any concerns about the trip. Then, the leaders and their followers set goals to improve upon the next day. In addition to debriefing sessions, the leaders were responsible for managing the social relations of their followers. To explain, the leaders were expected to ensure that every follower was included and was participating in the activities of the day. Due to the difficult, physical challenges of backpacking, the leaders were expected to constantly motivate their followers to overcome challenges like general fatigue, changing weather patterns, and being away from family and friends for the duration of the trip.

#### *Leader Risk Management Responsibilities*

Risk is inevitable in outdoor trips. All leaders were expected to prioritize safety, hygiene, and general risk management when leading their team of followers. Therefore, all leaders trained their followers on severe weather drills, monitor for hydration and regularity, teach proper hygiene skills, and enforce the program's protocol regarding bodies of water, road crossings, etc. The leaders were expected to provide proper first aid as needed, such as monitoring and treating blisters. Lastly, the leaders were expected to understand and be able to execute evacuation protocol.

Overall, the leaders in this program have a vast array of responsibilities that they are expected to be shared with their leadership team during each trip. These responsibilities include both task-oriented and interpersonal-oriented duties, which calls for a combination of both transformational and transactional leadership styles. Also, gender differences among adoption of leadership style can be

examined within these shared leadership teams because each team consisted of at least one male leader and one female leader. Furthermore, the shared leadership teams must work together for five, consecutive days and nights to lead their followers through the trip. Leaders must determine how to work well together for the sake of their followers. These shared leadership teams may need to establish a strong sense of trust in one another to accomplish the vast amount of job responsibilities on the excursion.

## **Procedure**

### *Quantitative Data*

After the backpacking program concluded for the season, the leaders were contacted via email by the researcher. The leaders were offered the chance to take an optional survey that reflected on their shared leadership experience during each of the trips they lead. The survey was created using the survey software, Qualtrics. The survey consisted of basic demographic questions, as well as each leader's perceptions of themselves and their co-leader(s) on various measures discussed in the next section.

### *Qualitative Data*

After completing each backpacking trip, the leaders were given a written survey created by their organization. The survey asked open-ended questions about the leader's own strengths and weakness. The leaders also answered questions about the strengths and weakness of their fellow co-leaders in their shared leadership teams. Overall, the survey had the leaders rate perceptions on themselves and how leaders perceived their co-leaders. The survey was administered immediately after the trip and all responses were returned to the organization before the leaders left on the final day of the trip. Therefore, the hand-written, open-ended surveys offered an immediate reflection of each leader's experiences with their shared leadership team during the trip. The organization granted us access to these responses, and the primary investigator coded leader names into unidentifiable codes to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. Then, three trained undergraduate research assistants typed out the handwritten responses into an excel document using the codes as identifiers for different leaders. The responses were then

analyzed using computerized text analysis software program, Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC).

## Measures

### Leader Measures

*Relational Transparency.* Each leader rated the extent that he or she perceived their co-leaders to be transparent using the 5-point, 4-item scale ( $\alpha = .80$ ) adapted from Neider, Schriesheim, and Chester (2011).

*Trust.* Each leader assessed to the extent that he or she trusted their co-leaders using a 7-point, 6-item adaptation of Marlowe and Nyhan's (1992) measure of trust ( $\alpha = .95$ ). Each leader reported the extent to which they trusted their co-leaders.

*Shared leadership team viability.* The extent to which the dyads or triads of leaders want to work together again after their shared leadership experience was assessed on a 5-point scale by adapting Tekleab, Quigley, and Tesluk's (2009) measure of team viability ( $\alpha = .89$ ). Each leader self-reported their perception of viability of the dyad or triad.

*Leadership style.* The extent to which leaders used a transformational or transactional style when leading was assessed on a the 5-point, 21-item scale using a version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, the MLQ-Form 6S (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). The MLQ specifically measures four aspects of transformational leadership including, idealized/charismatic influence ( $\alpha = .78$ ), inspirational motivation ( $\alpha = .81$ ), intellectual stimulation ( $\alpha = .75$ ), and individual consideration ( $\alpha = .74$ ). The MLQ-Form 6S also measured aspects of transactional leadership including contingent reward ( $\alpha = .73$ ) and management-by-exception ( $\alpha = .72$ ) (Elenkov, Judge, & Wright, 2005). Each leader self-reported their perceptions of their own leadership style using this scale.

*Gender.* Participants reported their gender by selecting which gender they most identify out of a list. The options for selecting gender were inclusive, including options such as transgender, gender

variant, etc. The participants also had the option of writing in their gender if their gender identity was not listed.

### **Leader Qualitative Feedback**

Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) software was used to analyze the qualitative responses from the handwritten surveys. We analyzed the open-ended responses for content and style (Tausczik & Pennebaker, 2010). While content focused on what the person said, style analyzed how people communicated. Specifically, this study used LIWC software to monitor positive and negative emotion words in the open-ended surveys. Examples of positive words were “love, nice, sweet” and negative words included “hurt, ugly, nasty” (Tausczik & Pennebaker, 2010). Overall, results from the LIWC data gave us supplemental understanding to the perceptions of co-leaders.

## Chapter 6

### Results

Means, standard deviations, and correlations are reported in Table 1. To test Hypothesis 1, examining the relationship between relational transparency and trust, we conducted a correlational analysis using SPSS Version 20. Hypothesis 1 was supported. Perceived relational transparency ( $M = 17.83$ ,  $SD = 2.77$ ) among shared leadership teams was positively correlated with perceived trust ( $M = 43.08$ ,  $SD = 6.75$ ),  $r(48) = .60$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $N = 50$ . Leaders who perceived their shared leadership team co-leaders to be high on relational transparency also rated higher levels of trust among the shared leadership teams.

To test Hypothesis 2, examining the relationship between trust and viability, we conducted a correlational analysis. Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Perceived trust ( $M = 43.08$ ,  $SD = 6.75$ ) among shared leadership teams was not positively correlated with perceived viability ( $M = 8.46$ ,  $SD = 2.06$ ),  $r(48) = -.23$ ,  $p = .102$ ,  $N = 50$ . While non-significant, the findings indicate a trend towards a negative relationship between trust and viability, where leaders who reported higher levels of trust within the shared leadership team reported lower levels of viability.

To test Hypothesis 3a and 3b, we conducted a multivariate linear regression analysis using SPSS Version 20 to examine the relationship between gender and leadership style. Hypothesis 3 was not supported. Leader gender did not show a significant difference among reporting a transformational leadership style,  $F(1, 21) = .41$ ,  $p = .53$ , or a transactional leadership style,  $F(1, 21) = .90$ ,  $p = .36$ .

#### *LIWC*

Due to the small sample size of quantitative data, we supplemented the quantitative data by analyzing the qualitative survey using LIWC software. LIWC uses base rate analyses to form a dictionary that is constructed from judges' rating of texts, and the Meaning Extraction Helper (MEH: Boyd, 2015) to understand how much dictionary words were used in many different writing contexts

(Pennebaker, Boyd, Jordan, & Blackburn, 2015). Then, all words were used to compute internal consistency statistics for each category (Pennebaker et al., 2015). LIWC also has summary variables which include authenticity (Newman, Pennebaker, Berry, & Richards, 2003), and emotional tone (Cohn, Mehl, & Pennebaker, 2004). These summary variables were converted to percentiles based on scores from comparison samples (Pennebaker, et al., 2015). For these summary variables of authenticity and emotional tone, >50% is high, <50% is low, and a score of 50% indicates a neutral score (Hai-Jew, 2016).

We used the summary score, tone to supplement our understanding of viability because we found a negative correlation with trust and viability. According to Tausczik & Pennebaker (2010), the degree that people express emotion can tell us how people react and cope with certain events. Positive emotion tone words are used to describe event or interaction that was perceived as positive, while negative emotional tone words were used to describe perceptions of negative experiences or people (Tauszik & Pennebaker, 2010). Therefore, tone words could be used to understand if a leader reacted positively or negatively to their leader teammates, which could add to our understanding of viability in this study. Tone scored a very high score of 99% which means that the majority of the qualitative responses were high on positive tone and positive emotion overall (Hai-Jew, 2016). Specifically, affect accounted for 12.94% of words. Of the 12.94%, 11.53% of words were positive emotion words, while only 1.07% of words were negative emotion words.

## Chapter 7

### Discussion

As stated by Yammarino and colleagues (2012), “The current literature supports the idea that the use of shared leadership is a good predictor of desirable outcomes...but more theory development and research is necessary...” (p. 390-391). This study attempted to better understand the relational and gender dynamics within a shared leadership structure. Findings did show a link between relational transparency and perceived trust. However, findings did not support a significant positive relationship between trust and viability. Overall, the findings showed that leader gender did not significantly differ in the adoption of a transformational or transactional leadership style.

#### *Shared Leadership Dynamics*

Previous research acknowledges that trust is important to the success of shared leader teams (Ferrin et al., 2002). Also, previous research showed that transparency between leaders and followers increased trust among followers (Norman, Avoilo, & Luthans, 2010), but there has not been empirical research conducted to understand the relationship between transparency and trust within shared leader teams. This study gives evidence to support that, yes, transparency among leaders increases trust which can, in turn, increase the overall effectiveness of the shared leader teams. This finding could suggest that shared leader teams should practice being vulnerable with one another to increase trust. Leaders who tell their leader teammates about both their challenges and positive experiences on the job could influence other team members to trust them to lead well. Other leaders may see transparency as evidence that the leader is self-aware and actively reflecting on their leadership ability. Also, transparency may show that a leader trusts their co-leaders enough to be transparent with them, which could warrant trust in return. Overall, this study does support that relational transparency could be important when building trust which contributes to understanding the dynamics of shared leadership teams.

Interestingly, we found a negative relationship between trust and viability. In other words, leaders who reported that they trusted their fellow leaders also reported that they did not want to be in a

shared leader team with the leaders in the future. This finding could suggest that a leader trusted the rest of their leader team members to be honest and share knowledge about followers, but the leader might not have trusted co-leaders to lead effectively. Also, this finding could suggest that trust is not the most influential variable when determining viability. Leader personalities or working styles could influence viability more so than trust. Overall, this finding was the most surprising and needs to be studied more in order to understand how to increase viability within shared leadership teams, particularly for teams who have to work together for multiple projects.

LIWC analysis was used to supplement our understanding of perceptions of shared leader team members. Rating of tone were very high; 99% of text rated positive tone words. On top of that, of the 12.94% of total affective words, only 1.07% of the affective words were negative. These two findings seem to contradict the finding that leaders who trust one another do not rate their partners high on viability. The low percentage of negative emotion words used to describe leader teammates suggests that leaders had a positive experience working with their leader teammates. Even though we found a negative relationship between viability and trust, we think these results might be due to our low sample size, and further data collection would alter these finding to be consistent with our LIWC findings. We are more confident in the LIWC findings because we analyzed the authenticity of the leaders' responses on their perceptions of their co-leaders, and we found that the written feedback was highly authentic (i.e., honest and open to disclosing details, 66.7%; (Pennebaker, et al., 2015).

#### *Debate on Gender Differences and Adoption of Leadership Style*

As previously mentioned in one study, women seemed to adopted a transformational style of leadership when they were studied in an organizational setting (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Researchers in outdoor leadership value the practical uses of transformational and transactional leadership style in the field (Hayashi & Ewert, 2006). Even though researchers know that context, transformational and transactional leadership styles, and gender are all important factors of leadership, there has been little

empirical research on all of these factors. This paper answers the call to try and understand gender and leadership style in the context of outdoor leadership, where many leader teams are required to be constructed with a mix of both genders. This study found no correlation between gender and the reporting of transactional and transformational leadership style. Since outdoor leadership demands both transformational and transactional leadership styles in order to complete varying tasks, the context of outdoor leadership itself could act as an equalizer for both genders. In other words, in order to succeed as an outdoor leader, leaders need to adopt both transactional and transformational leadership styles to be successful, regardless of gender. Lastly, our result could suggest that gender does not influence leadership style at all. Either way, continued data collection will offer clearer insight into the role of an outdoor leadership context on gender and the adoption of leadership style.

## Chapter 8

### Limitations and Future Research

Despite these key contributions, there are still a number of limitations that exist in this study. To begin, the sample size is small. Previous studies on shared leadership also have small sample sizes because it is difficult to find many teams of leaders to study. Therefore, many shared leadership studies take place in the laboratory settings. The advantage to this study is that it took place in the field setting. Also, since all leaders came from the same training, the leadership experience took place at the same time, and the shared leader team goals and responsibilities were the same, this group of shared leader teams allowed our researchers to control for moderating variables within this field study. The outdoor orientation backpacking organization runs their program every year. Therefore, our researchers have the opportunity to increase our sample size by studying the shared leader teams within this program every year, which will increase statistical power.

Previous studies acknowledge that organizational setting is important to consider because leadership training from the organization effects leadership style (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). In our study, leaders all led for the same organization, and therefore, all leaders participated in the same leadership training taught by the same organizational leaders. Therefore, the results of showing no significant gender difference in reporting the adoption of transformational or transactional style could result from all leaders, regardless of gender, being trained to lead in a similar way. This result could suggest that training leaders could supersede differing leadership style tendencies.

The sample size limited our ability to account for nesting. These leaders are a part of one organization. This organization also has multiple orientation programs across the country, and this study focused on examining an orientation program in just the north eastern part of the country. These other programs, run by the same organization, were not studied. Leaders who lead for the other trips usually are more experienced and have been promoted, therefore, studying these shared leader teams in the other programs could give us more insight into the dynamics of shared leadership over a longer period of time.

Furthermore, the organization is influenced by the university that is affiliated with the backing orientation program. Our study was unable to address the complex, multi-level relationships among the shared leader teams, the differing backpacking trips, the organization, and the university environment. Increasing our sample size and studying the levels of shared leadership might help clarify this complex organizational structure.

Since shared leadership is in the beginning stages of development, there is not a consensus on the definition of shared leadership. In our study, there was a mix of both triads and dyads. The lack of a solid definition of shared leadership allowed us to study both triads and dyads as shared leader teams. In future data collection, we can separate the triads from the dyads to see if there are major leadership differences between the two types of shared leadership teams. Overall, researchers would benefit from clarifying if there is a significant difference in leadership outcomes and dynamics between triads and dyads. If there is a difference, there could be practical implications for selecting triads versus dyads to lead for differing organizational goals and outcomes.

Furthermore, this study might not be generalizable to all shared leadership situations. Our participants had specific tasks and goals that fell into the category of outdoor leadership. These results may not be transferable to shared leader teams who work in a corporate office or a traditional, academic setting. On the other hand, this research could be generalizable to outdoor military leaders and military leader training since the environment and follower size could be similar.

The timing of data collection is a limitation for this study. Even though the leaders took the qualitative survey immediately when they emerged from the trail, the optional quantitative survey was sent after the season concluded. Therefore, the participants filled out the survey by memory, which could have altered their responses. If we continue to collect data, we will not be able to administer the quantitative survey on-site, due to its length, but we can require the participants to complete the survey within a week after the conclusion of the season. That way, participants can give the most accurate responses possible.

The organization required the leaders to fill out the qualitative survey on-sight, where co-leaders were present as the survey was being completed. Leaders knew that their shared leader teammate(s) would eventually read the feedback, and there was not an obligation to work with this person again in the future. Therefore, leaders might have used more positive emotion words when filling out the qualitative responses in order to avoid ending the shared leadership team in a negative way. This means that it is possible that leaders were writing about their shared leader partner in a more positive way than they actually felt.

Lastly, there are many different definitions and types of trust and transparency. Therefore, future research that clarifies these conceptually constructed definitions would be helpful to specify what types of transparency increases what types of trust between shared leader teammates. If these definitions could be clarified, trust and transparency could be translated into specific, trainable behaviors which would be practical for shared leadership training. Understanding more specific definitions for trust and transparency could help clarify this study's findings that leaders who trusted one another did not want to work with them in a shared leader team in the future.

### *Implications*

The findings of this study have many practical implications for training. As previously mentioned, transparency increases trust among leaders which is imperative for successful shared leadership. Our finding that relational transparency and trust could have practical implications for training shared leader teams. For example, training programs could emphasize emotional vulnerability with other leaders. This training is important because being transparent might not be intuitive for some leaders. If training programs encourage leaders to be open about what they are thinking and feeling, shared leader team members could increase trust. Those who train shared leader teams can explain the importance of transparency and give behavioral examples of transparency. Also, this research shows no correlation between gender and adoption of transformational or transactional leadership, so those who hire shared leader team members could be taught to not assume that one gender will lead transformational

or transactional. This finding supports gender equality and leadership style diversity for leading in outdoor leadership positions. Overall, these findings help inform the people who train and construct shared leader teams.

### *Conclusion*

At the beginning of this study, the literature informed us that shared leadership, transformational and transactional leadership, and context is important. This paper took steps to clarify and understand the dynamics of shared leadership including transparency, trust, and viability. Most importantly, we found that transparency increases trust. Also, this paper empirically explored the complicated relationship between gender and adoption of leadership style within the context of outdoor leadership. As a whole, this paper provides insight on shared leadership, which could be useful for future research on shared leadership.

## Appendix A

### Adaptation of Neider, Schriesheim, & Chester (2011) Relational Transparency

**Cronbach's alpha = .80**

1. My co-lead clearly stated what they meant.
2. My co-lead admitted to mistakes when they occurred.
3. My co-lead openly shared information with others.
4. My co-lead expressed their ideas and thoughts clearly to others.

## **Appendix B**

### **Adaptation of Marlowe & Nyhan (1992) Trust**

**Cronbach's alpha = .95**

1. My co-lead could make good decisions & judgments.
2. I was ready to trust my co-lead to overcome any obstacle.
3. My co-lead was good in leading us when completing tasks essential to the trip.
4. I gave full commitment to work with my co-lead.
5. My co-leader's ideas/opinions were useful for me in doing my job.
6. I believe that my co-lead provided correct information about the tasks for me.
7. I could share my ideas and thoughts with my co-lead.

## Appendix C

### Adaptation of Tekleab, Quigley, & Tesluk's (2009) Viability

**Cronbach's alpha = .89**

1. If I had a chance, I would have switched co-leads.
2. I would be happy to work with my co-leads on other trips in the future.
3. My co-lead and I should never work together in the future.
4. I would have preferred to lead the group by myself rather than have a co-lead.

## Appendix D

### Adaptation of Avolio, Bass, & Jung (1999) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire- MLQ-

#### Form 6S

**Cronbach's alpha – idealized influence = .78**

1. I make others feel good to be around me.
2. Others have complete faith in me.
3. Others are proud to be associated with me.

**Cronbach's alpha- inspirational motivation = .81**

1. I express with a few simple words what we could and should do.
2. I provide appealing images about what we can do.
3. I help others find meaning in their work.

**Cronbach's alpha-intellectual stimulation = .75**

1. I enable others to think about old problems in new ways.
2. I provide others with new ways of looking at puzzling things.
3. I get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before.

**Cronbach's alpha-individual consideration = .74**

1. I help others develop themselves.
2. I let others know how I think they are doing.
3. I give personal attention to others who seem rejected

**Cronbach's alpha-contingent reward = .73**

1. I tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work.
2. I provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals.
3. I call attention to what others can get for what they accomplish.

**Cronbach's alpha- management-by-exception = .72**

1. I am satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards.
2. As long as things are working, I do not try to change anything.
3. I tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work.

**Appendix E****Gender**

1. Male
2. Female
3. Transgender Female
4. Transgender Male
5. Gender Variant/Non-Conforming
6. Prefer not to Answer
7. Not Listed \_\_\_\_\_

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using multifactor leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-462.  
<https://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166789>
- Avolio, B. J., & Gibbons, T.C. (1988). Developing transformational leaders: A life span approach. In J.A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo, & Associates (Eds.) *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 276- 308). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Balkundi, P., Barsness, Z., & Michael, J. H. (2009). Unlocking the influence of leadership network structures on team conflict and viability. *Small Group Research*, 40(3), 301-322.  
<http://dio: 10.1177/1046496409333404>
- Bennis, W.G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bowers D. G., & Seashore, S.E. (1966). Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 11(2), 238-263. <http://doi:10.2307/2391247>
- Boyd, R. L. (2015). MEH: Meaning Extraction Helper [Software]. Available from <http://meh.ryanb.cc>
- Brymer, E., & Gray, T. (2006). Effective leadership: Transformational or transactional? *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 10(2), 13-19. Retrieved from:  
<https://search.proquest.com/docview/232847118?pq-origsite=gscholar>
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Byrnes, J.P., Miller, D.C., & Schafer, W.D. (1999). Gender differences in risk taking: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *125*:3, 376-383. Retrieved from:  
<http://psycnet.apa.org/buy/1999-13573-004>
- Cohn, M. A., Mehl, M. R., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2004). Linguistic markers of psychological change surrounding September 11, 2001. *Psychological science*, *15*, 687-93.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fj.0956-7976.2004.00741.x>
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(4), 611-628.  
<http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611>
- Downton, J.V. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in a revolutionary process*.  
New York: Free Press.
- Drescher, G., & Garbers, Y. (2016). Shared leadership and commonality: A policy-capturing study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *27*, 200-217. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.02.002>.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C., & Engen, M., L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-Faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychology Bulletin*, *129*(4), 569-591. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B.T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychology Bulletin*, *108*(2). 233-256. Retrieved from: <http://psycnet.apa.org/buy/1991-01136-001>
- Eckman, E. W. (2006). Co-principals: Characteristics of dual leadership teams. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *5*(2), 89-107. <http://doi:10.1080/15700760600549596>
- Elenkov, D. S., Judge, W., & Wright, P. (2005). Strategic leadership and executive innovation influence: An international multi-cluster comparative study. *Strategic Management Journal*, *26*, 665-682.

doi: 10.1002/smj.469

Ensley, M. D., Hmieleski, K. M., & Pearce, C. L. (2006). The importance of vertical and shared leadership within new venture top management teams: Implications for the performance of startups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 217–231. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.02.002>.

Ewert, A. W. (1983). *Outdoor adventure and self-concept: A research analysis*. Eugene, OR: Center of Leisure Studies, University of Oregon.

Flechter, J. K., & Käufer, K. (2002). Shared Leadership: Paradox and Possibility. In *Shared leadership: reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (2). Retrieved from: Retrieved from: <https://books.google.com/books>

Hai-Jew, S. (2016). *LIWC-ing at texts for insights from linguistic patterns* [PowerPoint Slides].

Retrieved from: <https://www.slideshare.net/ShalinHaiJew/liwcing-at-texts-for-insights-from-linguistic-patterns>

Hayashi, A. & Ewert, A. W. (2006). Outdoor leaders' emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 26:3, 222-242. Retrieved from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/105382590602800305>

Hmieleski, K. M., Cole, M. S., & Baron, R. A. (2012). Shared authentic leadership and new venture performance. *Journal of Management*, 38, 1476–1499. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206311415419>

Jehn, K., & Mannix, E. (2001). The dynamic nature of conflict: a longitudinal study of intra-group conflict and group performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 238-251. <https://doi.org/10.5465/3069453>

- Kouzes, K. W., & Posner, B.Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuhnert, K. W. (1994). Transforming leadership: Developing people through delegation. In B.M. Bass & B.J. Avolio (Eds.), *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership* (pp. 10-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Marlowe H. A., Jr., Nyhan R.C. (1992). Development and Psychometric Properties of the Organizational Trust Inventory. Unpublished paper: University of Florida.
- Mathieu, J. E., Heffner, T. S., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Cannon- Bowers, J. A. (2000). The influence of shared mental models on team process and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 273–283. <http://doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.2.273>
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 24–59. <http://doi.org/10.5465/256727>
- Neider, L.L., Schriesheim, C. A. (2011). The authentic leadership inventory (ALI): Development and empirical tests. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1146-1164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.09.008>
- Newman, M. L., Pennebaker, J. W., Berry, D. S., & Richards, J. M. (2003). Lying words: Predicting deception from linguistic style. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 665-675. Retrieved from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0146167203029005010>
- Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J., & Luthans, F. (2010). The impact of positive transparency on trust in leaders and their perceived effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 350-364. [doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.002)
- Northouse, P. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Pearce, C.L., & Conger, J. A. (2002). *Shared leadership: reframing the hows and whys of leadership*.

Retrieved from: <https://books.google.com/books>

Pennebaker, J.W., Boyd, R.L., Jordan, K., & Blackburn, K. (2015). The development and psychometric properties of LIWC2015. Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin. doi:10.15781/T29G6Z

Wang, G., Oh, I., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: a meta-analytic review of 25 years of research.

*Group and Organizational Management*, 36:2, 223-270. doi: 10.1177/1059601111401017

Tausczik, Y. R., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2010). The psychological meaning of words: LIWC and

computerized text analysis methods. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 29(1), 24-54.

doi: 10.1177/0261927X09351676

Tekleab, A.G., Quigley, N.R., & Tesluk, P.E. (2009). A longitudinal study of team conflict, conflict

management, cohesion, and team effectiveness. *Group & Organization Management*, 34(2), 170-

205. doi: 10.1177/1059601108331218

Wang, D., Waldman, D. A., & Zhang, Z. (2014). A meta-analysis of shared leadership and team

effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 181–198. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0034531>.

Wood, M. S., & Fields, D. (2007). Exploring the impact of shared leadership on management team

member job outcomes. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 2, 251–272.

<http://doi.org/10.1108/17465260710817474>.

Yammarino, F. J., Salas, E., Serban, A., Shirreffs, K., & Shuffler, M. L. (2012). Collectivistic leadership

approaches: putting the “we” in leadership science and practice. *Industrial and Organizational*

*Psychology*, 5, 382-402. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2012.01467.x>

## ACADEMIC VITA

**Academic Vita of Taylor Lender**

taylor.lender@gmail.com

**Education**

---

Fall 2014 – Present      **The Pennsylvania State University:** *Graduation: May 2018*  
 Bachelor of Arts in Psychology & Bachelor of Arts in English

**Publications**

---

Small, M. L., Waterman, E. & **Lender, T.** Time use during first year of college predicts participation in high-impact activities during later years. *Journal of College Student Development*. 58, (6) 954-960.

**Grant Applications**

---

**Lender, T.** (Summer 2015). Leadership Prevention Lab Intern and Research Assistantship. Grant proposal submitted to the *Penn State Enrichment Network*. Amount Requested \$1,200.(Funded)

**Research Presentations**

---

**Lender, T.,** Runkle, L., & Rosini, C. (2016, Fall). *Writing Centers as a Brave Space*. Individual PowerPoint panel present at the 2016 Annual National Conference in Peer Tutoring in Writing. Tacoma, WA.

**Research Leadership**

---

Fall 2017 – Spring 2018 **Lab Coordinator of the Leadership and Innovation Lab**

Penn State University, Psychology Department

Faculty Supervisor: Samuel L. Hunter, PhD

- Assisted in managing sixteen student research assistants on multiple projects, coordinating schedules, assigning tasks, and maintaining frequent communication among researchers
- Participated in the selection process of potential new lab members by screening applicants and conducting interviews
- Attended bi-weekly meetings to review the progress of projects and discuss professional development in the field of I/O Psychology

- Acted as liaison between undergraduate students and the graduate coordinators

Fall 2016      **Co-lead “Writing Centers as a Brave Space.”**

Penn State University, English Department

Faculty Supervisor: Jon Olson, PhD

- Wrote and submitted research proposal to the National Conference for Peer Tutoring and Writing Conference (NCPTW)
- Applied social work research on empathy to writing center organizations and developed a presentation to translate this research into a writing center context
- Presented at NCPTW conference and responded to questions and critiques from the audience

### **Research Experience**

---

Fall 2016 – Present      **Research Assistant**

Leadership Innovation Lab, Penn State University

Faculty Supervisor: Samuel L. Hunter, PhD

*Leader Response to Failure-* Primary Researcher: Kristen Swigart

- Reviewed literature on apology, denial, response to failure, and re-building trust
- Complied and wrote article summaries to efficiently communicate main ideas of each article with fellow research assistants and primary researcher

*Leader-Follower Fit and the Creative Process-* Primary Researcher: Melissa Gutworth, PhD

- Coded qualitative data from participants responses for quality and originality
- Assisted participants through the lab study by giving instructions and responding to questions
- Reviewed Qualtrics survey for cohesiveness, clarity, and grammar

*Workplace Experiences of Employees with Depression-* Primary Researcher: Kayla Weaver,

Doctoral Candidate

- Transcribed interviews with primary researcher and participants who have depressions

Spring 2015 – Summer 2015      **Research Assistant**

Prevention Innovation Lab, Penn State University

Faculty Supervisor: Meg Small, PhD

### ***Student Time Use During First Year***

- Performed literature review regarding adolescent time use
- Created article summaries that communicated the main ideas of each article to the primary researcher and faculty advisor
- Edited and proofed the paper for clarity and cohesiveness
- Engaged with department representatives to discuss how research could be applied to their students and programs

### **Relevant Work Experience**

---

Spring 2016, Spring 2017      **Teaching Assistant**

Penn State University Psychology Department, University Park, PA

#### ***Introduction to Industrial Organizational Psychology***

- Lead review sessions before each exam to give an overview of the material while answering a variety of questions from the students
- Assisted in preparation of class materials by reviewing PowerPoint presentations and organizing extra credit & exams
- Held office hours for tutoring I/O content
- Reviewed exams with student by explaining the theory and content behind exam answers

#### ***Advanced Adolescent Psychology***

- Coded Qualitative Data from ~200 students
- Lead review sessions for each exam and elaborated on class content
- Tutored students who requested additional help with the material

Spring 2017 – Spring 2018      **Leadership Development Center Employee**

Penn State University Schreyer Honors College, University Park, PA

- Assisted in handling the logistical and technical aspects of the assessment center
- Created content and managed the social media campaign
- Coded data from Linked-In of pasted participants

Spring 2015 – Summer 2015      **Research Assistant, “Student Time Use During First Year”**

Prevention Innovation Lab, Penn State University -Faculty Supervisor: Meg Small, PhD- Graduate

Researcher: Emily Waterman

- Brainstormed new research ideas that could be applied to undergraduate student development
- Created materials that were distributed in classrooms for the primary researcher’s project on student development

- Spokesperson in informative videos for projects that paired the applied research with a start-up company called Live It
- Spring 2016 – Fall 2017     **Writing Tutor**

Penn State Learning, Penn State University - Faculty Supervisor: Jon Olson, PhD

- Tutor undergraduate, ESL, and graduate students in any major for clarity, cohesiveness, grammar, idea-generation, etc.
- Created and presented 75-minute lectures for professors who requested workshops regarding personal statement writing, business writing, and rhetorical essay writing
- Assess tutee's writing needs and adjust the tutorial accordingly
- Mentor and train new writing tutors about writing center procedures

Spring 2015 – Summer 2017     **Backpacking Leader**

Aurora Outdoor Orientation Programs, Penn State University- Program Director: Jen Emigh

- Guided five-day long trips in Olympic National Park, WA & Rothrock State Park, PA
- Taught groups backpacking skills such as building shelters, cooking food, packing a pack, managing wildlife, etc.
- Managed risk of guiding ten participants through extreme weather conditions

Summer 2016     **Shaver Creek Intern**

Rock N' River Adventure Program, Penn State University Program Director: Will Wise

- Decided on teaching methods and program style with three co-leaders
- Taught skills including: caving, rock climbing, white-water canoeing, & mountain biking to a wide age group (11-17 years old)

### **Academic Honors and Scholarship**

---

Spring 2016 – Spring 2018

**Schreyer Honors College**

Spring 2018

**Harold L. Hinman Memorial Scholarship**

Fall 2014 – Fall 2017

**Dean's List**

### **Involvement and Service**

---

SIOP Student Affiliate

Class Mentor for Backpacking Leaders

Wilderness First Responder

Wilderness First Aid Certified

### **Relevant Skills**

---

Microsoft Office (Excel, Word, PowerPoint)

Google Documents

Qualtrics

SPSS