ACTING WITH THE BEST OF INTENTIONS... OR NOT: A TYPOLOGY AND MODEL OF IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT IN LEADERSHIP

A dissertation submitted to Kent State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

> by, Jessica A. Peck April 2019

Dissertation written by:

Jessica A. Peck

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Bowling Green State University, 2008

Master of Business Administration, Kent State University, 2014

Doctor of Philosophy in Business Administration, Kent State University, 2019

Approved by:

Chair, Doctoral Dissertation Committee

Dr. Mary Hogue

Dr. Pratim Datta

Dr. Greta Polites

Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee

Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee

Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee

Dr. Jennifer Wiggins

Accepted by:

Doctoral Director, Graduate Programs

Dr. Emmanuel Dechenaux

Dean, Graduate Programs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to my advisor, Dr. Mary Hogue, for her patience, wisdom, and mentorship throughout this process. I am also grateful to my dissertation committee including Dr. Pratim Datta, Dr. Greta Polites, and Dr. Jennifer Wiggins for their advice and scholarly inquiries to continually improve my work.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my husband, Andrew, and my parents, Mark and Patricia. Thank you, mom and dad, for instilling in me a desire and interest in learning from a young age, as you did for so many other students. Thank you, Andrew, for your patience, support, and love you showed me throughout this process. This dissertation would not have been possible without you – my partner in all things.

ABSTRACT

Followers accept influence when target leaders meet their perception of what it means to be a leader. Impression management (IM) is an important means of influencing these perceptions. However, extant literature on leader IM is fragmented and lacks a clear explanation of how the influence process occurs. I unify the literature in this area by creating a multidimensional typology and multi-level model of IM in leadership. I examine the multidimensional nature of IM as composed of information processing, communicative, and goaldirected components, creating eight IM archetypes. Further, I develop an instrument used in experimental studies to test the IM model within transformational leadership theory, highlighting followers' cognitive categorization processes and testing how the addition of a moderator, ethical work climate (EWC), impacts causal predictions from the model. Across two empirical studies, I find that authentic IM behavior leads to greater transformational leadership perceptions (TL perceptions) than inauthentic and pro-social IM behavior leads to greater TL perceptions than pro-self. There is no significant difference between automatic and controlled IM behavior and TL perceptions. Also, an EWC strengthens the positive effects of authentic communication on TL perceptions. Finally, I provide a cognitive explanation for the IM influence process by showing that certain IM behaviors are implicitly associated with transformational leader behaviors. I integrate my results within existing literature and explain how the model can be used in future research.

Keywords: impression management; leader impression management typology; transformational leadership theory; authentic leadership theory; leader categorization theory

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1 - A TYPOLOGY AND MODEL OF LEADER IMPRESSION MANAGE	MENT 4
Leader IM Behaviors	6
Controlled or Automatic Processing	7
Authentic or Inauthentic Communication	10
Pro-self or Pro-Social Goals	14
Combining Dimensions	18
Typology of Behaviors	19
Follower Perceptions	
Transformational/Charismatic Leadership Theory	
Authentic Leadership Theory	
Leader Categorization Theory	30
Implications	32
Implications for Research	32
Implications for Practice	37
CHAPTER 2 – AN EMPIRICAL EXAMINATION OF THE POSITIVE EFFECTS OF LEADER IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT ON FOLLOWER PERCEPTIONS OF	
TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP	39
Theoretical Integration	41
Transformational Leadership	41
Leader Categorization Theory	42
Instrumental Impact of Leader IM	43
IM Dimensions and Transformational Leadership	44
The Moderating Effects of EWC	49
Implicit Nature of the Relationship	51
Connectionist Networks within Leader Categorization Theory	51
Methods	55
Study 1: Instrumental Impact of IM	56
Research Design	56

Participants and Procedures
Independent Variables
Dependent Variable
Analysis and Results
Study 2: Implicit Nature of the Relationship71
Research Design71
Participants and Procedures73
Analysis and Results
Discussion
Study 1: Instrumental Implications78
Study 2: Implicit Implications
Overall Implications
Limitations
Conclusion
REFERENCES
APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Factors and Aspects of IM	100
Table 2. Leader Profile Descriptions	101
Table 3. Results of Between-Subjects Pilot Testing	102
Table 4. Results of Within-Subjects Pilot Testing	103
Table 5. Results of Conjoint Analysis (n=196)	104
Table 6. Moderating Effects of EWC	105
Table 7. Automaticity Descriptive Statistics and Correlations	106
Table 8. Authenticity ANCOVA Descriptive Statistics and Correlations	107
Table 9. Goal Orientation ANCOVA Descriptive Statistics and Correlations	108
Table 10. ANCOVA Results for EWC	109
Table 11. Stimulus Materials for IAT	110
Table 12. Schematic Example of IAT	111
Table 13. IAT Results	112

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Impression Management in Leadership	113
Figure 2. Model of the Effects of IM on TL Perceptions	114
Figure 3. Utilities by IM Archetype	115

INTRODUCTION

Impression management (IM) is important for effective leadership (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Followers accept influence from individuals who meet their perceptions of what it means to be a leader (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984), and IM is an important way of impacting those perceptions. Yet, IM is often discussed with a negative connotation and lacks focus on the importance of follower perceptions of the target leader (e.g. the person engaged in influence). Further, the extant literature leader on IM is fragmented and lacks a clear explanation of how the influence process occurs.

For example, support for IM can be found in theories across distinct disciplines such as social psychology (e.g., Leary & Kowalski, 1990), organizational studies (e.g., Bozeman & Kacmar, 1997), and communication (e.g., Burgoon, Guerrero, & Manusov, 2011). The leadership literature has some specific examination of IM across theories such as charismatic leadership (Sosik, Avolio, & Jung, 2009), transformational leadership (Gardner & Cleavenger, 1999) and the romanticism of leadership (Gray & Densten, 2007). There is also some study of IM at different levels of leadership including CEO IM (Westphal & Graebner, 2010) and manager IM (Fisk & Friesen, 2012). Despite this extant research, there is no conceptual framework that unifies the underlying process of leader IM resulting in many disparate studies.

Recent reviews of IM have called for better theoretical reasoning as to how and why the influence process of IM is effective (Bolino, Kacmar, Turnley, & Gilstrap, 2008). Moreover, as I previously mentioned, typical conceptions of IM view it as being at odds with authenticity (Avolio, 2005) or analogous to intentional faking (Zerbe & Paulhus, 1987) which provides a limited and narrow view of the construct. Additionally, typical IM research overlooks the

importance of perceptions in the IM influence process. Such research generally asks the person engaged in IM to self report their IM behaviors (Bolino et al., 2016). However, the intent of IM is to influence the impression someone has of you, so failing to consider perceptions is problematic in understanding how those perceptions affect important outcomes. This dissertation addresses these shortcomings across two chapters in the following ways.

In chapter 1, I unify the literature by creating a multi-dimensional typology and multilevel model of IM in leadership highlighting the importance of follower perceptions. The multidimensional nature of IM is composed of information processing, communicative, and goaldirected components, thereby creating eight IM archetypes in the IM typology. The typology is grounded in my definition of *impression management* as conscious or unconscious, authentic or inauthentic, goal-directed behavior individuals engage in to influence the impression others form of them in social interactions (e.g., Bolino, Long, & Turnley, 2016; Schlenker, 2011). I also present a model showing the three dimensions of leader IM have biological, psychological, and social underpinnings, that leader IM has a direct impact on follower perceptions, and through that, has an indirect impact on leadership outcomes. A foundational component of the model is that follower perceptions ultimately determine the consequences of the leader relationship (Shamir, 2007). Chapter 1 concludes with examples of the utility of the typology for predicting the impact of leader IM across three leadership theories in which follower perceptions are particularly salient including transformational leadership theory (Howell & Shamir, 2005).

In Chapter 2, I empirically test the heart of the model, examining how each IM dimension impacts follower perceptions of transformational leadership (TL perceptions) by demonstrating the *instrumental* and *implicit* nature of the relationship between leader IM and TL perceptions. Followers are uniquely important in this leadership theory as the leader changes followers by uplifting their motivation and performance by creating a relationship of trust, admiration, and respect (Yukl, 1999). Followers who perceive a leader to be transformational experience increased confidence and growth to the point where the followers themselves become leaders (Yammarino & Dubinsky, 1994). For these reasons, and because of the limited study of the effects of IM on TL perceptions (e.g. Christie, Barling, & Turner, 2011; Sosik et al., 2012), the relationship between leader IM and TL perceptions is an important area of study for showing the usefulness of the model. Therefore, I provide an empirical test of how each dimension effects TL perceptions, challenging the existing assumption that IM is only used in nefarious ways, but instead showing the positive effects such behavior yields. I also show that this relationship does not occur in a vacuum by drawing in ethical work climate as a moderator and examining the effect of this construct on the IM-perception relationship. Finally, I use leader categorization theory to explain how the IM influence process is effective, answering researchers' calls for a better theoretical understanding of why the influence process works (e.g. Bolino et al., 2008) and highlighting the implicit processes at play.

This research yields several primary insights. First, the construct of IM is multidimensional in nature. This is the seminal study of each of the components together. It is also an important acknowledgement of the role of information processing which is mentioned but not studied empirically in the IM literature. Second, this research underscores IM is nuanced and should not be portrayed in a wholly negative light. Finally, leader IM implicitly impacts follower perceptions through a cognitive categorization process providing an explanation of how the influence process works. Findings herein offer insights into future research, instruments for use in future research, and practical knowledge to enhance transformational leader development.

CHAPTER 1 - A TYPOLOGY AND MODEL OF LEADER IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT

Impression management (IM) is foundational to effective leadership (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Followers more readily accept influence from individuals perceived to match the follower's understanding of the ideal leader (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984), and IM is a means of impacting those perceptions. However, despite the importance of IM to leaders, extant literature investigating leader IM is fragmented. IM has been examined within different types of leadership including charismatic leadership (Sosik, Avolio & Jung, 2002), transformational leadership (Gardner & Cleavenger, 1999), the romanticism of leadership (Gray & Densten, 2007), and leader-member exchange relationships (Zhang, Deng, Zhang, & Hu, 2016). IM also has been examined at different levels of leadership including CEO IM (Westphal & Graebner, 2010) and manager IM (Fisk & Friesen, 2012). Moreover, support for IM-related research is found in various theories across disparate disciplines ranging from social psychology (e.g., Leary & Kowalski, 1990) to organizational studies (e.g., Bozeman & Kacmar, 1997) to communication (e.g., Burgoon, Guerrero, & Manusov, 2011).

This extensive literature would benefit from theoretical integration, which can provide important insights in leadership research (Avolio, 2007). The purpose of the present chapter is to integrate knowledge across various disciplines and theories to achieve three goals: 1) develop a 3-dimension typology of IM behaviors that elucidates the underlying nature of leader IM as consisting of information processing, communication, and leader goals; 2) propose a model of IM that presents a framework for understanding the means by which leader IM impacts leadership outcomes; and 3) demonstrate the utility of the typology for predicting how leader IM influences follower perceptions using three prominent leadership theories. The typology and model appear in Figure 1.

Insert Figure 1 about here

The typology is grounded in my definition of *impression management* as conscious or unconscious, authentic or inauthentic, goal-directed behavior individuals engage in to influence the impression others form of them in social interactions (e.g., Bolino, Long, & Turnley, 2016; Schlenker, 2011). This definition sets the scope of IM in this chapter in two important ways. First, it clarifies that my discussion involves IM directed toward others, rather than including a similar construct, self-deception, that involves IM-like behavior directed toward the self (e.g., Farnham, Greenwald & Banaji, 1999). Second, the definition provides the three dimensions of the typology: information processing (automatic or controlled), communication (authentic or inauthentic), and goals (pro-self or pro-social). These three dimensions create eight IM archetypes. In developing the typology, I draw from dual processing theory (Schneider & Chein, 2003), authentic communication (Molleda, 2010), and social value orientation (Van Lange, 1999).

The second goal of this chapter is to present a model showing the process by which leader IM impacts leadership outcomes. My model suggests the three dimensions of leader IM have biological, psychological, and social underpinnings. It also suggests that leader IM has a direct impact on follower perceptions, and through that, has an indirect impact on leadership outcomes. Thus, the heart of my model is grounded in the knowledge that follower perceptions ultimately determine the consequences of the leader relationship (Shamir, 2007). Because leadership is a dynamic process that occurs over time (Hogue & Lord, 2007), the model also suggests that leader IM behaviors are influenced by feedback the leader receives from downstream processes.

The third goal of this chapter is to show the usefulness of the typology for predicting the impact of leader IM across various leadership theories. I focus on three theories in which follower perceptions are particularly salient: transformational/charismatic leadership theory (Howell & Shamir, 2005), authentic leadership theory (Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrang, 2005), and leader categorization theory (Lord et al., 1984).

The chapter is structured to walk the reader through the central portion of the model. In particular, Figure 1 is presented with Leader IM Typology and Follower Perceptions highlighted, while Antecedents and Leadership Outcomes are shaded. Space constraints do not allow a detailed discussion of Antecedents and Outcomes. Rather, I incorporate information about Antecedents into the discussion of the Leader IM Typology, and I incorporate information about Outcomes into the discussion of Follower Perceptions. I begin with the typology.

Leader IM Behaviors

The typology classifies types rather than tactics of IM behavior. The intent is not to suggest that one tactic (e.g., mimicry) belongs to one archetype and a different tactic (e.g., ingratiation) belongs to another. Rather, my archetypes signify that the underlying nature of IM is complex. In particular, I pose these archetypes not as leader traits but as behaviors that are influenced by factors both internal and external to the leader. I briefly illustrate the complexity of the dimensions through a discussion of a sampling of the dimension's biological (e.g., physiological), psychological (e.g., cognitive, emotional), and social (e.g., contextual)

underpinnings. I provide greater detail of dimensional complexity as we discuss each dimension's dual character.

Controlled or Automatic Processing

The first dimension in the typology addresses the leader's cognitive information processing. Dual processing theory proposes that human cognitive functioning is the result of two processes, automatic and controlled, which differ by the amount of effort and attention needed to categorize, buffer, associate, and prioritize information (Schneider & Shriffin, 1977; Schneider & Chein, 2003). This dimension informs our understanding of the speed and ease with which IM occurs for leaders.

The conscious or unconscious dimension of IM involves biological, psychological, and social processes related to the neuronal connections that underlie information processing. Automatic and controlled information processing occurs in the cortico-basal ganglia system of the brain, yet each type of processing operates using a different sort of processing network (Yin & Knowlton, 2006). Controlled processing functions along an action-outcome associative network that relies on conscious awareness of desired outcomes. Alternatively, automatic processing functions along a stimulus-response sensorimotor network that relies on learned connections between a behavior and its stimulus trigger.

The same IM tactic may be engaged in a controlled or automatic way. For example, a leader may choose to imitate the behaviors of group members in a conscious attempt to fit in. Alternatively, imitation may occur through activation of mirror neurons, which are a unique type of neuron that can be triggered by the presence of others. Once activated, mirror neurons are responsible for automatic social imitation (Gallese, Eagle, & Migone, 2007), which tends to enhance the likelihood of fitting in and being liked (Iacoboni, 2009). Thus, one dimension of leader IM involves whether the IM results from controlled or automatic information processing.

Controlled processing. Controlled processing occurs when an individual uses volitional control and attention to activate a temporary sequence of data modules, or nodes (Schneider & Shriffin, 1977). Individuals are assumed to possess a central control system that is equipped with goal processors, attention controllers, activity monitors, and episodic stores. The central control system assesses the priority of multiple stimuli, engages in memory retrieval and storage, initiates corresponding output reporting to other systems (such as motor or vision centers), and receives and processes feedback from data modules.

Controlled processing may involve both newly learned and previously stored information (Schneider & Chen, 2003). An example of the former might be a leader who explicitly assesses a novel situation to create an intentional plan for engaging in IM. An example of the latter might occur when a familiar environmental stimulus activates a previously learned IM response that the leader then engages in a controlled way to determine the appropriateness of the response. Controlled processing tends to occur slowly, with multiple tasks performed serially (Fisk & Schneider, 1983). Therefore, controlled processing tends to be effortful, requiring attention toward explicitly assessing the situation or considering follower feedback. Controlled processing can be undone easily and is readily interrupted by stressors (Schneider & Fisk, 1982).

The use of controlled processing in leader IM is well represented in the literature, typically discussed in terms of behaviors that are intentional or behaviors of which the leader is explicitly aware. In empirical research, Sosik et al. (2002) found that a leader's self-reported self-monitoring strategies (including intentional aspects of expressive self-control) were related to follower's reports of their leader's use of IM tactics. Berson and Sosik (2007) found that selfreported self-awareness regarding a leader's own charismatic leadership positively relates to the leader's effective use of IM tactics. Leary, Robertson, Barnes, and Miller, (1986) defined self-presentation as a controlled process, and found that leaders expressed a task or relational identity based on their perceptions of situational requirements. Finally, Westphal and Graebner (2010) showed that CEOs intentionally use verbal IM to increase external stakeholder perceptions of improved governance practices even in the absence of any actual improvements. Also, in conceptual research, Gardner and Avolio (1998) defined IM as a process of actively regulating one's identity. In their framework, IM involves phases used by actors such as scripting or staging, both of which include intentional direction and management.

Automatic processing. Automatic processing is involuntary, occurring when stores of information are triggered and processed in a way that bypasses the central control system altogether (Schneider & Chein, 2003). Automaticity results from extended, consistent training that establishes a network of cognitive associations between a stimulus trigger and its resulting behavior. Automatic activation can result in behavior that is engaged outside the individual's conscious awareness (Ouellette & Wood, 1998). Automaticity can be developed for a particular instance both through repeated training with distinct exemplars, and for entire categories through training of multiple types that fit the same category (Fisk & Schneider, 1983). Therefore, leaders may develop standard IM responses to repeat situations they encounter, whether those situations are identical to the one in which learning initially occurred or simply exhibit categorical similarity.

Automatic processing occurs quickly, with multiple tasks performed in parallel. Automatic processing is not effortful, can occur in high workload situations, and is robust to stressors (Schneider & Fisk, 1982). Automatic processing in IM is difficult to control, difficult to unlearn, and tends to be triggered by stimuli across multiple unique situations rather than conscious attention toward examining follower feedback.

Despite the frequently habitual nature of leader IM, the extant leadership literature is limited in its study of automatic IM behaviors. I found just one study by Gray and Densten (2007) explicitly mentioning that leader IM behavior may be automatic. These authors studied how leaders contribute to follower perceptions of romantic notions of leadership, acknowledging that leaders may engage in both conscious and unconscious IM to construct a leader identity. Although there is a dearth of studies examining automatic IM behaviors in leadership, the literature from other fields is more abundant and likely would extend to leaders. For example, research shows that individuals automatically adjust their behavior to be synchronous with that of a conversation partner (Vacharkulksemsuk & Fredrickson, 2012), and they automatically mimic the behavior of others (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999). Each of these behaviors builds rapport and generates liking.

Authentic or Inauthentic Communication

Authenticity is defined as being true to the self (Zickmund, 2007). The second dimension in my typology addresses the transmission of an impression that is either true to self (i.e., authentic) or not true to self (i.e., inauthentic). For this, I draw from communication literature discussing authentic communication.

To illustrate the biological, psychological and social foundations of authentic and inauthentic IM, I examine aspects related to the self, as illustrated in Goffman's (1959) seminal work, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Goffman states that self-presentational behavior can be, "real, sincere, or honest" or can be "something painstakingly pasted together, one false item on another" (Goffman, 1959; p. 70). According to Goffman, self-presentation involves manipulation of one's appearance, behavior, and the setting. Hochschild (1983) calls this "surface acting" in which an actor either pretends to be a character, contrasting this with deep acting, in which an actor becomes the character. Deep acting has similar social implications to surface acting, but because it involves the actor's true identity and has emotional implications (Hochschild, 1983), it also has deep biological and psychological roots. According to Hochschild, surface acting communicates a false or inauthentic self, while deep acting communicates a true self.

The same IM tactic may be either authentic or inauthentic. For example, online photos can be used to create impressions and influence social interactions. Research shows that during the 2000 U.S. presidential election, candidates appeared to present photos of themselves on their websites in ways that would enhance positive and reduce negative impressions (Verser & Wicks 2006). An example of positive versus negative images in this study involved facial expression, whether the candidate appeared cheerful and confident or unhappy and worried. For a cheerful confident candidate, presenting such a photo would be authentic IM, but for an unhappy worried candidate, this same photo would be inauthentic. Thus, to understand leader IM, it is important to understand the authenticity of the image being conveyed.

Authentic communication. Leaders have multiple identities composed of various personal traits and role characteristics, with different identities triggered by a number of contextual factors (Oyserman, Elmore & Smith, 2011). Authentic communication conveys identity-congruent images to an audience (Molleda, 2010) and is used for various reasons. For instance, leaders may try to convey truthful information about themselves to establish credibility, to receive validation or boost self-esteem (Schlenker, 2011), or to follow norms when honesty is the standard method of communication (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May & Walumba, 2005).

Authentic IM involves the alignment of verbal (with words) and nonverbal (without words) messaging (Burgoon et al., 2011). Verbal forms of authentic IM tend to involve the effective use of vivid cues and sensory information as leaders draw from personal knowledge and experience, and tend not to focus on conveying an image of perfection, as the true self often is imperfect (DePaulo et al., 2003). Nonverbal authentic IM can be tied to emotional displays that often have physiological, psychological, and social effects. For example, authentic smiles, referred to as felt smiles or Duchenne smiles (Ekman, Davidson, & Friesen, 1990), use particular muscles around the eye, are symmetrical, are timed congruently with interpersonal interaction, and tend to be perceived by others as real. Further, Duchenne smiles activate the left-sided anterior temporal region of the brain, the region congruent with happiness (Davidson, Ekman, Saron, Senulis, & Friesen, 1990; Ekman, et al., 1990). In all communication, it is important that verbal and nonverbal messages align (Burgoon et al., 2011) to reduce leakage and confusion from inter-channel inconsistency (Ekman & Friesen, 1969; Buller & Burgoon, 1996). In authentic IM, verbal and nonverbal messages naturally align.

To illustrate authentic IM in leadership, we can look to research focused on identity construction and transmission as well as research into authentic leadership. Examples of identity-related research include the paper by Gardner and Avolio (1998), who discussed a variety of authentic IM techniques used by leaders to construct trustworthy and credible identities with their followers. These authentic IM behaviors were verbal communication techniques such as exemplifying commitment to followers, self-promoting competence, and justifying responsibility for a negative event. Pollach and Kerbler (2011) also approached authentic IM from the perspective of credibility, focusing on how CEO IM on the corporate website generated impressions of the CEO in followers. Examples of authentic IM also are discussed indirectly in

authentic leadership literature, which specifies a primary aspect of authentic leadership involves transparency and openness, both of which convey the leader's true self (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008).

Inauthentic communication. Inauthentic communication is used to convey identityincongruent images to an audience. Displays of inauthentic identity may produce desirable outcomes when inauthentic IM is beneficial and believable (Schlenker, 2011), resulting in potential motivation for a leader to use inauthentic communication. However, with inauthentic IM, leakage or inter-channel inconsistencies are likely.

Leakage occurs when nonverbal communication does not match verbal communication (Buller & Burgoon, 1996). This can happen in multiple ways. For example, when communication is inauthentic, the sender may experience and display negative emotions that contradict the intended message. Displays of negative emptions include pupil dilation, high pitched voices, shorter responses, slower speech, and silent hesitations creating a more negative, tense, and impersonal impression (DePaulo et al., 2003). Relative to the Duchenne smile discussed previously, false smiles activate the right-sided anterior temporal region of the brain, the region congruent with disgust (Davidson et al., 1990; Ekman et al., 1990), and the timing of false smiles is not judged by others to fit conversational norms (Ekman & Friesen, 1982). Inauthentic communication tends not to be compelling, contain effective sensory information, use vivid imagery, or offer unusual detail; it often is not structured in a logical way, thereby creating interpersonal distance (DePaulo et al., 2003).

In the leadership literature, a typical focus of inauthentic IM is exaggeration. For example, Sharma and Grant (2011) highlighted the IM technique of storytelling via a case analysis of Steve Jobs and acknowledged there may be some stretching of the truth that accompanies this technique. Yagil (1998) examined charismatic leadership and close versus distant leaders, suggesting distant leaders may be able to project a superhuman image using organizational myths. Finally, in an examination of how social desirability and cultural norms influence CEO leadership, Densten and Sarros (2011) defined IM as intentionally over-reporting beneficial behaviors.

Pro-self or Pro-Social Goals

Behavior is motivated by individuals' belief that they can perform successfully in a way that leads to a desirable outcome (Vroom, 1964). The third dimension in my typology addresses IM as a goal-directed behavior. I focus on pro-self and pro-social goals, which I explain using principles related to social value orientation. Social value orientation is a stable preference for certain outcomes for oneself and others (Van Lange, 1999). Pro-self outcomes maximize the benefit to self; pro-social outcomes maximize the benefit to oneself and others (Van Lange, Otten, De Bruin, & Joireman, 1997). The definition of social value orientation as a stable preference suggests it is dispositional, but many lines of research indicate that situational factors influence the extent to which individuals engage in pro-self or pro-social behavior. For example, power and stability within the hierarchy are influential in whether pro-self or pro-social action is taken (Galinsky, Gruenfeld, & Magee, 2003; Maner & Mead, 2010). Further, situational cues that prime morality (e.g., honest, trustworthy) versus might (e.g., assertive, independent) influence the extent to which individuals use pro-self versus pro-social behaviors (Smeesters, Warlop, Van Avermaet, Leuven & Yzerbyt, 2003). Thus, my emphasis is not on the stability of pro-self and pro-social behavior but the focus of the leader's outcome preference as self or social, manifested by the situation.

The social value orientation guiding an individual's behavior has its roots at least in part in need fulfillment (Van Lange et al., 1997). Work behaviors are motivated to satisfy biological, psychological, and social needs (Dawkins, 1976; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Such needs can be similar across individuals. Biologically, individuals are wired for both pro-self and pro-social tendencies. Genetically, we are programmed toward pro-self behavior such as survival and reproduction (Dawkins, 1976) and also wired to act pro-socially through evolutionary success garnered from concepts such as reciprocal altruism (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005). Individuals also are driven by psychological factors, particularly autonomy, competence, relatedness, and self-esteem (Sheldon, Kim, & Kasser, 2001), with many of these factors also including social or relationship-focused aspects.

Whether the goal of a particular IM tactic is pro-self or pro-social is not determined by the tactic, but by the leader's goal. For example, a leader may self-promote about recent success on a new project to increase follower perceptions of leader competence. This may be pro-self or pro-social behavior. Identity is socially constructed (Oyserman et al., 2011), so this would be pro-self behavior if the goal is to fulfill the leader's personal need to generate an impression of competence that is reflected back to the leader. Alternatively, some leaders can inspire followers through demonstrations of self-confidence (Howell & Shamir, 2005). If the leader's goal is to inspire followers, then the leader's self-promotion would be a pro-social behavior.

Pro-self behavior. Pro-self behavior is intended to produce a desirable outcome for the self (Van Lange, 1999). Pro-self behavior can be dispositional (Van Lange et al., 1997) or it can be triggered when a social situation primes an individual's identity, causing the individual to act with self-focus in mind (Oyserman et al., 2011). Myriad pro-self behaviors exist. These might include justifications and disclaimers that affect perceptions of social loafing (Mulvey, Bowes-

Sperry, & Klein, 1998) or self-promotion and ingratiation typically used during job interviews to impact perceptions of competence and likability (Peck & Levashina, 2017). Thus, pro-self behaviors can take many forms and occur across various situations.

Foundations of pro-self behavior have biological, psychological, and social connections. Physiologically, neural structures that support the pursuit of self-interests are situated in the lefthemisphere of the brain (Hecht, 2014). Psychologically, pro-self behavior is related to identity (Leary & Kowalski, 1990), self-monitoring (Turnley & Bolino, 2001), Machiavellianism (Bolino & Turnley, 2003), extraversion, and agreeableness (Higgins & Judge, 2004). Socially, pro-self behavior is influenced by social norms such that pro-self self-promotion may be normative in situations like job interviews, but less so in settings of prolonged interaction such as job performance (Peck & Levashina, 2017).

Pro-self IM behavior is not widely represented in leadership literature, but it is discussed in other areas. In one leader-related study, Siegel and Brockner (2005) found that CEOs' anticipatory handicapping, operationalized as a warning to stakeholders of external factors that could impact performance, was related to receiving significantly higher pay relative to CEOs who did not use such pro-self behavior. Outside the leader realm, an examination of pro-self behavior on the job showed individuals who faced job insecurity used a variety of pro-self behaviors to reduce affective job insecurity and increase performance ratings (Huang, Zhao, Niu, Ashford, & Lee, 2013). Interview settings are frequently analyzed for pro-self behavior. Tsai, Huang, Wu, and Lo (2015) found that the use of apologies, justifications, and excuses by applicants could mitigate damage of a potentially harmful issue brought up during the interview. Further, Kristof-Brown, Barrick, and Franke (2002) found pro-self self-promotion was strongly related to interviewer perceptions of the interviewee's person-job fit. **Pro-social behavior.** Pro-social behavior is intended to produce a desirable outcome for the self and others (Van Lange, 1999). They are behaviors regarded generally by society as helpful to the group (Penner et al., 2005). Pro-social behaviors encompass a variety of activities occurring at multiple levels in an organization such as team-based helping behavior, in which customer service teams work together to satisfy customers (George & Bettenhausen, 1990), and interpersonal helping behavior, in which an individual comforts a coworker under distress (Penner et al., 2005).

Pro-social behavior by the leader can be understood in terms of biological, psychological, and social motivations. Physiological differences in the brain suggest neural structures supporting pro-social behaviors primarily are concentrated in the right-hemisphere (Hecht, 2014). In addition to this biological basis, pro-social behavior is learned through observation of such behaviors by others (Penner et al., 2005). Additional psychological foundations of pro-social behavior include psychological arousal and affect, including empathic concern (Batson, 2016) as well as pro-social moral reasoning, (Eisenberg et al., 2002), and enduring personality traits such as agreeableness (Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007). Intergroup bias suggests individuals are more likely to use pro-social behavior with in-group members compared to out-group members (Penner et al., 2005). Finally, people can have both dispositional and situational (e.g., cultural norms of social responsibility, cooperation, and helping behavior) reasons for behaving pro-socially (Batson & Powell, 2003).

The leadership literature provides limited examples of pro-social IM behavior. Sosik, et al. (2002) found a leader's pro-social behaviors relate positively to follower perceptions of charismatic leadership, while pro-self behaviors do not. Examples exist outside of the leadership literature, which suggest possible applicability to leadership. For instance, pro-social IM

behavior has been demonstrated at the individual level through its connection to affiliative citizenship behaviors (Grant & Mayer, 2009) and at the group level through its connection to cohesiveness, socialization, sales performance, and positive leader mood (George & Bettenhausen, 1990). Krupka and Weber (2009) examined the influence of norms on pro-social behavior and found norms increased pro-social behavior both through thinking about the behavior and observing the behavior.

Combining Dimensions

Although I presented each dimension in my typology as having a binary distinction, it is important to recognize that such a distinction is not static. For example, processing that has been controlled can shift to automatic. Such a shift occurs when a behavior has been rewarded with desired outcomes a sufficient number of times (Yin & Knowlton, 2006). Also, inauthentic behavior may shift to authentic or vice versa. Authenticity involves owning one's personal experiences including beliefs, values, and emotions and then acting in accord with those experiences (Gardner et al., 2005). However, true values, beliefs, emotions, etc. can be altered by input from others (Sparrowe, 2005). Finally, pro-self and pro-social goals may be impacted by whether someone else controls the valued outcome (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). As control of the outcome shifts, the goal may shift as well.

Thus, the typology should not be viewed as a static system into which a particular leader or a particular leader IM tactic is placed. Rather, the typology is intended to create a framework that explicates the complexities of leader IM, suggesting that different types of leader IM arise when various aspects of these three dimensions are combined, which may change based on factors both internal and external to the leader.

Typology of Behaviors

The three dimensions of my typology give way to eight archetypes of IM behavior. I present a brief description of each archetype, illustrating it with examples from the literature. Because leadership literature has not yet considered the three-dimensional nature of leader IM, the examples I use cross a wide expanse of different literatures and underscore the opportunity the typology provides to unify perspectives on IM.

Opportunistic Representation. Opportunistic Representation is IM that is controlled, authentic, and pro-self. Wilhelmy, Kleinmann, Konig, Melchers, and Truxillo (2016) illustrate Opportunistic Representation in their study examining interviewers' deliberate attempts to engage in authentic behavior to increase positive candidate perceptions of the organization, job, and interviewer. Examples of such behavior include demonstrating job knowledge, telling personal stories, and deliberate note taking. This controlled, authentic behavior has pro-self intentions of establishing attractiveness, authenticity, closeness, professional distance, and superiority. Cable and Kay (2012) illustrate another example through their examination of individual's attempts at self-verification striving upon organizational entry. Cable and Kay viewed self-verification striving as behaving in a way that conveys to others who you really are, and they found that these intentional behaviors satisfied the pro-self needs of job satisfaction and enhanced personal performance. A leader who intentionally uses IM to convey a true self as a means of achieving personal gain is using Opportunistic Representation.

Authentic Representation. Authentic Representation is IM that is automatic, authentic, and pro-self. An example of Authentic Representation can be found in a study by Johnson (2008) on emotional contagion and leadership. Emotional contagion is automatically transferring emotions between individuals due to activation of mirror neurons causing individuals to mimic the emotions of the interaction partner (Johnson, 2008; Gallese et al., 2007; Chartrand & Bargh, 1999). Leader positive affect is communicated through both verbal and nonverbal behaviors, such as automatically and authentically smiling when engaging a follower. Johnson (2008) found that such positive behaviors result in emotional contagion, meaning followers take on the positive emotions conveyed by the leader. The transfer of positive emotions from leader to follower in turn increases follower attributions of charismatic leadership (Johnson, 2008), indicating the follower has formed a positive impression of the leader. Thus, leaders may automatically engage in authentic behaviors to convey affect. Such affect becomes emotionally contagious, impacting followers' impressions of the leader, and resulting in pro-self outcomes for leaders. A leader who involuntarily conveys a true self as a means of achieving personal gain is using Authentic Representation.

Fraudulent Misrepresentation. Fraudulent Misrepresentation is IM that is controlled, inauthentic, and pro-self. This is exemplified in the faking literature in employee selection. Levashina and Campion (2007) defined faking during the interview as "conscious distortions of answers to the interview questions in order to obtain a better score on the interview and/or otherwise create favorable perceptions" (p. 1639). Therefore, faking is by definition controlled, inauthentic, and pro-self. Research has shown that this type of IM generally is not successful in enhancing liking or perceptions of competence. Roulin, Bangerter, and Levashina (2015) found interviewers provided lower performance ratings to applicants they perceived as deceptive, however, the interviewers' ability to detect deception was poor. A leader who intentionally conveys an untrue self as a means of achieving personal gain is using Fraudulent Misrepresentation.

Inadvertent Misrepresentation. Inadvertent Misrepresentation is IM that is automatic, inauthentic, and pro-self. An example of Inadvertent Misrepresentation is seen in Verschuere, Spruyt, Meijer, and Otgaar's (2011) study of habitual lying. These researchers found that habitual lying was easier than truth-telling for individuals frequently engaged in such behavior. Also, when lying is habit, it results in fewer behavioral errors, suggesting lying rather than truth as the dominant response for habitual liars. Ford (1999) categorized types of lies and noted that *white lies* are often automatic social conventions. Thus, leaders using these automatic lies for pro-self reasons such as avoiding embarrassment are engaging in Inadvertent Misrepresentation. A leader who involuntarily conveys an untrue self for personal gain is using Inadvertent Misrepresentation.

Diplomatic Representation. Diplomatic Representation is IM that is controlled, authentic, and pro-social. Grant and Mayer (2009) explored this type of IM via the interactive effects of self-serving motives and pro-social motives on affiliative citizenship behavior. These researchers found that self-serving motives (e.g., to look better than coworkers) and pro-social motives (e.g., to have a positive impact on others) interacted to impact citizenship behaviors such as helping others or preventing problems for other employees. Thus, the conceptualization used by Grant and Mayer (2009) fits the definition of pro-social goals put forth by social value orientation as benefiting self and others. The use of self-report measures of true motives suggests controlled processing and authentic communication. A leader who intentionally conveys a true self for social benefit is using Diplomatic Representation.

Cooperative Representation. Cooperative Representation is IM that is automatic, authentic, and pro-social. Cooperation reflects a goal orientation focused on group benefits (e.g., Tjosvold, 1998), and cooperation often is considered a trait (Wiggins, Trapnell, & Philips, 1988),

suggesting a stability that can bring automaticity. One example of Cooperative Representation is mimicry. Chartrand and Bargh (1999) provide an excellent example of this type of IM in their discussion of the chameleon effect. Through a series of experiments, Chartrand and Bargh (1999) showed that perception of an interaction partner's behavior led to unconscious mimicry of the behavior. Further, the mimicry increased liking and ease of interaction between individuals. Similarly, Bernieri (1988) studied movement synchrony among high school students in teaching dyads and found that increased coordination and timing of movements was related to positive rapport. Each of these examples indicates automatic, authentic behavior, and each implies a prosocial goal. A leader who involuntarily conveys a true self for social benefit is using Cooperative Representation.

Tactful Misrepresentation. Tactful Misrepresentation is IM that is controlled, inauthentic, and pro-social. I draw from literature that discusses controlled altruistic lies to provide examples of Tactful Misrepresentation in action. DePaulo, Kashy, Kirkendol, Wyer, and Epstein (1996) defined lying as "intentionally try[ing] to mislead someone" (p. 981), thus emphasizing the controlled nature of telling lies. In a diary study of college students and community members, DePaulo et al., (1996) found that one out of every four lies was used for what I have called a pro-social reason (i.e., for the benefit of others and the self). In a follow up study by DePaulo and Kashy (1998), the type of lie and closeness of relationships were examined, with results showing that altruistic lies rather than self-centered lies were more frequently told in close relationships. Further, altruistic lies were more commonly used by college students when they had known their interaction partner for a long period of time. A leader who intentionally conveys an untrue self for social benefit is using Tactful Misrepresentation.

Amiable Misrepresentation. Amiable Misrepresentation is IM that is automatic, inauthentic and pro-social. To illustrate this, I contrast white lies, which are automatic, with my previous discussion of lies in general, which are controlled. In his discussion of white lies as social conventions, Ford (1999) defines white lies as "social lies that serve to lubricate interpersonal relationships... frequently provided in such an automatic manner as not even to register in consciousness" (p.29), thus emphasizing the automaticity of such lies. Examples of such lies include those that may "respect the sensitivity and dignity of others" (p. 29). For example, an individual habitually telling a colleague that he has fun at the colleague's parties even though the individual was bored is an automatic pro-social white lie because it is habitual in interpersonal interaction and protects both the colleague and individual from social embarrassment or discomfort that could affect future feelings of relatedness. McLeod and Genereux (2008) examined the relationships between personality and likelihood of lying, finding that assertiveness and honesty were significantly, negatively correlated with altruistic lying. The link between altruistic lying (i.e., white lies) and stable personality characteristics suggests lying for pro-social reasons can be automatically engaged. A leader who involuntarily conveys an untrue self for social benefit is using Amiable Misrepresentation.

These eight archetypes suggest the complexity of leader IM by presenting the various types of IM behaviors that may occur as the result of differences in information processing, communication, and leader goals. The examples from the literature highlight the vastness of IM and how it has been studied across literatures, using different terminology. These archetypes present a novel and comprehensive way to understand how various types of leader IM may be used to influence follower perceptions.

Follower Perceptions

A leader's ability to influence leadership outcomes is influenced by follower perceptions (Shamir, 2007). Numerous leadership theories emphasize different aspects of follower perceptions of the leader. For example, according to transformational leadership theory, when followers regard their leader to be inspirational, the followers' values are transformed and their motivation is increased (Yukl, 1999). According to authentic leadership theory, when followers understand their leader to be honest, followers' trust in leader grows, thereby encouraging optimal follower authenticity and functioning (Walumbwa et al., 2008). According to leader categorization theory, when followers perceive a target leader to match their own expectations of a leader, followers' thoughts and behaviors align with the follower role, thereby allowing for more effective leadership (Lord et al., 1984).

Through the lenses of transformational, authentic, and leader categorization theories, I discuss the impact of my IM typology on followers' perceptions of the leader and positive leadership outcomes specified by each theory.

Transformational/Charismatic Leadership Theory

Transformational and charismatic leadership theories are neo-charismatic theories that focus on visionary leadership (Rowold & Heinitz, 2007). Transformational and charismatic leadership theories were introduced into the literature separately, but the constructs overlap significantly as transformational leadership encompasses leader charisma (Rowold & Heinitz, 2007; Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). Transformational leadership includes the key factors of idealized influence attributed to the leader (follower perceptions of socialized charisma), idealized influence behaviors (charismatic behaviors representing values and beliefs), inspirational motivation (exciting followers by communicating idealized vision), intellectual stimulation (causing followers to think logically and critically), and individualized consideration (developing followers based on individual needs) (Antonakis et al., 2003). Thus, followers' perceptions of their leaders play a critical role in realizing the benefits of transformational/charismatic leadership.

Transformational/charismatic leadership theory suggests follower perceptions of the leader are linked to followers' emotions, attitudes, and self-concept (Howell & Shamir, 2005; Shamir et al., 1993; Lord et al., 1999). However, follower perceptions of the leader also are guided by leader behavior, including IM (Shamir et al., 1993). Leader IM can be used to inspire transformational/charismatic leadership across nearly all of the factors identified by Antonakis et al. (2003), with the influence of each dimension easily discernible in existing literature.

Controlled or automatic. Transformational/charismatic leadership includes the relatively stable personality traits that comprise charisma (House & Howell, 1992). As such, presence of trait charisma may bring automatic exhibition of charismatic/transformational behavior. Individuals without the personality trait of charisma, or with insufficient levels of the trait, may be consciously aware that it is an important mechanism for transforming follower's beliefs based on the given situation, and they may engage in controlled charismatic behaviors to influence follower perceptions (House & Howell, 1992). Yet, automatic processing is less effortful and robust to stressors while controlled processing is not (Schneider & Fisk, 1982), so followers are likely to detect the difference between leaders who embody trait charisma and those who are merely using controlled IM to appear charismatic. When too many controlled behaviors are used to create perceptions of leader charisma, the leader may appear manipulative (Gardner & Avolio, 2008; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Thus, relative to controlled processing in

leader IM behavior, I expect automatic processing to be a more important contributor to follower perceptions of leader charisma.

Authentic or inauthentic. Transformational/charismatic leadership is built on a strong foundation of ethics, with positive outcomes contingent on trust (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). A critical factor for engaging in transformational/charismatic leadership is to engage in authentic behavior, while pseudo-transformational leadership is characterized by inauthentic behavior that may appear charismatic on its face but is really manipulative or deceptive (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) acknowledge that when faced with two poor choices, sometimes it is necessary for even the transformational noral leadership. All people, including leaders, have multiple selves, and transformational leadership suggests it is the moral obligation of a leader to convey her or his better self to followers (Price, 2003). Because followers' trust in the leader is an important determinate of transformational leadership outcomes (Podsakoff et al., 1990), I believe a leader's authentic communication will be more conducive than inauthentic communication to a follower's perceptions of the leader as trustworthy.

Pro-self or pro-social. Followers may have either a personalized or socialized charismatic relationship with the leader. Relationships built on socialized charismatic relationships are characterized by high ethical standards and are important for follower perceptions of transformational/charismatic leadership (Howell & Shamir, 2005). Socialized charismatic relationships are focused on the collective group identity and well-being (Shamir et al., 1993). On the contrary, personalized charismatic relationships may encourage leaders to shirk ethical behavior (Howell & Shamir, 2005), and engage in IM for their own self-interests,

with behavior often appearing deceitful or manipulative, which is emblematic of pseudotransformational leadership (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Thus, relative to pro-self IM behavior, I expect pro-social leader IM to be a more important contributor to follower perceptions of transformational/charismatic leadership.

Important Archetypes and Outcomes. The previous discussion suggests IM dimensions important for leadership outcomes related to transformational/charismatic leadership include IM that is automatic, authentic, and pro-social. Therefore, Cooperative Representation should be especially helpful and Fraudulent Misrepresentation may be harmful in achieving the positive leadership outcomes specified by transformational/charismatic leadership theory. Such outcomes are multi-level and include follower job satisfaction (Judge & Piccolo, 2004), team-level performance, and organizational-level performance (Wang, Oh, Courtright, Colbert, & 2011).

Authentic Leadership Theory

Authentic leadership theory is rooted in the idea that leaders should be true to self, and it is spawned by a renewed focus on ethical conduct of leaders (Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011). Authentic leaders exhibit self-awareness (understanding one's self), internalized moral perspective (using internal moral standards to guide decision making), balanced processing of information (objectively analyzing information), and relational transparency (interacting with others based on one's authentic self). Such behaviors promote in leaders and followers the positive psychological capacities of confidence, hope, optimism, and resilience (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Importantly, authentic leadership is not merely an activity performed by leaders. Rather, authentic leadership requires authentic followership, meaning followers recognize, embrace, and emulate the leader's authentic behaviors (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004). Follower perceptions of authentic leadership are guided by both follower positive affect and follower identification with the leader (Avolio et al., 2004), with a critical aspect being follower's perceptions of identification with the leader (Ilies et al., 2005; Avolio et al., 2004). Some experts have indicated that authentic leadership is at odds with IM (e.g., Avolio, 2005). However, I believe certain types of IM may be critical to follower's positive affect and identification with the leader in authentic leadership.

Controlled or automatic. Both automatic and controlled information processing could be important to conveying an image of authenticity. On one hand, automatic behavior has shorter response latencies than controlled behavior, in part because individuals are behaving true to self (DePaulo et al., 2003). A leader's spontaneous engagement in ethical self-presentation behaviors may be perceived by followers as an honest display of values, thereby increasing the follower's positive affect and identification with the leader. On the other hand, self-regulatory processes such as self-awareness and balanced processing (Gardner et al., 2005), as well as authentic selfmonitoring behavior, defined as actively regulating authentic behavior based on situational cues (Ilies et al., 2005; Zaccaro, Foti & Kenny, 1991), are important mechanisms for achieving positive outcomes in authentic leadership. Such controlled processes may send a message that the leader honestly values taking time for such endeavors. This, too, may enhance follower positive affect and identification. Thus, I expect automatic and controlled IM to be useful in influencing follower perceptions that the leader is authentic.

Authentic or inauthentic. The lynchpin of follower perceptions of an authentic leader is that the leader engages in authentic behaviors, including authentic communication. Authentic behavior can be seen across each of the factors that define the authentic leadership. For example, leaders must have an awareness of the self and use balanced processing to neither exaggerate nor
ignore aspects of the self while processing information (Kernis, 2003), leading to psychological authenticity (Ilies et al., 2005). This psychological authenticity and internalized moral processing materializes in relational transparency that involves "presenting one's authentic self (as opposed to a fake or distorted self) to others" (Walumbwa et al., 2008; p. 96). Further, authentic leaders are focused on self-verification and self-improvement, so they are more likely to engage in authentic IM to obtain the accurate reflected appraisals that will enhance self-development (Gardner et al., 2005). Thus, relative to inauthentic communication in leader IM behavior, I expect authentic communication to be a more important contributor to follower perceptions of authentic leadership.

Pro-self or pro-social. Finally, I expect leaders engaged in authentic leadership to undertake IM for both pro-self and pro-social goals. Authentic leaders are focused on their own development and the collective goals and objectives of others (Gardner et al., 2005; Ilies et al., 2005). Authentic leaders seek self-verification and self-improvement as they use reflected appraisals by followers to cement their authentic self and increase self-esteem (Gardner et al., 2005; Kernis, 2003). Authentic leaders also express positive values, emotions, and goals aimed at follower growth and development (Gardner et al., 2005). Thus, I believe pro-self and pro-social IM behaviors to be important contributors to followers' perceptions of leader authenticity.

Important Archetypes and Outcomes. This review suggests automatic or controlled, authentic, pro-self or pro-social IM behaviors may relate positively to follower perceptions that the leader is authentic. Therefore, Cooperative Representation, Diplomatic Representation, Authentic Representation, and Opportunistic Representation should be helpful in achieving positive leadership outcomes specified by authentic leadership theory, while Amiable Misrepresentation, Tactful Misrepresentation, Inadvertent Misrepresentation, and Fraudulent Misrepresentation may be unhelpful. Positive leadership outcomes specified by authentic leadership theory include increased follower job performance (Walumbwa et al., 2008), follower organizational commitment (Jensen & Luthans, 2006), and organizational financial performance (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang, & Avey, 2009).

Leader Categorization Theory

Leader categorization theory is an information-processing theory focused on how individuals cognitively perceive leaders and subsequently engage in the leadership process (Lord et al., 1984). The theory is focused on how followers construct leadership via their own cognitive categorization processes. The core premise of the theory is that followers develop cognitive leader categories, assess whether an individual fits their established leader category, and then behave accordingly, accepting influence from those categorized as leaders (Lord et al., 1984).

Through experience, individuals develop knowledge structures or cognitive schema used to organize information about leaders (Lord & Maher, 1991). Schemas are formed as categories that organize together similar but non-identical information (Lord & Maher, 1991). Using key information within the leader schema, followers generate leader prototypes, or images of the most representative category member, against which a potential leader is compared to determine category fit (Lord & Maher, 1991). Followers will perceive individuals as either fitting or not fitting the leader prototype. The leader prototype is stable due to patterns of behavior that are categorized as prototypical over time but also flexible based on situational constraints (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001). IM can impact whether an individual is categorized as a leader.

Controlled or automatic. Both automatic and controlled processing may be implicated as prototypical leader behaviors. It may be important for leaders to engage in controlled processing to exhibit flexibility as a leader. For example, Cronshaw and Lord (1987) identified controlled processes as part of prototypical leader behaviors, drawing from several prior wide scale studies. Such controlled behaviors include statements that the leader "delayed action on decisions" and "carefully planned what to do" (Cronshaw & Lord, 1987; p. 100). Despite the importance of controlled processing in the categorization process, another prototypical leader characteristic is decisiveness (Lord, et al., 1984), which represents quick decision making. Followers often view leaders as having an intrinsic ability to lead (Hogg, 2001) that could manifest in automatic decision-making. Consequently, I believe both controlled and automatic IM behaviors are implicated in perceptions of a target as a leader.

Authentic or inauthentic. I expect a stronger influence for authentic than inauthentic IM communication on follower perceptions of a leader as being prototypical. Leader prototypes are influenced by normative behavior (Hogg, 2001). Although some normative behavior emphasizes altruistic lying to protect those close to us (DePaulo & Kashy, 1998), on average normative leader behavior emphasizes ethical and authentic behavior (Kalshoven & Hartog, 2009). Lord et al., (1984) examined prototypical leader characteristics and found the following to be rated as highly prototypical: honest, fair, strong character, believable, trustworthy, admits mistakes. Alternatively, manipulative and dishonest were rated low. Thus, relative to inauthentic communication in leader IM, I expect authentic communication to be a more important contributor to follower perceptions of leader prototypicality.

Pro-self or pro-social. Prototypical leaders focus their energy on serving the group (Hogg, 2001), so I expect prototypical leader behaviors to be the result of pro-social goals. Lord et al., (1984), found the following characteristics to be central to the leader prototype: caring, humanitarian, unselfish, and coordinates groups. Other researchers have examined leader prototypes using implicit leadership theories. This research shows that typical implicit leadership

theory prototypes in the U.S. include being sensitive, intelligent, dedicated, and dynamic (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004), while implicit leadership theories in China include being personally moral, goal efficient, interpersonally competent, and versatile (Ling, Chia, & Fang, 2000). Epitropaki and Martin (2004) include conceited, selfish, and manipulative as items for the antiprototypical factor in their implicit leadership scale. Thus, I suggest prototypes for the ideal leader include pro-social behaviors rather than pro-self behaviors. Leader IM grounded in such pro-social goals will positively relate with follower categorization of a target as a leader.

Important Archetypes and Outcomes. The previous discussion indicates automatic or controlled, authentic, pro-social behavior is important for leader prototypicality. Therefore, Cooperative Representation and Diplomatic Representation should be helpful and Fraudulent Misrepresentation and Inadvertent Misrepresentation unhelpful in achieving positive leadership outcomes specified by leader categorization theory. According to the theory, categorization sets the foundation for social interaction including leadership outcomes because categorization impacts a perceiver's expectations, attitudes, and behaviors (Johnson & Lord, 2004). Through its impact on the leadership relationship, categorization influences follower well-being, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005).

Implications

The typology and model created herein is descriptive in nature, yet it also provides many opportunities for future research and important implications for practitioners.

Implications for Research

Opportunities for research begin with an exploration of the three-dimensional nature of my model and extend to an exploration of the model itself.

Validating the typology. My model suggests leader IM is a complex process, and so validating the three dimensions will be complex as well. To begin, a significant implication of my typology is the expansion of the construct to include IM that is automatic and pro-social. Typical conceptions of IM follow the definition of IM as intentional faking (Levashina & Campion, 2006) or IM as being at odds with authenticity (Avolio, 2005). Yet, managing an impression often occurs automatically (e.g., an automatic smile to seem friendly) and is not always self-serving (e.g., self-promoting previous helpful behaviors to seem cooperative and be allowed to help others). There is no current typology that includes automatic versus controlled information processing and honest versus dishonest IM, despite calls from researchers (e.g., Bolino et al., 2016). Thus, my typology provides an important step in expanding the nomological net of IM.

Further, because IM typically has not been considered in a positive light, the negative connotation surrounding IM makes it a sensitive subject to explore. As Greenwald and his colleagues indicate (Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann, & Banaji, 2009), understanding of potentially socially sensitive topics is enhanced by using both explicit and implicit measures, as each explains variance beyond what is explained by the other. Typical IM measures are self-report, wherein the person engaged in IM reports on her or his own use of IM, but self-report is not always appropriate for assessing IM (Bolino et al., 2016). Because my typology suggests nuanced differences in dimensions, assessing the typology may involve triangulation from leader and follower perspectives that occurs in both self-report and implicit ways. Self-report instruments may focus on leader and follower perceptions of IM behavior at the dimensional level. Implicit tactics could be used to examine perceptions of dimensional IM behavior, similar to implicit assessments of self-related constructs or attitudes (Greenwald & Farnham, 2000).

Testing the model. My model also suggests leader IM is part of a complex leadership process, which also should be explored. The instruments discussed above will be critical for assessing the model, but other methods may be employed as well. For instance, researchers might draw from other areas. Conjoint analysis typically is used by marketers to understand consumers' buying preferences and decisions. Conjoint analysis allows researchers to explore subtle differences in evaluative perceptions by presenting individuals with choices and then analyzing the drivers of the choices (Priem & Walters, 2011). The result of conjoint analysis is a utility report that indicates which thoughts are driving an individual's decisions. Through the instruments I have proposed developing as well as use of additional methods including conjoint analysis, researchers can begin assessing predictions within the model.

Antecedents of IM. In this review, I discussed several critical biological, psychological, and social antecedents to the dimensions of IM in my model. Yet, it would be nearly impossible to list all such antecedents. Future research could explore the effects of factors I discussed as well as those I did not (e.g., biochemical factors, gender, culture, etc.) to determine the impact of specific variables on particular IM dimensions or across dimensions. Perhaps, biochemical factors are especially important for the information processing dimension of the typology, or gender may be important across each of the dimensions, and the strength of its effect on each dimension could be compared. Exploration is required for these and many other biological, psychological, and social antecedents of leader IM.

The mediation of follower perceptions. My model brings to IM literature an explicit focus on target perceptions as a precursor to outcomes, a focus that has been missing in much IM literature. Typical research examining IM asks the person engaged in IM to report personal IM behaviors (Bolino et al., 2016). This is illustrated well in selection literature wherein research

often relies on interviewees' post-interview ratings of their use of IM, which are then correlated with interview outcomes. Yet, this method fails to consider interviewer perceptions of interviewee IM behavior and how those perceptions impact outcomes (Roulin, Bangerter, & Levashina, 2014). My model notes the importance of target perceptions as a mediator between leader IM and leadership outcomes. Future research should examine the mediating role of target perceptions between leader IM and a variety of important outcomes at the individual, group, and organizational levels of analysis. For example, how does leader IM influence individual organizational citizenship behaviors or group-level counterproductive work norms, or organization-level productivity?

Extension to other theories. An important contribution of my model is its application to follower-focused leadership theories. I offered predictions of possible noteworthy effects of certain dimensions and/or archetypes on follower perceptions within three leadership theories. For example, I suggest automatic, authentic, and pro-social IM (Cooperative Representation) is important for impacting follower perceptions of transformational leadership. This effect might be tested through an experimental design in which actors portray this archetype and others to learn the impact on follower perceptions and ultimately their impact on leadership outcomes.

I also reviewed the possible impact of IM on follower perceptions through the lens of LCT, which suggests the categorization process is particularly helpful when a perceiver's mental capacity is reduced, such as times of stress (Johnson & Lord, 2004). It would be interesting to learn the impact of IM in LCT when followers are stressed. Predictions across the theories I discussed can be explored, and my model can be extended to other follower-focused leadership theories such as romance of leadership, leader-member exchange, social identity theory of leadership, and servant leadership.

The feedback loop. Leadership is a dynamic process that occurs over time (Hogue & Lord, 2007). Thus, my model suggests leader IM is impacted via feedback the leader receives from follower perceptions and leadership outcomes. Feedback allows for necessary adjustment of IM, which potentially could shift the nature of the dimensions. For example, effective use of controlled processing strengthens cognitive connections such that processing shifts from automatic to controlled. Future research should examine how this feedback loop dynamically influences leader IM dimensions and behaviors over time using longitudinal designs. Further, future cross-sectional designs should examine factors such as the length of time leaders and followers have worked together to examine whether time impacts the type and frequency of IM behaviors and follower perceptions of these IM behaviors.

Extending the model. Pathways in my model also should be explored for possible moderators. Important variables that moderate the relationship between leader IM and follower perceptions may come from the situation. For example, researchers have called for an examination of cross-level effects in IM research (Bolino et al., 2008). Applied to my model, researchers could explore how norms within the work climate impact the effect of leader IM on follower perceptions of the leader, or whether relationships in the model differ when the leader is the CEO and the follower is another executive in the C-suite versus when the leader is a line manager and the follower is a line worker, or any other combination that could occur at different levels in an organization.

Extension beyond leader IM. Finally, the usefulness of my typology and model extends beyond the leadership literature. The typology is rooted in my definition of IM that is ubiquitous across literatures and should be applied to other areas in which IM is particularly salient. Within the human resources and organizational behavior literature, this typology can be used to

understand a variety of contexts in which important IM dimensions have been overlooked (e.g., automatic versus controlled IM). For example, my model suggests a three-dimensional view of IM, and it suggests that IM impacts work-related outcomes by way of changed perceptions. This perspective can help researchers understand the effects of employee IM directed towards the manager on various performance outcomes as mediated by manager perceptions of the employee. Similarly, the typology and model provide perspective for understanding the effects of candidate IM directed towards the interviewer on hiring outcomes as mediated by interviewer perceptions of candidate fit.

My typology and model are useful beyond the human resources and organizational behavior literature as well, as they offer perspective for researchers attempting to understand the effects of political candidate IM on winning an election as mediated by the electorates' perceptions of the individual as a good candidate, or the effects of sales representative IM on customer purchases as mediated by customer perceptions of the sales representative. Thus, many opportunities exist for how my typology and model can be used to shed light on IM behaviors across literatures.

Implications for Practice

Leadership involves influence (Hogue & Lord, 2007). An important area of influence for leaders entails influencing the impression followers hold of the leader. Until now, the IM literature has been fragmented, but within this chapter, I provide insight for leaders and those working to improve leader development.

By integrating literature related to IM, my typology and model expose the complexity and the usefulness of IM for leaders. My typology clarifies the multi-dimensional nature of leader IM, and my model is a useful reminder that leaders must consider follower perceptions when trying to impact important outcomes. Leaders should engage in IM that positively influences followers' perceptions towards a more ideal version of the leader. While the definition of the ideal leader may differ across followers, various follower-focused leadership theories highlight authenticity as an important dimension of follower perceptions suggesting a possible focus for IM-related leader development.

Leadership development programs could benefit from an explicit discussion of the use of IM, including a discussion of the various dimensions of leader IM. One important lesson may be the importance of authentic and pro-social IM for influencing follower perceptions. Another important lesson is that leaders should consider the multi-dimensional nature of IM, examining their own actions for subtle IM behaviors that might be habitual, communication that is inauthentic, and goals that might sacrifice pro-social outcomes for those that only serve the self. As leaders become aware of the IM that is conducive to their intended outcomes, they also must learn to be cognizant of the feedback provided to them by follower perceptions and achievement of leadership outcomes. Through this, leaders will develop agility in using IM that will improve their own leadership and increase the leadership outcomes of individuals, groups, and organizations.

CHAPTER 2 – AN EMPIRICAL EXAMINATION OF THE POSITIVE EFFECTS OF LEADER IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT ON FOLLOWER PERCEPTIONS OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Impression management (IM) is essential to effective transformational leadership (Peck & Hogue, 2018). In transformational leadership, the leader changes followers by uplifting their motivation and performance (Yukl, 1999). However, followers are not passive recipients of such change. Because followers accept influence from those they perceive to match their understanding of what it means to be a leader (Lord et al., 1984), it is crucial that a transformational leader appears as someone capable of bringing about such change. IM is a means of impacting followers' perceptions by ensuring that a target leader is seen to match the follower's conception, or prototype, of what it means to be a transformational leader. Extant research suggests IM is effective for pseudo-transformational leaders (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999), but empirical research has not demonstrated its positive effects with respect to influencing follower perceptions of transformational leadership (TL perceptions).

In Chapter 1, I presented a definition and model of leader IM. IM is defined as conscious or unconscious, authentic or inauthentic, goal-directed behavior individuals use to influence the impressions others form of them in social interactions. Leader IM is multifaceted, composed of three IM dimensions: information processing, communicative, and goal-directed behaviors. Further, these dimensions each have dual components. Specifically, the information processing dimension is informed by dual processing theory that suggests cognitive information processing can be either automatic or controlled (Schneider & Chein, 2003). The communication dimension is informed by our understanding that communication can be authentic (i.e., true to self) or inauthentic (i.e., untrue to self) (Zickmund, 2007). Finally, the goal-directed nature of IM is

informed by social value orientation that suggests individuals can have pro-self (i.e., outcomes benefit the self) or pro-social (i.e. outcomes benefit the self and others) goals (Van Lange, 1999).

The presentation of these dimensions is a new development in the leadership literature, with the combination of dimensions forming eight IM archetypes (2 x 2 x 2) that explain how IM functions through information processing, communication, and goal orientation components (Peck & Hogue, 2018). Having developed the archetypes and conceptual framework, it is important to test them empirically. In addition, despite calls for a greater overarching understanding of why IM is effective in influencing perceptions (e.g., Bolino, Kacmar, Turnley, & Gilstrap, 2008), previous research has not examined this question or the cognitive process whereby the influence occurs.

Experts also have called for IM research that considers cross-level effects (Bolino, et al., 2008) and moderators of the relationship between leader IM and follower perceptions (Peck & Hogue, 2018). Contextual moderators are particularly important to explore as the activation of cognitive processes is influenced by situational factors (Lord et al., 2001a). One such situational factor, an EWC, is uniquely important when considering TL perceptions as organizational norms and managerial actions guide perceptions of leader behavior (Trevino, 1986) and the presence of an EWC provides a lens through which transformational leadership is understood. Figure 2 shows the IM dimensions and predicted moderating effect of EWC.

Insert Figure 2 about here

The goals of this research involve demonstrating the *instrumental* and *implicit* nature of the relationship between leader IM and TL perceptions. I address these goals through two studies. In the first, I examine the instrumental relationship through a conjoint analysis, developing new tools to assess leader IM and exploring the moderating role of EWC. In the second study, I examine the implicit nature of the relationship through an implicit association test (IAT). In both studies, I integrate conceptual and methodological principles of transformational leadership theory (Yukl, 1999) and leader categorization theory (Lord et al., 1984). Thus, I begin with a brief discussion of both theories and an explanation of the importance of leader categorization theory for understanding the content of the transformational leader prototype.

Theoretical Integration

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is characterized by leaders who engage in behaviors that increase follower motivations to transcend beyond their own self-interests and exceed performance expectations (Yukl, 1999). To accomplish this, transformational leadership generally is considered to be composed of the following dimensions: idealized influence attributed to the leader, idealized influence behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Antonakis et al., 2003). Idealized influence attributed to the leader refers to the leader's socialized charisma, which reflects a leader who is self-confident, powerful, and ethical; idealized influence behaviors are actions the leader engages in that are congruent with the leader's values and beliefs. Inspirational motivation is the process of inspiring followers to reach their goals through visionary goal setting, optimism, and the belief that followers can achieve their goals. Intellectual stimulation involves the leader pushing followers to think analytically and creatively to solve problems based on logic and data. Finally, individualized consideration emphasizes that the leader should focus on individual needs of followers to enhance their development and satisfaction (Antonakis et al., 2003).

Transformational leaders have a profound impact on followers (e.g. Bass, 1995). Transformational leaders motivate followers to perform at levels higher than they normally would by creating a relationship of trust, admiration, and respect (Yukl, 1999). Such leaders increase follower confidence and guide them toward a path of growth wherein ultimately followers strive to become leaders (Yammarino & Dubinsky, 1994). Transformational leaders inspire followers to go beyond their own self-interests for the good of the group or organization (Gillespie & Mann, 2004; Wang et al., 2011). In order for followers to be changed in these ways, they must recognize the target leader as capable of inspiring such change. In other words, followers must recognize the target as a transformational leader. Leader categorization theory provides an understanding of how this recognition occurs.

Leader Categorization Theory

Leader categorization theory is a follower-focused leadership theory that highlights the importance of follower cognitive categorizations of what it means to be a leader and how such categorizations influence follower perceptions of a potential leader (Lord et al., 1984). This theory is useful in explaining the process whereby leader IM influences TL perceptions. Over time and through experience, individuals develop cognitive schema, or networks of related information, that are used to interpret various items, experiences, and people. The schema for leaders organizes information about leaders and provides information to interpret whether a target individual is a leader. Interpretation of a target as a leader occurs through a process of prototype generation and matching (Shondrick, Dinh & Lord, 2010).

Individuals use important information within the schema to generate leader prototypes of the most representative member of the cognitive category (Lord & Maher, 1991). A prototype is an exemplary representative of the category and contains both traits and behaviors (Lord et al., 1984). Prototypes are somewhat stable, but they also can be flexible, with make-up of the prototype influenced by the impact situational factors can have on cognitive activation (Lord et al., 2001a). This suggests individuals may form prototypes for different types of leaders, such as those in business versus the military, for example, or those who are transformational versus transactional. When individuals encounter a potential target leader, the target is compared against the leader prototype to determine whether the individual fits the follower's understanding of what it means to be a leader (Lord & Maher, 1991). If fit is determined, then the target is categorized as (i.e., understood to be) a leader. When leader categorization occurs, the perceiver's behaviors and expectations will follow that categorization such that individuals will accept influence from those categorized as leaders (Lord et al., 1984).

When leadership involves accepting influence of change that involves inspiration, increased motivation, and enhanced performance, the prototype may not be a general leader prototype, but may be a transformational leader prototype. IM can increase the likelihood a target leader will match the transformational leader prototype to the extent the IM behaviors are related to behaviors contained within the transformational leader prototype. The IM dimensions presented in Chapter 1 can be used to understand what types of IM will increase the likelihood of being seen as a transformational leader.

Instrumental Impact of Leader IM

The model created in Chapter 1 shows the process whereby IM in leadership occurs. The model posits that antecedents of leader IM can be biological, psychological, or social, and the

consequences of leader IM are influence of follower perceptions and ultimately follower behavior. At the heart of the model, I suggest leader IM influences follower perceptions about the leader, including whether the leader is transformational. In particular, I predict that certain aspects of each IM dimension will cause a change in follower perceptions.

IM Dimensions and Transformational Leadership

An important means of formulating impressions is for perceivers to use all available information about the individual (Fiske & Taylor, 1991), including perceptions of information processing, communication, and goal-orientated behavior. While some pieces of information may have a greater impact on perceptions than others (Fiske & Taylor, 1991), extant literature provides no evidence to suggest that any one dimension of IM would carry more weight or be singularly sufficient for generating an impression of transformational leadership. Thus, an understanding of how each dimension is implicated in TL perceptions helps provide some insight into how leaders can manage impressions of themselves as transformational (Peck & Hogue, 2018).

Automatic or controlled processing. According to dual processing theory, cognitive information processing can be automatic and controlled, differing by the amount of effort and attention needed to categorize, buffer, associate, and prioritize information (Schneider & Shriffin, 1977; Schneider & Chein, 2003). Relative to controlled processing, automatic processing occurs more quickly with multiple tasks performed in parallel, is less effortful and is more robust to stressors (Schneider & Fisk, 1982). As detailed below, I suggest that automatic rather than controlled leader behaviors will lead to increased TL perceptions.

Some individuals may be prone to engage in behaviors connected to transformational leadership. Examples include trait charisma, as noted in Chapter 1, and behavioral scripts, which are linked to charismatic and visionary behaviors, respectively. Individuals with high levels of trait charisma automatically engage in charismatic behavior (House & Howell, 1992), and leaders who are visionary often rely on cognitive schema containing scripts of visionary behavioral responses that, when primed by a familiar situation, are accessed automatically by the leader as a behavioral response (Wofford & Goodwin, 1994). Alternatively, when transactional leaders engage in charismatic and visionary behaviors, such engagement is conscious and controlled.

The automaticity of certain transformational leadership behaviors is illustrated through neurological patterns of brain power and connectivity associated with the examples of individualized consideration and the complex thinking required for intellectual stimulation. . Transformational leaders' resting brain activity differs from that of a non-transformational leader such that transformational leaders tend to have higher levels of brain connectivity and integration in the right hemisphere of the brain compared to non-transformational leaders as measured by electroencephalograms (EEG) coherence (Balthazard, Waldman, Thatcher, & Hannah, 2012). Integration within the right side of the brain relates to emotional control and empathy (Jones, Field, & Davalos, 2000) and, therefore, the ability to provide individualized consideration in connecting with followers (Balthazard et al., 2012). Transformational leaders also have more differentiation in the left hemisphere than non-transformational leaders (Balthazard et al., 2012). The left hemisphere is responsible for rational thinking (Hellige, 1990), therefore, providing greater capability of engaging in complex thinking necessary for intellectual stimulation (Balthazard et al., 2012). The biological differences between transformational and non-transformational leaders suggest a transformational leader engages in unique automatic processing. Automatic processing translates to automatic behaviors (Ouellette & Wood, 1998) and followers perceive the automaticity of these behaviors as transformational (Peck & Hogue, 2018). In sum, a leader's automatic engagement in transformational leadership IM behaviors will lead to greater TL perceptions than controlled engagement in transformational leadership behaviors.

Hypothesis 1: A leader's automatic IM behavior leads to greater follower TL perceptions than controlled.

Authentic or inauthentic communication. According to communication literature, communication can be either authentic or inauthentic, depending on whether the individual is true to self (Molleda, 2010; Zickmund, 2007). Authentic communication involves conveying identity-congruent images (Molleda, 2010) with verbal and nonverbal messaging that aligns (Burgoon et al., 2011), while inauthentic communication involves conveying identity-incongruent images (Molleda, 2010) with nonverbal and verbal messaging that does not align (i.e. leakage) (Buller & Burgoon, 1996). As detailed below, I suggest authentic rather than inauthentic leader behaviors will lead to increased TL perceptions.

Transformational leadership is founded on a high level of ethics with trust as an important antecedent to establishing follower perceptions of transformational leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 1992; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Trust between the leader and follower is established when the leader "practices what he or she preaches" (Kouzes & Posner p. 483), and the leader behaves according to his or her morals and values (Zhu, Avolio, Riggio, & Sosik, 2011). In both of these examples, the leader engages in identity-congruent behavior or authentic

communication, making this an important IM strategy for increasing follower perceptions of the leader as transformational.

Authentic communication enhances trust, and as such is a basic necessity for viewing a leader as transformational. This is illustrated across many of the transformational leadership dimensions. For example, when intellectually stimulating followers, leaders should use authentic, factual information to drive creative problem solving (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). On the other hand, pseudo-transformational leaders (i.e., those attempting to appear transformational) generally use inauthentic communication via false information to intellectually stimulate followers (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Similarly, transformational leaders inspirationally motivate their followers using visionary images of the future, while pseudo-transformational leaders often motivate using deception (Christie, Barling, & Turner, 2011). When followers perceive a target leader's communication to be honest and trustworthy, they are likely to perceive the leader as transformational (Christie et al., 2011). Therefore, I expect a leader's use of authentic communication will lead to greater TL perceptions as compared to inauthentic communication.

Hypothesis 2: A leader's authentic IM behavior leads to greater follower TL perceptions than inauthentic.

Pro-self or pro-social goal orientation. According to social value orientation, goals can be either pro-self or pro-social depending on whose outcomes the target leader intends to maximize. Pro-self goals have an outcome that benefits the self while pro-social goals have an outcome that benefits the self and others; these behaviors can be dispositional (Van Lange, 1999), but situational factors also influence the extent to which individuals engage in such behaviors (e.g. Galinksy et al., 2003) so that target leaders have a specific self or social goal intention based on the situation. As detailed below, I suggest pro-social rather than pro-self leader behaviors will lead to increased TL perceptions.

Transformational leaders engage in behaviors to benefit the collective group, with an explicit focus on developing their followers (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). As mentioned in Chapter 1, an important dimension of transformational leadership is idealized influence, also described as socialized charisma (Antonakis et al., 2003). Socialized charisma is underscored by a high level of ethics centered on a collective focus towards others compared to personalized charisma that focuses on self-interests and accumulating personal power (Howell & Shamir, 2005). Christie et al. (2011) conducted four experiments using different leader manipulations and found across all studies that leaders who engaged in behaviors focused on the collective group were perceived to be transformational, while leaders who engaged in self-interested behaviors were perceived to be pseudo-transformational. Also, in a survey study involving managers and their subordinates, researchers found pro-social IM had a much stronger influence on follower perceptions of charismatic (i.e., transformational) leadership, than did self-serving IM behavior (Sosik et al., 2002).

Two other constructs that are similar in nature to pro-social IM and have been supported as important for TL perceptions include self-sacrifice and altruism. Self-sacrifice refers to abandoning one's own interests (Choi & Mai-Dalton, 1998), while altruism is focused specifically on benefitting others (Avolio & Locke, 2002) and through this act others become part of the leader's own identity (Singh & Krishnan, 2007). Choi and Mai-Dalton (1999) found that self-sacrificial behavior is part of a follower's implicit idea of what a transformational leader should be and, further, that self-sacrificial leaders were charismatic and seen as legitimate leaders. Altruism has similar support in the literature and has been argued to be the philosophical perspective of transformational leaders (Kanungo, 2001). Empirical evidence suggests both selfsacrificial and altruistic behaviors are positively related to transformational leadership (Singh & Krishnan, 2007) providing further support for pro-social IM as an important means of influencing follower perceptions of transformational leadership. Therefore, I expect leader IM that displays pro-social goal orientation will lead to greater TL perceptions than leader IM that displays pro-self goal orientation.

Hypothesis 3: A leader's pro-social IM behavior leads to greater follower TL perceptions than pro-self.

The Moderating Effects of EWC

Transformational leadership embodies high moral and ethical standards (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Follower perception of transformational leadership is impacted by the context in which the interaction takes place. Because of the importance of ethics to transformational leadership (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999), the contextual element of an EWC is of particular importance for examining how various leader IM behaviors influence perceptions of transformational leadership. I suggest that an EWC will moderate the predicted relationships between automatic, authentic, and pro-social IM and TL perceptions, such that the positive effects of these types of IM will be strengthened.

Ethical work climate (EWC). EWC is the common understanding of what is deemed moral behavior within an organization (Deshpande, 1996). A work climate involves a collective set of norms, values, attitudes, and behaviors that comprise the work climate. Work climate is said to be ethical if there are high levels of moral sensitivity, collective moral judgement, collective moral motivation, and collective moral character (Arnaud, 2010).

EWCs are an organizational-level construct, yet perceptions of an EWC inform individual perceptions and decisions (Barnett & Vaicys, 2000; Wyld & Jones, 1997). In fact, climate is a critical connection between the organization and the individual (Field & Abelson, 1982). Work climates influence norms and guide behavior, and organizations with a strong normative structure in place have an unwritten agreement within the organization as to what behavior is considered acceptable (Trevino, 1986). Followers will perceive leader behavior through the lens of the work climate, which acts as a symbolic prime to impact perceptions of expected behavior (Markus & Kitayama, 2010).

Cognitive priming is a process of activating mental representations that provide a framework through which future information is perceived. Priming often occurs based on the context (Bargh & Chartrand, 2000). The priming of one concept causes other associated concepts in memory to be unconsciously activated as well (Oyserman & Lee, 2008). Priming changes the way we perceive information by bringing to mind certain contexts or ideas that then influence the way we perceive new information based on the ideas that have been activated (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). EWC primes expectations of ethical behavior, and transformational leadership is characterized by ethical behavior (Antonakis et al., 2003; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Thus, I expect the presence of an EWC will prime expectations in followers that will strengthen the relationships automatic, authentic, and pro-social IM behaviors have with TL perceptions.

Hypothesis 4: EWC moderates the effect of (a) automatic, (b) authentic, and (c) prosocial IM behavior on TL perceptions such that the positive effects are strengthened in the presence of EWC.

Implicit Nature of the Relationship

The preceding section suggests automatic, authentic, pro-social IM will cause followers to perceive a leader as transformational. To strengthen the argument that this occurs through their role as part of the transformational leader prototype, it is necessary to establish the implicit nature of the relationship between these behaviors and thoughts of transformational leadership. Prototypical characteristics and behaviors are connected more strongly within the schema, so they are activated more quickly than other concepts resulting in implicit beliefs about category membership and expectations for category-congruent behavior (Lord et al., 2001a). I proceed using leader categorization theory to provide a detailed description of this process.

Connectionist Networks within Leader Categorization Theory

Leader categorization theory (Lord et al., 1984) suggests that leadership perceptions occur through a matching process in which a perceiver's understanding of whether a target is a leader is determined by how well the target matches the prototype the individual holds for a leader. The prototype represents associated attributes that signify category membership and includes both traits and behaviors (Lord et al., 1984). The initial conceptualization of the theory suggested that prototypes represent symbolic-level processing with static constructions of various prototypes that exist in memory and could be recalled intact. However, over time the theory has shifted to a connectionist systems perspective suggesting that leadership categories are generated extemporaneously, meaning the category's prototype is not static but rather dynamically reconstructed in real time based on connectionist networks (Epitropaki et al., 2013; Lord, Brown, & Harvey, 2001).

"Connectionist networks are networks of neuron-like processing units that continuously integrate information from input sources and pass on the resulting activation (inhibition) to connected (output) units" (Lord et al., 2001a; pp. 314). They are used to create meaning. Meaning may be localized or distributed. When localized, meaning is held in individual units within the network such that activation of a particular unit results in a specific understanding; when distributed, meaning exists in the pattern of activation or inhibition that occurs together throughout the network (Smith, 1996). Complex knowledge such as leadership representations are distributed rather than localized (Lord & Shondrink, 2011; Lord et al., 2001a).

In a distributed network, meaning is constrained by the pattern of activation or inhibition that occurs. Inputs into a connectionist network are called constraints (Lord et al., 2001b). These inputs constrain meaning within the network. Constraints can be positive or negative. Positive constraints represent two concepts that tend to go together (i.e. leader and extraverted). Negative constraints represent two concepts that tend to conflict (i.e. leader and unintelligent). The amount of activation or inhibition between concepts depends on the weights of the paths between them. Weights are created and strengthened each time two concepts are activated or inhibited together. This means weights adjust as learning occurs, so adjustment often occurs slowly (Hogue & Lord, 2007; Smith & DeCoster, 2000). The weight of a path impacts the strength of the constraint's impact within the network. A heavily weighted constraint impacts meaning more intensely and quickly than those with lighter weights. Together, this suggests that meaning within a connectionist network emerges through the activation or inhibition of units within the network itself, free from the intentional direction of any central executive system (Hogue & Lord, 2007).

Prototypes within connectionist networks. Changes in constraints and slowly shifting weights lead to prototypes that can be both stable over time and flexible (Lord et al., 2001a; Shondrick et al., 2010). Prototypes are stable as the system creates a pattern based on repeat connections and strengthening weights (Kunda & Thagard, 1996; Lord et al., 2001b). Prototypes

are flexible as activation and inhibition within the network is impacted by input from the context (Kunda & Thagard, 1996). Connectionist networks are multi-layered, containing input from the context as well as previously held beliefs, values, norms, etc. (Lord et al., 2001a; Kunda & Thagard, 1996). They can be impacted by information processing that occurs in a top-down way, wherein existing memory structures guide expectations, and they can be impacted by information processing that occurs in a bottom-up fashion, wherein stimulus inputs create an emerging understanding (Hogue & Lord, 2007; Lord & Shondrick, 2011). With respect to prototypes, in top-down processing, an individual's pre-conceived understanding of a leader informs the prototype, and in bottom-up processing, contextual information guides prototype formation.

Top-down and bottom-up processing can work in concert. For example, a leader's inspirational behavior both activates the transformational leadership category and acts as input into prototype development. In activating the existing category, all beliefs held therein are activated. At the same time, the observed behavior becomes part of the activated category. As such, both inform the meaning a follower assigns to a target leader.

Transformational leader prototype. Transformational leaders are a unique type of leader who inspire followers to reach beyond their own self-interests and reach higher levels of performance than they would otherwise attain (Yukl, 1999). Transformational leader prototype generation follows the connectionist network perspective previously outlined in which various forms of input and the weights between and among them are used to generate an ideal representative of the transformational leader category.

Eventually, settling-in occurs in which a set of positive and negative constraints is optimized leading to a somewhat stable, transformational leader prototype containing various traits, behaviors, and emotional responses (Lord et al., 2001a; Awamleh & Gardner, 1999).

Extant research suggests a variety of characteristics and behaviors are linked with transformational leadership and may serve as positive constraints within the transformational leader prototype. These include the ability to articulate ideas and feelings, strong communication delivery of content, (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999), focusing on ethics, portraying confidence, exuding charisma, projecting a vision, approaching the future with optimism, appealing to logic, and supporting individual needs (Antonakis et al., 2003). To add to our understanding of how transformational leaders are perceived, I have suggested that target leaders who engage in IM that conveys automatic, authentic, and pro-social behaviors will be perceived by followers as transformational as such behaviors match the transformational leader prototype.

At the same time, a variety of characteristics are in conflict with transformational leadership and may serve as negative constraints within the transformational leader prototype. These include abusing power, maximizing personal interests, behaving unethically (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999), creating dependence, generating fear, instilling feelings of job insecurity (Barling, Christie, & Turner, 2008), stifling independent thought, and exploiting followers (Christie et al., 2011). To add to our understanding of how transformational leaders are perceived, I have suggested that target leaders who engage in IM that conveys controlled, inauthentic, and pro-self behaviors will not be perceived by followers as transformational as such behaviors do not match the transformational leader prototype.

Based on this, I argue that, a target leader using IM that conveys automatic processing, authentic communication, and pro-social goal orientation will be matched (categorized) as a transformational leader more quickly than a target leader using IM that conveys controlled processing, inauthentic communication, and pro-self goal orientation.

Hypothesis 5: Associations will be made more quickly between concepts related to:

a) automatic leader IM and transformational leadership than controlled leader
IM and transformational leadership,
b) authentic leader IM and transformational leadership than inauthentic leader
IM and transformational leadership,
c) pro-social leader IM and transformational leadership than pro-self leader IM
and transformational leadership.

Methods

My goals were to develop new tools and use those tools to assess the *instrumental* impact of leader IM on follower perceptions of TL as well as the moderating role of EWC on that relationship and to demonstrate the *implicit* nature of the relationship between leader IM and follower perceptions of transformational leadership. I designed separate studies to assess the instrumental and implicit goals and test the hypotheses presented in Figure 2. Study 1 was a between-subjects and within-subjects experimental conjoint analysis. Two groups of participants were presented with all combinations of leader IM profiles and responded to a measure of perceived transformational leadership after each profile. The tool for experimental testing of leader IM was constructed and validated through a series of pilot tests. Study 1 addressed hypotheses 1-4 by investigating the instrumental relationship between various IM behaviors and TL perceptions while also testing the moderating effects of EWC. Study 2 was an implicit association test (IAT) that empirically explored the cognitive connections between types of IM and conceptions of a transformational leader, thereby supporting leader categorization theory as an explanation for the relationship between leader IM and TL perceptions.

Study 1: Instrumental Impact of IM

Research Design

First, I constructed and pilot tested leader IM profiles based on the information processing, communicative, and goal orientation dimensions. The profiles involved withinsubject manipulations with three factors (information processing, communication, and goal orientation) with two aspects each (automatic or controlled; authentic or inauthentic; pro-self or pro-social) yielding a 2 x 2 x 2 = 8 combination design as presented in Table 1. Then, I performed a conjoint analysis wherein all of the profiles were given to two samples of participants, one with an EWC manipulation and one with a control. Participants in both groups rated perceptions of leaders as transformational.

Insert Table 1 about here

Conjoint Analysis. Conjoint analysis is also called policy capturing design or judgement analysis, and I used this to validate the dimensionality of the leader profiles and corroborate which aspects of the dimensions positively impact TL perceptions. Conjoint analysis is a regression-based method typically used to ascertain the implicit value individuals place on certain information and how that information combines to inform decisions. In conjoint analysis, individuals are presented with a series of vignettes or scenarios with a variety of cues manipulated within each scenario. Regression weights are then used to determine the relative impact of each of those cues on a particular outcome (Aiman-Smith, Scullen & Barr, 2002). Conjoint analysis frequently is used in marketing research to determine the optimal combination of product specifications to influence consumer purchases (Green, Krieger, & Wind, 2001) and has been used in organizational behavior and human resource management research to examine the influence and combination of factors individuals consider when making a job choice (Cable & Judge, 1994), rating applicants (Dunn, Mount, Barrick, & Ones, 1995), and determining performance evaluations (Brannick & Brannick, 1989). Despite this, conjoint analysis within management studies is fairly limited, and researchers have called for expanding its use (Priem, Walters, & Li, 2002).

Conjoint analysis provides a unique and sophisticated way of testing specific combinations of IM dimensions and their effects on follower perceptions. Priem et al. (2002) point out that this is a useful mechanism for understanding how perceptions inform our opinions or conclusions. As such, conjoint analysis is an appropriate method for examining how follower perceptions of various IM dimensions inform the conclusions they make about transformational leadership.

One of the benefits of conjoint analysis is that it does not rely on explicit self-report of the ways various cues impact their perceptions of the outcome. As such, it can reduce the impact of social desirability on responding (Judge & Bretz, 1992; Karren & Barringer, 2002). I created leader profiles to represent each of the eight IM archetypes. For these, social desirability could have impacted responses. For example, followers may have thought it was socially correct to state that authentic communication positively impacted their perceptions of a target leader as transformational when in reality, it was inauthentic communication that impacted those perceptions. In addition, asking individuals about their perceptions when analyzing scenarios with multiple attributes is akin to the way individuals actually form perceptions, making it a more realistic assessment of judgements than self-reported perceptions of each dimension (Karren & Barringer, 2002; Rynes & Lawler, 1983). Therefore, I used conjoint analysis to investigate two features of the relationship between leader IM and TL perceptions. First, I examined the individual effects of each aspect of the IM dimension (e.g., controlled and automatic information processing) on TL perceptions. Second, I examined the interactive effects of combination(s) of the various aspects of each dimension (in the form of the IM archetypes) on TL perceptions.

Conjoint analysis allows the investigation of individual and interactive effects when using a decomposed experimental manipulation (Hair et al., 2010). This design allows for examination of within-subject effects. The within-subject manipulations involved three factors (information processing, communication, and goal orientation) with two aspects each (automatic or controlled; authentic or inauthentic; pro-self or pro-social) yielding a $2 \ge 2 \ge 8$ combination design, which aligned with the 8 leader IM archetypes from Chapter 1 and presented in Table 2. I used an orthogonal, fully crossed cue design to assess the independent effect of each cue as is most common and recommended (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002; Karren & Barringer, 2002). Fully crossing the cues helped to ensure the cues were not correlated, meaning the variance in the dependent variable explained by each cue was attributed to that cue only, and the regression coefficient reflected this effect (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002). In some cases, researchers caution against fully crossing designs because of concerns with realism (e.g. crossing quality and cost may mean combining low quality with high cost when this often is not realistic). However, in my design, it was reasonable for each of the values of the dimensions to be fully crossed with one another. In addition to the eight unique IM archetype profiles, I added a duplicate profile to perform test-retest reliability, as recommended by researchers (e.g., Aiman-Smith, et al., 2002). The duplicate profile was consistent for all participants and is profile nine in

Table 2. Participants were shown all possible profiles. This is recommended when there are six or fewer factors (Hair et al., 2010), and my study had only three factors.

Insert Table 2 about here

Participants and Procedures

Multiple pilot studies were conducted to determine the best descriptors of IM behavior and the best format of the profiles for successfully manipulating the IM dimensions. Pilot studies usually are conducted with a small grouping of students (Aiman-Smith et al., 2002), with recent examples suggesting between 10-50 students (e.g., Sekiguchi & Huber, 2011).

Pilot 1: Synonyms for aspects of IM dimensions. The first pilot study was conducted to determine the best synonyms to use to represent each of the IM dimensions (e.g., automatic = effortless, unconscious, instinctive). Upper-level undergraduate students were recruited from a large Midwestern University to complete this study, and 83 students participated for extra course credit. Students were presented with a description of the dimension in addition to several examples discerning each aspect of the dimension. They were then asked to order a series of words representing the particular aspect of each dimension with the best word first and the worst word last. This was done for all aspects of the three dimensions including automatic, controlled, authentic, inauthentic, pro-self, and pro-social. Below is a small sample of this pilot test.

Automatic and controlled behavior

One way of thinking of leader behavior is whether it is automatic or controlled. Automatic behavior takes place when an individual does something without having to think about it. Controlled behavior occurs when the individual thinks about the behavior. For example,

1. Driving can be automatic when a person is driving to work or on another similar route that has been driven many times. Driving also can be controlled when a person is driving to a new place and must pay attention to directions.

2. Riding a bike can be automatic and require no attention for a skilled rider, but it can be controlled for a novice rider who must pay attention to coordinating pedal pushing with steering and balancing.

3. Interpersonal interactions can be automatic, such as when individuals automatically interrupt and talk over friends in conversation but control those interruptions when speaking with their boss.

In the next sections, you will be asked to rate words you think describe automatic and controlled behavior. Some words may be similar in each group, but it is not necessary that you choose similar pairs of words.

The results of this pilot test suggested the following words should be used as descriptors for each dimension and used in the leader profiles:

Automatic – effortless, instinctive, unconscious Controlled – conscious, effortful, intentional Authentic – genuine, honest, sincere Inauthentic – fake, false, insincere Pro-self – benefits self, self-focused, self-interested Pro-social – benefits others, selfless, unselfish

Pilot 2: Leader profile manipulations. The second pilot test was conducted to

determine whether the leader IM manipulations were working effectively for each dimension. Two formats were used to test the manipulations. Students were again recruited from the same large Midwestern University in exchange for extra credit, and 160 students participated. Two separate formats were tested. Participants randomly received each format electronically using Qualtrics. While the actual conjoint analysis would involve giving all nine profile combinations (eight combinations plus one for test-retest reliability) to each participant, in this pilot, I randomly assigned participants to receive just two of the profiles to combat carelessness and fatigue. One format involved providing a series of descriptions of how your manager interacts with you and other employees, followed by three questions asking: 1) "To what extent does this leader engage in automatic behaviors?" 2) "To what extent does this leader engage in authentic communication?" 3) "To what extent is this leader focused on goals that benefit others?" Each of these questions was followed by a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = to no extent to 5 = to a very high extent.

The second format involved providing a more detailed set of descriptions of how your manager interacts with you and other employees. This was followed by three sliding scales in which the participant rated the leader's behavior on each of the three dimensions. The scales were numbered with verbal anchors on each end. The verbal anchors for the first scale went from automatic to controlled, the second scale from authentic to inauthentic, and the third scale from pro-self to pro-social. Participants electronically recorded their responses using Qualtrics.

I conducted independent and paired sample t-tests for each format of the leader profiles to assess which resulted in the best manipulation of dimensions. Analyses suggested format B using the slide scales as responses was best. In format B, there were statistically significant differences for all between-subjects responses, meaning automatic and controlled, authentic and inauthentic, and pro-self and pro-social were all significantly distinguished based on the leader profile manipulations.

Further, there were statistically significant differences within-subjects when appropriate and no significant differences when appropriate. Because each participant was given two profiles, sometimes the manipulation in the first profile would be the same as the manipulation in the second profile. For example, perhaps the first profile had automatic processing and so did the second. In all cases in which the manipulations were the same in the first and second profiles, there were no statistically significant differences, meaning the manipulations were working consistently across profiles by the same person. In other cases, the manipulations between the first and second profile were different. For example, perhaps the first profile had automatic processing and the second profile had controlled processing. In all cases in which the manipulations were different in the first and second profiles, there were statistically significant differences, meaning the manipulations were recognized as appropriately different across profiles by the same person.

Due to concerns about careless responding among college students (Meade & Craig, 2012), I conducted my actual experiments using Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Therefore, I repeated the pilot testing again with 114 MTurkers to ensure the leader IM behavior manipulations and sliding scale responses worked effectively. Again, all between-subjects responses were statistically significant, meaning automatic and controlled, authentic and inauthentic, and pro-self and pro-social were all significantly distinguished based on the leader profile manipulations (all significant at p < .000).

Further, there were statistically significant differences within-subjects when different manipulations were given in each of the profiles with the exception of pro-social in profile 1 and pro-self in profile 2 (p < .245). Sample size is critical to achieving power to find in effect in such designs (Hair et al., 2010), therefore this finding likely is due to small sample size. There were no statistically significant differences within-subjects when the same manipulations were given in each of the profiles (i.e. automatic in profile 1 and controlled in profile 2). The results of pilot testing are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

Conjoint analysis. Participants were recruited via MTurk with two requirements, a HIT approval rate greater than 90% and located in the US. Participants were paid \$2.00 to complete the study. MTurk is used frequently in social science research (e.g. Skarlicki, 2014), and compares favorably to traditional forms of data collection (e.g. Buhrmester, Kwang, & Goslong, 2011; Sprouse, 2011). In total, 301 individuals participated in the study. However, 35 were outliers based on the time spent on the study, an additional 62 did not pass the manipulation check, and an additional 8 were removed due to test/retest reliability results. Therefore, the final sample consisted of 196 participants. The average age of the final sample was 36.87 (SD =10.63) years old, and 47.96% were women. All participants were from the United States, and 82.65% were Caucasian, 8.67% were African American, 3.57% were Asian, 3.06% were Hispanic, and 2.04% were mixed race. Comparatively, the United States' population in 2017 was 60.7% Caucasian, 13.4% African American, 5.8% Asian, 18.1% Hispanic, and 2.7% mixed race (US Census, 2017). In terms of education, 34.18% of participants had a bachelor's degree, 27.04% completed some college, 16.33% had a high school diploma, 10.71% had an associate's degree, 9.18% had a graduate degree, and 2.55% completed some graduate school. Comparatively, in the United States in 2016, 19.49% had a bachelor's degree, 19.10% completed some college, 28.95% had a high school diploma, 9.56% had an associate's degree, and 11.19% had a graduate degree (US Census, 2016). Participants had an average of 15.92 (SD = 11.36) years' work experience with 67.86% employed full-time, 14.80% employed part-time, 7.14% not employed and not looking for work, 5.61% not employed and looking for work, 3.57% retired, and 1% who did not say.

The conjoint experimental design was a completely crossed, orthogonal design to assess the independent effects of each dimension (e.g. Aiman et al., 2002). The three dimensions representing information processing, communication, and goal orientation are automaticity, authenticity, and pro-social goal orientation, respectively. Each dimension had two aspects with automaticity represented by automatic and controlled, authenticity represented by authentic and inauthentic, and goal orientation represented by pro-self and pro-social. This resulted in eight profiles ($2 \times 2 \times 2 = 8$) with one replicated profile to test judgement reliability, thus, yielding nine total profiles. Each participant was provided with all nine profiles, and the order of the profiles was randomized for each participant. Research suggests randomization mitigates biasing effects due to order of presentation (Alreck & Settle, 2004).

In addition, the experimental design included a between-subjects design to test the EWC moderator. Experimental design is predicated on ensuring participants are randomly assigned to experimental conditions. Random assignment is critical for reducing potential alternative explanations for the outcome. It also reduces threats to internal validity by spreading them across conditions and it equates groups on expectation such that differences between participants are based on luck that equal out over many experiments and not due to a systematic bias that may confound the results (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002). Thus, participants were randomly assigned to either the EWC manipulation or the control.

Independent Variables

The words used to describe both aspects of each dimension were identified through the pilot testing described previously.

Automaticity. Automatic IM was described as unconscious, effortless, and instinctive. Controlled IM was described as conscious, effortful, and intentional.

Authenticity. Authentic IM was described as honest, sincere, and genuine. Inauthentic IM was described as fake, false, and insincere.
Goal Orientation. Pro-self IM was described as benefitting self, self-interested, and self-

focused. Pro-social IM was described as benefitting others, selfless, and unselfish.

Below is a sample of one of the leader profiles. The full profiles are presented in the

Appendix. This sample profile represents a leader engaged in automatic, authentic, and pro-self

behavior (Authentic Representation). The order of the underlined words was adjusted depending

on the manipulation.

Imagine yourself interacting with your leader at work whose behavior toward you and other employees can be described in the following ways:

Engages in friendly interactions with you in a way that is <u>unconscious rather than a way that takes</u> <u>conscious effort</u>. Responds in a way that is <u>effortless rather than effortful</u>. Provides feedback to employees in a way that is <u>instinctive rather than intentional</u>. Communicates about what she believes in <u>honestly rather than in a way that is fake</u>. Gives her opinion on issues in a way that is <u>sincere rather than false</u>. Tells people about accomplishments that are <u>genuine rather than insincere</u>. Takes actions to <u>benefit herself rather than to benefits others</u>. Approaches team goals in a way that is <u>self-interested rather than selfless</u>. Interacts with others in a <u>self-focused manner rather than an unselfish manner</u>.

Ethical Work Climate. The EWC manipulation was administered by randomly

assigning participants to either a control group or EWC manipulation.

Control:

Statement from your leader: This is a reminder that you can purchase breakfast from the cafeteria until

10:00 a.m. The cafeteria will have a break in service until noon. Lunch service begins at noon, and you can

purchase lunch from noon until 2:00 p.m.

Manipulation:

Statement from your leader: This is a reminder to complete your annual Ethical Code of Conduct training,

which is important to our company fulfilling our values of truth, fairness, and respect for others along with

our mission of conducting business with the highest integrity.

Prior to seeing the leader profiles, participants were given a manipulation check to ensure

the intended manipulation was received. Respondents were asked to answer Yes or No to the

following questions: "Was your company's mission mentioned?" and "Was your company's breakfast time mentioned?" Respondents remained in the study only if responding appropriately to both questions given their assigned experimental condition. As previously mentioned, based on the manipulation check, 62 participants were removed from the study.

Dependent Variable

To construct the dependent variable, TL perceptions, I performed a content analysis of the transformational leadership literature to identify the most important facets of transformational leadership theory. The content analysis indicated the most important facets are: providing a visionary plan for the future, motivating others, and inspiring a high level of performance. I asked participants to rate how frequently they expected the leader in the description to behave in these ways. The participants rated the frequency on a Likert-type scale from 1 = not at all to 5 = frequently, if not always. This scale is consistent with the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (Avolio & Bass, 2004), which is a more lengthy instrument for assessing TL perceptions. I ran a factor analysis on these items and confirmed all items load on only one factor, and the reliability was 0.91, well above the recommended 0.7 threshold (Hair et al., 2010). The three items were averaged together to yield one measure of TL perceptions to be used in the conjoint analysis.

Analysis and Results

Preliminary Analysis. I examined test-retest reliability of the two identical profiles that were included in the conjoint analysis. An initial check resulted in reliability of .65. Because this is below the commonly accepted .7 threshold (Hair et al., 2010), I explored the absolute differences in average ratings between the individual cases to determine which cases might be reducing the reliability. This resulted in eight cases being identified for removal due to poor testretest reliability. This is a typical process followed in in conjoint and policy capturing studies (e.g. Shepherd, Patzelt, & Baron, 2013). The second analysis after these cases were removed yielded reliability of .78. The final sample included 196 participants.

Hypothesis Testing. I used the conjoint functionality in SPSS, paneling by participant number. Conjoint analysis uses very few statistical assumptions, and thus traditional tests for normality, homoscedasticity, and independence are unnecessary (Hair et al., 2010). Instead, the researcher must perform adequate conceptual research to ensure the experimental design is theory-driven. I developed both independent and dependent variables through careful attention to theory. I specified that the three dimensions were discrete, each with two aspects, and the rating provided to each profile was based on a score rather than sequence or rank. The resulting output yielded utility scores. Utility scores are similar to regression coefficients (SAS, 1993). However, the utilities cannot be analyzed across dimensions; instead, they are analyzed within dimension to explore the relative effects of one aspect of the dimension versus the other (Hair et al., 2010). I calculated confidence intervals using the following equation: 95% confidence interval = effect size $\pm 1.96 \times$ standard error of the effect size to assess hypotheses. Because I used rating data, it was appropriate to look at Pearson's R for a significant and high goodness of fit measure (closer to 100 reflects high goodness of fit) (Hair et al., 2010). The model had a value of r = .992 and thus was a strong fit.

I stated in hypothesis 1 that a leader's automatic IM behavior leads to greater TL perceptions than controlled. The utility estimates for automatic (*utility* = 0.05; p = 0.54) and controlled (*utility* = -0.05; p = 0.54) were in the expected directions, but were not significant, thus hypothesis 1 was not supported. I stated in hypothesis 2 that a leader's authentic IM behavior leads to greater TL perceptions than inauthentic. The utility estimates for authentic

(*utility* = 0.57; p < 0.00) and inauthentic (*utility* = -0.57; p < 0.00) were in the expected directions and significant. Thus, hypothesis 2 was supported. I stated in hypothesis 3 that a leader's prosocial IM behavior leads to greater TL perceptions than pro-self. The utility estimates for prosocial (*utility* = 0.58; p < 0.00) and pro-self (*utility* = -0.58; p < 0.00) were in the expected directions and significant, thus hypothesis 3 was supported.

In addition to calculating utilities, the conjoint analysis provides the capability to determine the importance values of each dimension for each of the IM archetypes. An importance value indicates the level of importance a particular dimension is playing in the outcome relative to the other dimensions. Importance values are indicated as percentages. Importance values for each of the IM dimensions were as follows goal orientation = 43 percent, authenticity = 41 percent, automaticity = 16 percent. This means the factors goal orientation and authentic communication played the largest role in TL perceptions.

I also calculated resulting utilities for each IM archetype by adding the corresponding utility scores for each archetype (i.e. Cooperative Representation = automatic + authentic + prosocial). It is common practice in conjoint analysis to add up the utilities across all factor aspects to determine an overall utility of the profile (e.g. Green et al., 2001; SAS, 1993). Thus, I feel comfortable including the automaticity dimension in these calculations, and although automatic was not significantly different from controlled in influencing TL perceptions, the overall dimension still contributed 16 percent to decision makers' TL perceptions.

The resulting utilities suggested Cooperative Representation (automatic, authentic, prosocial; utility = 1.20) and Diplomatic Representation (controlled, authentic, pro-social; utility = 1.11) were the most effective types of IM behavior to influence TL perceptions with Amiable Misrepresentation (automatic, inauthentic, pros-social; utility = 0.05) and Authentic Representation (automatic, authentic, pro-self; *utility* = 0.04) as slightly effective. On the other hand, Tactful Misrepresentation (controlled, inauthentic, pro-social; *utility* = -.04) and Opportunistic Representation (controlled, authentic, pro-self; *utility* = -0.05) were slightly ineffective in influencing TL perceptions while Inadvertent Misrepresentation (automatic, inauthentic, pro-self; *utility* = -1.11) and Fraudulent Misrepresentation (controlled, inauthentic, pro-self; *utility* = -1.20) were very ineffective. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 5 and Figure 3.

Insert Table 5 and Figure 3 about here

Hypothesis four stated that EWC moderates the effect of (a) automatic, (b) authentic, and pro-social IM behavior on TL perceptions such that the positive effects are strengthened in the presence of EWC. I assessed the moderating relationship of EWC by performing three separate ANCOVAs, one for each IM aspect across the control and manipulation conditions, controlling for a series of variables. The intent behind including covariates was to remove any variance that could result from systematic error outside of my control and to handle differences in participant responses that could result from their characteristics, both of which could bias the results. Potential covariates included gender, work experience, age, and ethnicity as research suggests these factors influence perceptions of leadership and could confound the results (Walter & Bruch, 2009). I also included dummy variables for automaticity, authenticity, and goal orientation when appropriate. For example, when analyzing hypothesis 4a regarding automaticity, I included dummy variables for authenticity and goal orientation to partial out variance attributed to these variables. I assessed whether the models met various assumptions necessary for ANCOVA. First, with regards to normality, each model failed the Shapiro-Wilks test, however other normality checks like examining for outliers were acceptable and experts indicate ANCOVA is robust to some departures from normality (Hair et al., 2010). I examined Levine's Test in each of the models to test for homogeneity of variances across treatment groups and each model was acceptable. In addition, I ensured independence through the research design as no participant was given more than EWC manipulation. I checked whether the covariates were linearly correlated with the DV which was difficult to establish given many of the covariates were nominal data. Finally, there were some issues with the homogeneity of regression effect as there was some interaction between the covariates and independent variables. This is addressed further in the limitations section and could have resulted in some of the variance that could have been explained by the moderator as being explained by one of the covariates, thus reducing the overall effect of the moderator (Hair et al., 2010).

Hypothesis 4a stated that EWC moderates the effect of automatic IM behavior on TL perceptions such that the positive effects are strengthened in the presence of EWC. For this, ANCOVA results showed that the effect of EWC (M = 3.069, SD = 1.167) compared to the control (M = 2.993, SD = 1.168) on follower TL perceptions was not significant, F(1) = 0.962, p = 0.327. Hypothesis 4a was not supported. Hypothesis 4b stated that EWC moderates the effect of authentic IM behavior on TL perceptions such that the positive effects are strengthened in the presence of EWC. For this, ANCOVA results showed that the effect of EWC (M = 3.643, SD = 1.024) compared to the control (M = 3.502, SD = 1.054) on follower TL perceptions was significant, F(1) = 4.688, p = 0.031. Hypothesis 4b was supported. Hypothesis 4c stated that EWC moderates the effect of pro-social IM behavior on TL perceptions such that the positive such that the positive stated that EWC moderates the effect of pro-social IM behavior on TL perceptions such that the positive such that the positi

effects are strengthened in the presence of EWC. For this, ANCOVA results showed that the effect of EWC (M = 3.582, SD = 1.054) compared to the control (M = 3.553, SD = 1.012) on TL perceptions was not significant, F(1) = 0.102, p = 0.750. Hypothesis 4c was not supported. Descriptive statistics and the results of the analysis are presented in Tables 6-10.

Insert Tables 6-10 about here

Study 2: Implicit Nature of the Relationship

Research Design

The purpose of Study 2 was to establish the implicit nature of the relationship of certain aspects of IM dimensions and transformational leadership. The research design involved an IAT. Stimuli for the IAT were identified by reviewing what makes up prototypical and antiprototypical transformational leadership (e.g. Den Hartog, House, Hanges, & Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1999; Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). The target words representing transformational and non-transformational leadership were established as "inspirational" and "authoritarian" based on this review. The attribute stimuli for each IM dimension remained the same as in the previous study.

Implicit association test (IAT). The IAT is a tool that is used to determine the relative strength of associated concepts. The IAT is used frequently in social psychology and has gained prominence in organizational behavior as well (e.g. Jost, et al., 2009). The IAT was conceptualized initially in Greenwald and Banaji (1995) and empirically tested in Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz (1998). In an IAT, there are two groups of words known as *target concepts* (targets), which sometimes are called categories, and *attributes*. Each target and

attribute is represented by two words, making a total of four possible response categories. Participants are presented with words on a computer screen, referred to as stimuli that represent one of the targets or attributes. Participants must classify the words into one of the categories using only two response keys. This involves pressing one of two designated keys on the computer keyboard.

The IAT measures strength of association between concepts so that it should be easier, and therefore faster, to categorize concepts that are strongly associated compared to those that are not strongly associated (Greenwald, et al., 1998). Participants engage in a series of matching exercises, and response times are recorded.

The matching process and the series of exercises are illustrated through a classic example involving the target words "insect" and "flower" and attribute words "bad" and "good". The IAT may present the words insect and good together on the left side of the screen and the words flower and bad on the right side of the screen. As a word appears on the screen that is associated with any one of these four words, the participant must classify the word into one of the categories using only two response keys. For example, the word daisy may appear on the screen and the participant would need to classify the word correctly on the right side of the screen as this represents a flower. Next, the word pleasant may appear on the screen and the user would need to correctly classify the word on the left side of the screen as this represents good.

In the next round, the attributes will switch so they are associated with the opposite targets. In this example, now insect and bad are together on the left side of the screen and flower and good are together on the right side of the screen. The same procedure follows wherein words appear on the screen that represent each one of these four words and the participant has to classify the words onto the correct side of the screen using only two response keys. The premise is that the word insect tends to be strongly associated with bad and the word flower strongly associated with good. Therefore, participants should be able to classify words faster when insect and bad share the same response key compared to when insect and good share the same response key (Nosek, Greenwald, & Banaji, 2005). Thus, participants should be able to classify stimuli faster when IM dimensions that fit the transformational leader prototype share the same response key as the word "inspirational" than when these same IM dimensions share a response key with the word "authoritarian".

Participants and Procedures

Participants. I recruited participants via MTurk. The participants in MTurk were required to have a HIT approval rate greater than 90% and to be located in the US. Participants were paid \$2.00 to engage in the study. In total, 300 individuals participated in the study. The average age of the sample was 37.36 (SD = 11.29) years old, and 47.00% were women. All participants were from the United States, and 77.67% were Caucasian, 10.00% were African American, 5.00% were Hispanic, 5.00% were Asian, and 1% were Mixed Race. According to statistics presented in Study 1, the composition of study participants differs slightly from the general U.S. population with a higher percentage of Caucasian participants and a lower percentage of Hispanic participants than reflected in the overall population. In terms of education, 44.33% had a bachelor's degree, 17.67% had completed some college, 12.33% had an associate's degree, 12% had a graduate degree, 12% had a high school diploma, and 1.67% completed some graduate school. The composition of study participants differs somewhat from the general U.S. population with a higher proportion of participants with bachelor's degrees and a lower proportion of participants with high school diplomas than the general population. Participants had an average of 16.12 (SD = 11.31) years work experience with 76.67% employed full-time, 11.67% employed part-time, 5% not employed and not looking for work, 4.67% not employed and looking for work, and 1.33% retired.

Procedures. I created the IAT using IATgen (iatgen.wordpress.com) and administered it via Qualtrics. Similar to the procedure previously outlined, participants used two keys on a keyboard to sort stimuli words that appeared on the screen into either the left or right side of the screen depending on the targets and attributes that appeared on each side of the screen. There were seven total blocks, meaning seven different sorting exercises for each IAT. In each block, participants used the "e" key to categorize a word on the left side of the screen and the "i" key to categorize a word on the right side of the screen. Participants were given a series of instructions at the beginning of each block guiding them to categorize the word that appeared on the screen as quickly as possible into either the left or right side of the screen depending on how well the word matched the target or attribute word presented on each side of the screen. IATgen measured in milliseconds (*ms*) the amount of time it took for a participant to categorize each word that appeared on the screen (Carpenter et al., 2018). Words appeared randomly on the screen from a pool of stimuli with replacement. The amount of time between stimuli was 250 *ms* as recommended by Greenwald et al., (1998).

Participants completed three successive IATs, one for each dimension. The order of the IATs was randomized. Further the order of left/right starting positions of targets and attributes was randomized with four potential options created and one assigned to each participant for each successive IAT (Nosek et al., 2005). A full IAT is recommended to have 7 blocks with 20 or 40 trials depending on the block (e.g. Lane, Banaji, Nosek, & Greenwald, 2007). I used 7 blocks with 20 trials per block as recommended by A.G. Greenwald (personal communication, June 21, 2018) because each participant would have to complete 3 successive IATs and there were some

concerns of fatigue. As an example, Block 1 of the IAT was a practice block (20 trials) of targets (e.g. inspirational; authoritarian). Block 2 was a practice block of attributes (e.g. authentic; inauthentic). Block 3 was a combined practice block (e.g. "compatible" block: inspirational + authentic; authoritarian + inauthentic) using targets and attribute (whether compatible or incompatible is shown first and whether the left or the right key assignment is made is based on the randomizer built into the survey). Block 4 was a trial block repeating Block 3. Block 5 was a reversed practice block of attributes to reduce left/right associations learned in prior blocks (e.g. inauthentic; authentic). Block 6 was a reversed practice block (e.g. "incompatible" block: inspirational + inauthentic; authoritarian + authentic). Block 7 was a trial block repeating Block 6 (Carpenter et al., 2018).

The practice blocks were necessary so that participant got used to which side of the screen the targets and attributes were presented. Compatible blocks represented the blocks in which the targets and attributes that were expected to be associated with one another were on the same side of the screen (e.g. inspirational + authentic; authoritarian + inauthentic), and thus, the word that was presented on the screen was expected to be more quickly cognitively categorized in either the left or right grouping than when incompatible blocks were presented on the screen. Incompatible blocks represented the blocks in which the targets and attributes that were not expected to be associated with one another were on the same side of the screen (e.g. inspirational + inauthentic; authoritarian + authentic), and thus, the word that was presented on the screen was expected to be more slowly cognitively categorized in either the left or right grouping than when incompatible blocks are presented on the screen was expected to be more quickly and attributes that were not expected to be more slowly cognitively categorized in either the left or right grouping than when compatible blocks were presented on the screen. The full set of targets, attributes, and stimuli are presented in Table 11 and a schematic example of each block is presented in Table 12.

Insert Tables 11-12 about here

Analysis and Results

I cleaned the data using the IATgen program following recommended guidelines by Greenwald et al., (2003) and Lane et al. (2007). Trials over 10,000 *ms* and IAT data from participants with >10% of responses < 300 *ms* were deleted. For each of the 3 IATs, data from Blocks 3, 4, 6, and 7 were used to create a single *D*-score. The block mean for practice blocks (blocks 3 + 6) and the block mean for trial blocks (blocks 4+7) were divided by inclusive standard deviations so that there were two *D*-scores created for each participant, and then these scores were averaged to create a single score. A positive D-score indicates the association occurred more quickly in the compatible than incompatible block, a negative *D*-score indicates the association occurred more quickly in the incompatible than compatible block (Carpenter et al., 2018).

Hypothesis testing - automaticity. Timeout rates were low at < 0.001% of trials. Fiftysix participants were dropped due to excessive speed. The error rate was 13.88%. The IAT was *D*-scored with positive scores indicating automatic IM associated with transformational leaders. The internal consistency of the IAT was assessed via a split-half procedure for the IAT (following De Houwer & De Bruycker, 2007), estimate = .842. Hypothesis 5a stated that associations will be made more quickly for automatic and transformational leadership than controlled and transformational leadership. There was a small effect in the survey-based automaticity IAT. Scores indicated automatic attributes were more strongly linked to transformational leadership than to authoritarian leadership. Results indicated $M_{D-Score} = 0.131$, SD = 0.537, d = 0.245, which significantly differed from zero, t(259) = 3.943, p < .0001, 95% $CI_{D-Score}$ [0.066, 0.197], therefore, hypothesis 5a was supported.

Hypothesis testing - authenticity. Timeout rates were low at < 0.001% of trials. Fiftyfour participants were dropped due to excessive speed. The error rate was 11.19%. The IAT was *D*-scored with positive scores indicating authentic IM associated with leaders. The internal consistency of the IAT was assessed via a split-half procedure for the IAT (following De Houwer & De Bruycker, 2007), estimate = .808. Hypothesis 5b stated that associations will be made more quickly for authentic and transformational leadership than inauthentic and transformational leadership. There was a strong effect in the survey-based authenticity IAT. Scores indicated authentic attributes were more strongly linked to transformational leadership than to authoritarian leadership. Results indicated $M_{D-Score} = 0.751$, SD = 0.438, d = 1.713, which significantly differed from zero, t(262) = 27.784, p < .00001, 95% $CI_{D-Score}$ [0.698, 0.804], therefore, hypothesis 5b was supported.

Hypothesis testing - goal orientation. Timeout rates were low at < 0.001% of trials. Fifty-one participants were dropped due to excessive speed. The error rate was 10.63%. The IAT was *D*-scored with positive scores indicating pro-social IM associated with leader. The internal consistency of the IAT was assessed via a split-half procedure for the IAT (following De Houwer & De Bruycker, 2007), estimate = 0.647. Finally, there was a small effect in the survey-based goal orientation IAT. Scores indicated pro-social attributes were more strongly linked to transformational leadership than to authoritarian leadership. Results indicated *M*_{*D*-*Score*} = 0.266, *SD* = 0.445, *d* = 0.597, which significantly differed from zero, *t*(265) = 9.738, *p* < .00001, 95% *CI*_{*D*-*Score*} [0.212, -0.319], therefore, hypothesis 5c was supported. The results of the IATs are presented in Table 13. Insert Table 13 about here

Discussion

The goals of this empirical research were to demonstrate the *instrumental* and *implicit* nature of a relationship posed in Chapter 1, the relationship between leader IM and follower perceptions, specifically TL perceptions. I addressed these goals through two studies. In the first study, I examined the causal relationship through a conjoint analysis, developed new tools to assess leader IM and explored the moderating role of EWC. In the second study, I examined the implicit nature of the relationship through an IAT. In both studies, I integrated conceptual and methodological principles of transformational leadership theory (Yukl, 1999) and leader categorization theory (Lord et al., 1984). In this section, I discuss the results of each of these studies, pointing out both the theoretical and practical implications of each and future research streams. Then, I provide an overall picture of how this research, both the conceptual and empirical research within this dissertation, is situated in the context of the existing literature. Finally, I conclude with limitations.

Study 1: Instrumental Implications

Theoretical. This research is the first to simultaneously test the effects of the three dimensions of leader IM (information processing, communication, and goal orientation) on TL perceptions. Previous research suggests that IM can be automatic or controlled, authentic or inauthentic, and pro-self or pro-social (e.g. Bolino et al., 2016), yet the typology provided in Chapter 1 is the first to conceptualize the three dimensions together. Thus, this research is the seminal exploration of how information processing, communication, and goal orientation each contribute to TL perceptions and moreover, how the combination of aspects of these dimensions help or hinder TL perceptions.

Automaticity. My research suggests that in terms of information processing, although the utility appeared in the expected direction, because the effect was not significant, no clear conclusion can be drawn. There are a few reasons why the effect might not be significant. Theoretically, I suggested that individuals with high levels of trait charisma may automatically engage in charismatic behavior and those who are visionary rely on cognitive schema containing scripts of visionary behavioral responses that are accessed automatically as a behavioral response. I also noted that transformational leaders' resting brain activity provides evidence that there is more ability for emotional control (Jones et al., 2000) and rational, complex thinking (Balthazard et al., 2012). Although these brain processes allow for automatic processing, perhaps they appear as controlled when perceived by others. Followers may view transformational leaders as controlling emotions and consciously thinking through complex issues, thus making controlled information processing as what leads to TL perceptions.

Alternatively, if, in fact, transformational leaders engage in charismatic and visionary behaviors automatically as I hypothesized and the results directionally (though not significantly) suggest, then another alternative explanation is that my manipulation was not strong enough to elicit this in the experiment. There could also have been a lack of realism in how information processing was displayed since words on a screen were presented to represent this construct. Experimental realism is critical for generalizing results (Winkler & Murphy, 1973). Future research should examine alternative ways to display automatic versus controlled behaviors that are more realistic. For example, researchers could videotape actors as leaders engaging in automatic and controlled behaviors and conduct a within-subjects experiment to determine follower perceptions. Another potential research method would be to use an EEG on the leader while recording leader behavior (e.g. Balthazard et al., 2012). After, the researcher could identify specifically when the leader was using automatic processing versus controlled processing and use these manipulations in a within-person video study. Alternatively, a potential follower could be shown the video in real time and record immediately their reactions to the target leader at different points in the video. Follower reactions could be compared with the timing of the leader's automatic versus controlled processing behaviors used via the EEG. Literature indicates theoretically that IM can be automatic (e.g. Gray & Densten, 2007), yet literature contains no empirical examinations to confirm the theoretical connection. My study shows that when considered together with authentic communication and goal orientation, information processing explains 16 percent of the overall variance in TL perceptions. Although this amount is smaller than the other dimensions, it still represents a portion of the overall preference, so unpacking the impact of controlled versus automatic processing is a fruitful area for future research.

Authenticity. In terms of communication, my research confirms my hypothesis that authentic communication leads to greater TL perceptions than inauthentic. While this may seem intuitive, Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) note that, "critics attribute manipulative, deceptive and other such devious behaviors to so-called transformational leaders" (p. 186). Similarly, other researchers (e.g. Howell & Avolio, 1992) have noted that charismatic leaders can be unethical and manipulative, which seems far from the notion of authenticity. Historically, researchers also have discounted the authentic component of IM, considering IM as being at odds with authenticity (Avolio, 2005) or specifically defining it as an exaggeration tactic (e.g. Densten & Sarros, 2012). However, the authenticity of communication is a fundamental dimension of leader IM (Peck & Hogue, 2018), and my present research makes clear that authentic communication is tantamount to TL perceptions. The impact of authentic communication on TL perceptions is significantly greater than the impact of inauthentic, and when considered with information processing and goal orientation, authentic communication contributes 41 percent to follower TL perceptions. This research joins the limited previous empirical research (e.g. Christie et al., 2011) suggesting perceptions of honest and trustworthy communication are important for TL perceptions.

Future research should be done to replicate these findings, and within-subjects video studies could be a useful method. Another area of future research could examine specific ways of conveying authentic and inauthentic communication in IM, both verbally and nonverbally, and whether certain types of authentic communication are more or less effective in evoking TL perceptions. For example, we have examples from other research of using a Duchenne smile versus a non-Duchenne smile to represent authentic versus inauthentic IM (e.g. Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005), so this same technique could be used by target leaders to examine the effect on perceptions of TL. It also would be interesting to have an actor use a variety of inauthentic IM techniques (e.g. non-Duchenne smile, high pitched voice, quick response, silent hesitations) (Davidson et al., 1990; DePaulo et al., 2003) to see which techniques have the most negative effect on perceptions of TL or, further, if inauthentic and authentic techniques are used together in the same interaction, what overall perception the follower has regarding the target leader.

Goal Orientation. In terms of goal orientation, my study confirms the hypothesis that prosocial goal orientation leads to greater TL perceptions than pro-self. In fact, my study shows that when considered together with information processing and authentic communication, goal orientation explains 43 percent of the overall variance in TL perceptions. This result fits with the current literature as researchers have generally reached a consensus that transformational leaders benefit the collective group rather than their own self-interests (e.g. Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). This same consensus does not appear to exist with respect to the impact of authentic communication and information processing on TL perceptions. Furthermore, prototypical leader characteristics often include caring, humanitarianism, and unselfishness (Lord et al., 1984), while anti-prototypical leader characteristics include domineering, selfish, and conceited (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). Despite this conceptual understanding, to my knowledge, only two previous studies have examined empirically pro-social versus pro-self behaviors and TL perceptions (e.g. Christie et al., 2011; Sosik et al., 2002). My study is the first to examine the instrumental impact of pro-social behavior on TL perceptions.

There are many avenues for future research in the area of pro-social IM and leadership. One is team-based work. Research that focuses on how pro-social IM is perceived when the work is team-based rather than individual-based could shed further light on how motives are perceived in team rather than dyadic contexts. Another avenue involves organizational policies. From a human resource management perspective, it would be interesting to explore how organization-level policies such as compensation moderate the effects of leader pro-social versus pro-self IM on TL perceptions. For example, how do compensation policies that promote individual goal achievement versus those that promote team goal achievement interact with proself versus pro-social leader IM to influence follower perceptions? Another interesting line of research could examine if there is a tipping point at which the benefits of pro-social IM eventually decrease, indicating a curvilinear relationship between pro-social IM and TL perceptions. In other words, is pro-social IM eventually perceived as the normative process such that it does not provide any marginal benefit to TL perceptions or, over time, does it seem suspicious or perhaps even pro-self? In a similar vein, there is some research that suggests the distinction between helpers and recipients may actually reinforce status perceptions leading to a sense of dependency and helplessness over time (Nadler, 2002). This is antithetical to transformational leadership, which is supposed to motivate and inspire, offering another potential negative effect of such prolonged behavior and a fruitful area for research.

IM Archetypes. Study 1 supports the IM archetypes established in Chapter 1 and many of the predictions regarding which IM archetypes are most important in TL perceptions. In Chapter 1, I suggested that Cooperative Representation characterized by automatic, authentic, and prosocial behavior would be most helpful for evoking TL perceptions, while Fraudulent Representation characterized by controlled, inauthentic, and pro-self-behavior would be most harmful. The results of Study 1 confirmed this suggestion as Cooperative Representation (automatic, authentic, pro-social) had an overall utility of 1.20 and Fraudulent Misrepresentation (controlled, inauthentic, pro-self) had an overall utility of -1.20. Also interesting is that Diplomatic Representation (controlled, authentic, pro-social) is very useful at 1.11, and after that point in utility values there is a large drop-off. The drop corresponds to the introduction of inauthentic and/or pro-self-behaviors. This underscores again the importance of authentic and pro-social behaviors for transformational leadership. My research examines the impact of the IM archetypes on perceptions of the overall construct of transformational leadership, but future research could explore how the IM archetypes impact the individual facets of transformational leadership (i.e. individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence).

EWC and future moderators. The final result from study 1 was that there was no significant moderating effect of an EWC on the relationship between automatic IM behavior and

TL perceptions or between pro-social IM behavior and TL perceptions. However, there was a significant effect on the relationship between authentic IM behavior and TL perceptions such that the positive effects are strengthened in the presence of EWC. An EWC involves high levels of moral sensitivity, collective moral judgement, collective moral motivation, and collective moral character. When the work climate is ethical, the positive effects of authentic IM on TL perceptions are even more pronounced. Social perception literature suggests aspects of the climate can provide a symbolic prime that implicitly activates related concepts in memory, thereby priming expectations of context-appropriate behavior (Markus & Kitayama, 2010). EWC primes expectations of ethical leader behavior. Transformational leadership involves characteristics and behaviors congruent with ethical behavior, so an EWC strengthens the existing relationship between each IM dimension and TL perceptions.

Results suggest the moderating relationship is especially strong for authentic communication. This may be due to the conceptual link between authenticity and ethics as both contain a component of truthfulness. The inability to find a moderating relationship for the information processing and goal orientation dimensions could be due to my EWC manipulation. Participants may not have made the connection between EWC as I described it and information processing or goal orientation. Further, the manipulation was presented at the beginning of nine leader profiles, so it may be the prime not only was too weak to connect to those dimensions, but also too weak to be carried through all profiles. Future studies should reexamine this and other moderators using a stronger manipulation, for example, by including it at the beginning of each profile, so respondents are repeatedly primed. It would also be interesting to replicate the study by providing multiple EWC manipulations including an unethical work climate.

In addition to these suggestions, there are many other possible moderators beyond an EWC that may be explored in future research. These moderators could include facets of the target leader and/or follower such as gender, position, and length of tenure. For example, does the gender of a leader engaging in pro-self versus pro-social IM impact TL perceptions, and does the follower's gender further moderate this relationship? Prior research indicates that people react more positively when IM is congruent with gender roles (Smith et al., 2013), so how would this affect TL perceptions? Another interesting moderator would be examining the length of time the target leader and follower have worked together. In other words, how does repeat experience with the same or different IM impact your TL perceptions in a given instance? Also, researchers could examine how the effectiveness of IM techniques differ based on distance between the leader and follower. For example, how does an entry-level employee perceive a CEO who uses different types of IM techniques on an earnings call versus an entry-level employee whose direct manager uses IM techniques during a daily meeting? Cross-level effects should also be studied (Bolino et al., 2008). For instance, organizational policies may impact the relationship between types of IM and TL perceptions, as I referenced earlier regarding compensation practices. The culture or location of the interaction also may make a difference in how IM is perceived by followers, and there is significant opportunity to expand on the limited cross cultural IM research (Bolino et al., 2016).

Practical. The results of this study provide many practical insights for leadership development in organizations. Academics (e.g. Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009) and the popular press (e.g. Wladawsky-Berger at the Wall Street Journal, 2016) alike hail transformational leadership as critical to achieving important work outcomes. To achieve these outcomes, followers must perceive a target leader as a legitimate transformational leader, and IM is a means of achieving this perception. Therefore, training individuals in IM that positively affects TL perceptions is important. The present research suggests that authentic communication and pro-social orientation are critically important to establishing TL perceptions (41 and 43 percent, respectively).

Leadership training programs should focus on educating potential leaders on avoiding inauthentic communication that can be seen through false smiles, short responses, slow responses, silent hesitations, and lack of compelling stories without vivid imagery or sensory details (DePaulo et al., 2003). Alternatively, communicating in a way that is true to self should be compelling, provide sensory details, and structured in a logical way (DePaulo et al., 2003). Training also should focus on the importance of pro-social IM. This means reducing pro-self behaviors such as justifications and disclaimers (Mulvey, Bowes-Sperry, & Klein, 1998) and enhancing pro-social behaviors such as team-based helping behavior (George & Bettenhausen, 1990), interpersonal helping behavior, volunteering, and cooperation (Penner et al., 2005). Further, as individuals regularly engage in authentic and pro-social behaviors, such behaviors will become learned, and automatic behavior will further strengthen the TL perception.

The present research also underscores the importance of organizational culture on follower perceptions in an organization. We know that an EWC exacerbated the relationship between authentic IM and TL perceptions. Companies should strive to have an EWC and can create policies and procedures to emphasize such a culture. For example, a company should have a core set of ethical values that permeate the organization, establish an ethics program, and emphasize proper tone at the top. Ethics programs include an ethical code of conduct, training, a whistleblower hotline, and an executive responsible for the oversight of company-wide ethics (Schwartz, 2013). Culture provides a lens through which most other interpersonal dynamics are viewed in an organization so to maintain positive leadership outcomes, positive cultural norms like an EWC are important.

Study 2: Implicit Implications

Theoretical. Study 2 provides a cognitive explanation for why IM is effective as an influence technique. A recent review of IM literature stated, "...A complex process is likely to dictate the ways in which IM behaviors are viewed by others. Few of the IM studies we reviewed, however, seemed to recognize this fact or offer a theoretical reason for how and why the process of IM works" (Bolino et al., 2008, p. 1099). The incorporation of concepts from leader categorization theory and transformational leadership allows for a theoretical explanation of how IM influences TL perceptions and the use of the IAT provides a novel method of testing this hypothesis.

How influence occurs. Leader categorization theory explains that individuals develop cognitive schema over time, which are used to interpret various items, experiences, and people. Leader prototypes are created from important information in schema (Lord & Maher, 1991). When encountering a potential target leader, we compare him/her against our prototype, which is dynamically reconstructed (Lord et al., 2001b). If there is a match, the target is categorized as a leader (Lord & Maher, 1991). The process is the same whether an individual is considering general thoughts of a leader, or a more specific type of a leader, such as a transformational leader. Therefore, individuals have a transformational leader prototype based on experience over time. IM that exhibits behaviors matching the prototype will be recognized as transformational more quickly then IM that does not match the prototype. I hypothesized and empirically found IM that is automatic, authentic, and pro-social is more closely associated with transformational

87

leaders than authoritarian leaders. Alternatively, IM that is controlled, inauthentic, or pro-self is more closely associated with authoritarian leaders than transformational leaders.

Method of study. IATs were used to determine the implicit associations between IM and leadership, which is a novel use of this technique. Scholars focused on implicit leadership theories have advocated for a broader use of such indirect measurement techniques to gain a greater understanding of how implicit processing impacts leader and follower interactions (Epitropaki et al., 2013). In addition, the technique has low vulnerability to faking or response distortion (Uhlmann et al., 2012). The present research provides a blueprint and examples for how to expand the use of IAT techniques in leadership research. Future research could use a similar approach to identify how IM is associated with a variety of follower perceptions including perceptions of a leader as pseudo-transformational or as a servant leader. A similar technique could be used to examine how IM is associated with followers compared to leaders and furthermore, IM perceptions as ethical or unethical. It also would be interesting to examine how repeat exposure to a leader impacts the association between the IM and follower perceptions. For instance, now that we have a baseline idea of the connection between IM and TL perceptions, it would be interesting to know how quickly (if at all) the association between certain IM dimensions or archetypes and TL perceptions change over time.

Practical. The practical implications for this study are similar to those identified in study 1. Leadership development programs should train individuals in how to engage automatically, authentically, and pro-socially as this will result in individuals in being perceived as transformational more quickly than those who engage in other IM. It may also be important to help individuals develop an awareness of how processes work outside of explicit awareness. Having a better understanding of how potential followers will perceive the target leader is important in convincing the target leader that behavioral changes may be necessary to reach their desired outcomes.

Overall Implications

Overview of goals. The overarching goals of my dissertation were to 1) examine the underlying nature of IM as consisting of information processing, communication, and leader goals resulting in eight IM archetypes and to present a model illustrating how IM influences follower perceptions and leadership outcomes; 2) develop an instrument to be used in experimental studies to test the IM model; and 3) use the newly developed instrument to assess the veracity of the model within transformational leadership theory, highlight followers' cognitive categorization processes that occur and test how the addition of a moderator, EWC, impacts causal predictions from the model.

I addressed the first goal in Chapter 1. In Chapter 1, I theoretically established a model of IM in leadership that establishes eight archetypes of leader IM developed from 3 foundational dimensions and highlights the relationship between these forms of IM and follower perceptions of the leader. The model includes biological, psychological, and social antecedents of leader IM as well as task and relational outcomes of follower perceptions. At the heart of the model is the illustration that the impact of leader IM flows directly to follower perceptions.

I completed goals 2 and 3 in Chapter 2 through my empirical work. I developed an instrument in the form of eight leader profiles that was used in an experimental conjoint analysis. These leader profiles that represent the eight IM archetypes can be used for future research as a method of testing the relationship between various antecedents and the IM dimensions or the IM dimensions and various follower perceptions or consequences of IM. Further, I tested the veracity of the model by showing the instrumental impact of authentic and pro-social IM on TL

perceptions. Finally, I successfully found EWC to exacerbate the positive effects of authentic IM on TL perceptions.

Results situated within the model. The results of my study are situated within the broader research field and can be connected to the antecedents of leader IM and outcomes of follower perceptions addressed in the model.

Antecedents. I indicated in Chapter 1 that the antecedents to leader IM include biological, psychological, and social factors. Each of these factors may influence the types of IM that are used across the three dimensions. I provide some examples of biological, psychological, and social antecedents that could be avenues for research in examining how each factor influences which aspect of the IM dimensions a leader may use.

There are many biological factors that influence how a leader processes information and whether automatic or controlled IM behavior is used. One such factor is the physiological impact on the amygdala when threats or anxiety are experienced. Threat detection when a stimulus is encountered happens automatically as the threat is registered and physiological responses take hold to fulfill the evolutionary premise of survival. During the primal mode, autonomic arousal occurs preparing the body for fight or flight. Therefore, during these times of anxiety or threat, it is likely that biological processes occurring will also result in automatic behaviors by leaders based on conditioned threat responses. Thus, leaders would be more likely to engage in automatic IM behaviors (Beck & Clark, 1997). The amygdala is activated automatically in cases of fear, although the response provided can be modulated through attentional control processes (Bishop, 2008). Therefore, as people begin to think about their anxiety, they engage in controlled processing (Beck & Clark, 1997) which would be more likely to lead to controlled IM behaviors. There is also genetic research that indicates that a variant in the gene that influences dopamine

metabolism in the prefrontal cortex is related to substantial variance in the executive function responsible for controlled processing of task stimuli when there are negative distractors in place (Bishop, Cohen, Fossella, Casey & Farah, 2006). Therefore, genetic differences could also influence a leader's usage of controlled or automatic IM.

Psychological factors also play a role in determining which aspects of the leader IM dimensions are used. For example, positive affect has been shown to improve social behaviors including generosity, helping behaviors, and overall behaviors that assist others. Similarly, positive affect enables greater flexibility that causes people to engage in pro-social interactions (Isen, 2002) meaning this emotional state is likely to cause leaders to use pro-social IM. Alternatively, individuals high in the trait of self-monitoring are effective at using pro-self IM to yield positive outcomes (Turnley & Bolino, 2001). Additionally, prior research suggests that individuals high in Machiavellianism are more likely to engage in deceptive IM (Bolino & Turnley, 2003) focused on the individual's self-interests (Ickes, Reidhead, & Patterson, 1986). Such factors are likely to cause leaders to use pro-self and inauthentic IM.

Finally, there are many social factors that influence the type of IM used. Some examples include social factors in the workplace such as perceived organizational support and task familiarity may impact the type of leader IM. For example, perhaps leaders familiar with the task can process their own behavior automatically by having enough cognitive bandwidth to do so, but a leader unfamiliar with the task needs to slow down with IM because the task is taking too much attention. After all, automatic behaviors are not effortful and are performed in parallel (Schneider & Chein, 2003) so a familiar task would be low effort relative to an unfamiliar task and allow for parallel automatic IM behaviors. With regard to perceived organizational support, research suggests that leaders who perceive a high level of organizational support will sense a

norm of reciprocity and be more willing to pass such support along acting in the best interest of their followers (Erdogan & Enders, 2007) meaning pro-social IM would be likely. On the other hand, those without perceived organizational support may believe they need to do whatever is necessary to get ahead and act in pro-self manner.

Outcomes. As I noted in Chapter 1, this research places follower perceptions at the center of the IM influence process, an oft missed step when looking at the relationship between IM and outcomes. I highlight the importance of follower perceptions by directly testing the relationship between leader IM and follower perceptions of TL leadership. Ultimately, follower perceptions determine the outcomes of the leader relationship. In Chapter 1, I suggested that Cooperative Representation (automatic, authentic, pro-social) would be especially helpful and Fraudulent Misrepresentation (controlled, inauthentic, pro-self) may be harmful in achieving positive leadership outcomes specified by transformational leadership. In fact, my empirical research in Chapter 2 confirms this proposition that Cooperative Representation (automatic, authentic, prosocial) influences TL perceptions by way of a match to the transformational leader prototype and, therefore, significant positive multi-level outcomes are attainable.

Extant literature highlights the positive multi-level outcomes possible when a leader is perceived as transformational. Leadership effectiveness is often viewed in terms of task or relational outcomes (Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey, 2011). Task performance refers to completing work that is part of the job description at the individual-level (Harrison, Newman & Roth, 2006) and represents meeting the broader mission or goals at the team or organizationallevel. Meta-analytic evidence suggests that leaders perceived as transformational yield significant individual-level task performance and creative performance (Wang et al., 2011). Additional meta-analytic evidence shows that leaders perceived as transformational also yield significant team-level (DeGroot, Kiker, & Cross, 2000; Wang et al., 2011) and organizationallevel (Judge & Piccolo, 2004) performance outcomes. Perhaps not surprisingly, one metaanalysis showed that transformational leadership had a stronger relationship with team performance compared to individual performance (Wang et al., 2011). This could be the result of the focus on the collective that is tantamount to transformational leadership.

Relational performance is sometimes referred to as contextual or extra-role outcomes and is interpersonally oriented and attitudinal in nature (Harrison et al., 2006). Extant research provides meta-analytic evidence that transformational leadership is positively related to individual contextual performance (Wang et al., 2011). More specifically, other meta-analyses suggest transformational leadership positively relates to follower organizational commitment, follower effort (DeGroot et al., 2000), follower job satisfaction, overall satisfaction with the leader, and follower motivation (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). An interesting finding in the metaanalysis by Wang et al., (2011) is that TL perceptions impact contextual/relational outcomes more strongly than task outcomes, and this trend of smaller effect sizes for task outcomes rather than relational outcomes carries through across many other meta-analyses as well (e.g DeGroot et al., 2000; Dumdum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). The task and relational outcomes highlighted herein are only possible if a leader is perceived as transformational.

Summary. The Leader Impression Management Model suggests that biopsychosocial antecedents impact leadership outcomes through a double mediation process. First, the array of biological, psychological, and social antecedents impact the type of each leader IM dimension that is used and the overall archetype in any given instant. From there, leader IM must influence follower perceptions of the leader in order for important outcomes to be realized. In this study, I have examined how leader IM dimensions and the resulting archetypes impact TL perceptions

and the cognitive categorization process that informs how this influence process occurs. Once TL perceptions manifest, then outcomes important to either the task or relational atmosphere of the organization can be realized.

Limitations

Information processing dimension. Although several pilot tests were used to verify that effortless, unconscious, and instinctive represented automatic behavior and conscious, effortful, and intentional represented controlled behavior, simply displaying words on a screen to represent information processing may not be the best way to convey this behavior. Experimental realism is important in any study (Winkler & Murphy, 1973), and perhaps displaying the words on the screen did not provide a realistic enough manipulation of information process to evoke a significant result. As previously mentioned, future research should examine alternative ways to manipulate information processing. Alternative methods could include video recording leaders (e.g. Larson, 1982) or using an EEG (e.g. Balthazard et al., 2012).

Moderator manipulation. Despite the rigorous nature of this study, there are several limitations that are important to address. First, it is likely that the moderating effect of EWC was not strong enough to cause an impact in all cases, and that may be due to the fact that it was presented at the beginning of nine leader profiles. Second, there was a violation of the homogeneity of regression effect assumption necessary for ANCOVA and as such there was some interaction between the covariates and independent variables. Because the covariate is correlated with the independent variable, it is possible that some of the variance that could have been explained by the moderator is being explained by one of the covariates, thus reducing the overall effect of the moderator (Hair et al., 2010). Based on these factors, it is possible the moderating effect was not as strong as it could have been and should be retested in the future.

Conjoint analysis-specific limitations. The conjoint analysis may have presented additional limitations in this study. Although the conjoint analysis provides an experimental mechanism to identify how an individual makes a judgement (Karren & Barringer, 2002), there are a couple limitations that suggest there could be alternative explanations for my results. First, conjoint analysis does not allow for the use of control variables so it is possible that other factors could explain or influence my results that were not considered. For example, gender, work experience, age, and ethnicity have been suggested as factors that influence perceptions of leadership and could confound the results (Walter & Bruch, 2009). Future studies should be done that replicate these results using other methods that allow for control of these variables or these variables could be explored as moderators in a future conjoint analysis to determine the effects. Another caution of conjoint analysis is that individuals are forced to form perceptions based on a limited amount of information when in reality the information available is much greater. A way to get around this issue to ensure proper theoretical work is done in advance to ensure that information most salient to the perception is identified, which I feel confident was the case. After all, decision makers rely on a small set of criteria to make judgements based on cognitive limitations, so as long as the most important information is included, then the realism and external validity are enhanced (Karren & Barringer, 2002).

IAT-specific limitations. IATs have been criticized in the past, however, the prominent criticism is that the associations identified in an IAT have low behavioral predictions. For example, a common use of the IAT is to measure unconscious bias, however, there may not be as strong of a prediction between unconscious bias and discriminatory behavior as was previously thought, or the predictive ability may be unreliable (e.g. Oswald, Mitchell, Blanton, Jaccard, & Tetock, 2013; Greenwald, Poehlman, & Banaji, 2009). While there is some conflicting research

on the predictive validity of unconscious bias and behavior, I did not use the IAT to make behavioral predictions. I used it to examine the speed at which cognitive associations occur, making it appropriate for my purpose. However, future researchers should heed caution if intending to use IAT to predict IM behavior or reactions to IM behavior.

MTurk. In addition, MTurk was used as the sample and although it has been shown to have strong comparative properties to standard sample populations (e.g. Buhrmester et al., 2011; Sprouse, 2011), it is still a relatively new tool. The studies should be replicated across other samples to ensure external validity.

Common method bias. An important consideration for all survey-type research is examining common method bias. Common method bias is, "variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than the constructs the measure represent" (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). This source of measurement error is problematic because it contains a random and systematic component and the systematic component suggests there is an additional explanation for the results. Common method bias is caused by many factors including common rater effects, item characteristic effects, item context effects, and measurement context effects. Common method bias is of particular concern when a measure of the independent and dependent variable are obtained by the same person at the same time (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

A benefit of the conjoint analysis is that the independent variable and dependent variables were not measured by the same person at the same point in time. The independent variable was manipulated by the researcher based on pilot studies from a set of participants different from the final survey participants that helped identify the best way to present and measure the variable. Then, participants were presented with the manipulation and asked to provide a rating of the dependent variable. Another bias that is common in IM research is item social desirability, however, conjoint analysis does not rely on explicit self-report of the ways various aspects of the dimensions impact perceptions. As such, it can reduce the impact of social desirability on responding (Judge & Bretz, 1992; Karren & Barringer, 2002). Podsakoff et al., (2003) recommend that when the independent and dependent variable are measured via different sources, then the researcher should limit any additional sources of method bias that may exist in the survey design which I minimized as much as possible in my study. For example, it is also possible that the context of the items played a role in the study such that the order of the IM made certain dimensions more salient or the type of dimension placed first had a mood altering effect on the rest of the study, however, the IM dimensions were ordered randomly for each participant to remove these effects. In addition, to prevent intermixing of constructs, each dimension remained grouped together to prevent risking a decrease in intraconstruct correlation and an increase in interconstruct correlation (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Overall, I took as many precautions as possible to reduce the effects of common method bias in the conjoint analysis, however, it is still possible some level of bias exists.

The IAT also operates outside of the standard survey research that has issues with common method bias due to independent and dependent variables measured by the same rater, however, there are other sources of method-specific variance. Research suggests that the block structure of the IAT contributes to method-specific variance and some have recommended using a single-block IAT to reduce method-variance (Teige-Mocigemba, Klauer, & Rothermund, 2008). In addition, researchers have suggested another source of method-bias is that participants may recode the tasks based on non-associative features to simplify the task which means response latencies are not a result of association of categories but rather other non-identified features (DeHouwer, 2003). As such, researchers have also tested ways to compare performance on trials within a single task rather than across different tasks (e.g. comparing compatible and incompatible) (DeHouwer, 2003). Mierke and Klauer (2003) identified that method-variance seems to be a play in IATs by finding correlations between IATs that do not overlap in content and have no explanatory reason for an association. Despite all of this research, the most effective way to remove method specific variance from the IAT that has been validated across multiple studies is using the *D*-scoring algorithm proposed by Greenwald, Nosek & Banaji (2003) (e.g. Mierke & Klauser, 2003; Back, Schmukle, & Egloff, 2005). This algorithm has also been found to minimize the correlation between IAT effects and individual subjects' average response latencies, order effects of IAT blocks, and the effect of previously completing one or more IATs (Lane et al., 2007). I used this *D*-scoring algorithm in my study. To further minimize order effects, I randomly assigned whether the compatible or incompatible blocks were shown first as well as which was associated with the right or the left side of the screen.

Careless responding. I tackled careless responding through sample selection and by identifying careless responses after the study. First, I switched from using student samples which are plagued with careless responding (Meade & Craig, 2012) to MTurkers which provides better reliability of data (Behrend, Sharek, Meade, & Wiebe, 2011). Although conjoint analysis and the IAT do not offer traditional survey-method techniques of reducing careless responding such as adding bogus items or instructed response items (e.g. respond to this item with a three), there are other methods to deal with careless responding. First, MTurk participants are paid after completing the survey and know that the researcher can reject their survey if it appears careless, so participants may be less likely to engage in careless responding. Knowing that careless responding could still be an issue, I conducted an outlier analysis of response time as recommended by Meade and Craig (2012) in the conjoint analysis and removed 35 outliers.

Similarly, I followed established procedures by Greenwald et al., (2003) in the IAT and removed all trials longer than 10,000 *ms* and any IAT data from participants with greater than 10% of the responses taking less than 300 *ms*. Although I took as many preventative and data analytic measures possible to remove careless responding, it is still possible that this influenced the results and could be a limitation.

Cross-sectional research. Finally, it is important to note that both the conjoint analysis and IAT were cross sectional studies, yet the leadership process is ongoing. Therefore, these studies represent a moment in time snapshot of follower perceptions and cognitive categorizations. Future research should incorporate longitudinal studies that are more akin to how the leadership influence process occurs.

Conclusion

The present research shows that automatic, authentic, and pro-social IM influences TL perceptions, with authentic communication and pro-social goal orientation each having a strong, significant effect. Automatic information processing appears to have a meaningful but insignificant effect. Authentic IM effects can be strengthened in an EWC. The process whereby leader IM impacts follower perceptions involves a cognitive categorization process in which followers encounter a target leader and go through a prototype matching process to determine if that individual's behavior matches their conception of a leader.

A primary insight gained from this research is that all IM should not have a negative connotation. IM can be used to enhance good perceptions by helping a leader be seen as transformational. Moreover, findings from this dissertation are important because they offer insight into paths for further research, instruments to be used in that research, and information to enhance the development of transformational leaders.

Table 1. Factors and Aspects of IM

Information Processing	Communication	Goal Orientation		
Automatic	Authentic	Pro-Self		
Controlled	Inauthentic	Pro-Social		
Profile	Information Processing	Communication	Goal Orientation	IM Archetype
---------	---------------------------	---------------	---------------------	-------------------------------
1	Automatic	Authentic	Pro-Self	Authentic Representation
2	Automatic	Authentic	Pro-Social	Cooperative Representation
3	Automatic	Inauthentic	Pro-Self	Inadvertent Misrepresentation
4	Automatic	Inauthentic	Pro-Social	Amiable Misrepresentation
5	Controlled	Authentic	Pro-Self	Opportunistic Representation
6	Controlled	Authentic	Pro-Social	Diplomatic Representation
7	Controlled	Inauthentic	Pro-Self	Fraudulent Misrepresentation
8	Controlled	Inauthentic	Pro-Social	Tactful Misrepresentation
9	Automatic	Authentic	Pro-Self	Authentic Representation

Table 2. Leader Profile Descriptions

Dimension	Between Subjects	Ν	М	Target p	Actual p
Information Processing	Automatic	51	2.37	<.05	0.000
	Controlled	63	3.87		
Communication	Authentic	57	2.23	<.05	0.000
	Inauthentic	57	3.77		
Goal Orientation	Pro-Social	59	3.68	<.05	0.000
	Pro-Self	55	2.31		

Table 3. Results of Between-Subjects Pilot Testing

			М	М	Target	Actual
Dimension	Within-Subjects	п	profile 1	profile 2	p	р
Information Processing	Automatic – Automatic	9	2.67	3.00	>.05	0.438
	Controlled - Controlled	15	3.73	4.13	>.05	0.271
	Automatic - Controlled	33	2.12	3.82	<.05	0.000
	Controlled – Automatic	0	-	-	-	-
Communication	Authentic – Authentic	14	2.64	2.29	>.05	0.315
	Inauthentic – Inauthentic	14	4.07	3.50	>.05	0.293
	Authentic – Inauthentic	20	2.10	3.75	<.05	0.000
	Inauthentic – Authentic	9	3.78	1.78	<.05	0.017
Goal Orientation	Pro-Social – Pro-Social	13	3.62	3.00	>.05	0.294
	Pro-Self – Pro-Self	11	2.18	2.18	>.05	1.000
	Pro-Self – Pro-Social	21	2.33	4.33	<.05	0.000
	Pro-Social – Pro-Self	12	2.45	4.03	<.05	0.245

Table 4. Results of Within-Subjects Pilot Testing

Factor	Aspects	Utility	Relative
			Importance (%)
Information Processing	Automatic	0.05.	16.17%
	Controlled	-0.05.	
Communication	Authentic	0.57*	40.65%
	Inauthentic	-0.57*	
Goal Orientation	Pro-Self	-0.58*	43.18%
	Pro-Social	0.58*	

Table 5. Results of Conjoint Analysis (n=196)

*p < .01

Table 6. Mod	Sable 6. Moderating Effects of EWC									
		Auto	omatic	Auth	nentic	Pro-S	Social			
Group	Ν	М	SD	М	SD	М	SD			

3.502

3.643

SD SD Group NМ М

1.168

1.167

2.993

3.069

Control

EWC

396

344

1.012

1.054

3.553

3.582

1.054

1.024

		М	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Rating	3.0345	1.164								
2.	Authenticity	0.500	0.500	.482**							
3.	Goal Orientation	0.500	0.500	$.510^{**}$	0.000						
4.	Gender	0.482	0.500	0.019	0.000	0.000					
5.	Ethnicity	1.332	0.850	0.027	0.000	0.000	100**				
6.	Age	36.871	10.607	-0.051	0.000	0.000	0.062	248**			
7.	Education	3.500	1.778	-0.035	0.000	0.000	$.158^{**}$	-0.063	$.076^{*}$		
8.	Employment	1.668	1.182	071 [*]	0.000	0.000	.155**	084*	.216**	.193**	
9.	Work Experience	15.921	11.340	-0.042	0.000	0.000	0.022	250**	.889**	.150**	.093**

Table 7. Automaticity Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Notes: Coding: 1 = Authentic, 0 = Inauthentic; 1 = Pro-social, 0 = Pro-self; 1 = Woman, 0 = Man

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

		М	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Rating	3.563	1.043								
2.	Automaticity	0.500	0.500	0.032							
3.	Goal Orientation	0.500	0.500	.658**	0.000						
4.	Gender	0.482	0.500	0.011	0.000	0.000					
5.	Ethnicity	1.332	0.850	0.025	0.000	0.000	100**				
6.	Age	36.871	10.607	-0.054	0.000	0.000	0.062	248**			
7.	Education	3.500	1.778	-0.051	0.000	0.000	$.158^{**}$	-0.063	$.076^{*}$		
8.	Employment	1.668	1.182	079^{*}	0.000	0.000	$.155^{**}$	084^{*}	.216**	.193**	
9.	Work Experience	15.921	11.340	-0.047	0.000	0.000	0.022	250**	$.889^{**}$	$.150^{**}$.093**
	~		~ 11								

Table 8. Authenticity ANCOVA Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Notes: Coding: 1 = Automatic, 0 = Controlled; 1 = Pro-social, 0 = Pro-self; 1 = Woman, 0 = Man

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

		М	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Rating	3.5703	1.03061								
2.	Automaticity	0.5000	0.50032	0.056							
3.	Authenticity	0.5000	0.50032	.658**	0.000						
4.	Gender	0.4821	0.50000	0.010	0.000	0.000					
5.	Ethnicity	1.3316	0.85004	-0.016	0.000	0.000	100**				
6.	Age	36.8710	10.60712	-0.049	0.000	0.000	0.062	248**			
7.	Education	3.5000	1.77826	-0.021	0.000	0.000	.158**	-0.063	$.076^{*}$		
8.	Employment	1.6684	1.18191	-0.046	0.000	0.000	.155**	084*	.216**	.193**	
9.	Work Experience	15.9209	11.33965	-0.026	0.000	0.000	0.022	250**	.889**	$.150^{**}$.093**

Table 9. Goal Orientation ANCOVA Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Notes: Coding: 1 = Automatic, 0 = Controlled; 1 = Authentic, 0 = Inauthentic; 1 = Woman, 0 = Man

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 10. ANCOVA Results for EWC

Variable	df	SS	MS	F	р
Automatic					<u> </u>
EWC	1	0.657	0.657	0.962	0.327
Age	1	0.545	0.545	0.798	0.372
Authenticity	1	239.151	239.151	350.250	0.000
Education	1	1.060	1.060	1.552	0.213
Employment	1	2.920	2.920	4.277	0.039
Ethnicity	1	0.701	0.701	1.027	0.311
Gender	1	1.365	1.365	1.999	0.158
Goal Orientation	1	259.462	259.462	379.996	0.000
Work Experience	1	0.155	0.155	0.226	0.634
Authentic					
EWC	1	2.852	2.852	4.688	0.031
Automaticity	1	0.650	0.650	1.068	0.302
Goal Orientation	1	345.216	345.216	567.485	0.000
Gender	1	0.658	0.658	1.082	0.299
Ethnicity	1	0.285	0.285	0.469	0.494
Age	1	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.967
Education	1	0.781	0.781	1.284	0.258
Employment	1	3.602	3.602	5.922	0.015
Work Experience	1	0.205	0.205	0.337	0.562
Goal Orientation					
EWC	1	0.060	0.060	0.102	0.750
Gender	1	0.508	0.508	0.860	0.354
Ethnicity	1	0.930	0.930	1.576	0.210
Age	1	2.856	2.856	4.842	0.028
Education	1	0.499	0.499	0.846	0.358
Employment	1	0.755	0.755	1.280	0.258
Work Experience	1	1.580	1.580	2.679	0.102
Authenticity	1	346.419	346.419	587.197	0.000
Automaticity	1	2.196	2.196	3.722	0.054

Table 11. Stimulus Materials for IAT

IAT	TL Target	TL Stimuli	Non-TL	Non-TL	Positive	Positive	Negative	Negative
	Name		Target Name	Stimuli	Attribute	Attribute	Attribute	Attribute
					Name	Stimuli	Name	Stimuli
Automaticity		Encouraging		Autocratic		Effortless		Effortful
	Inspirational	Motivational	Authoritarian	Domineering	Automatic	Instinctive	Controlled	Intentional
		Visionary		Overbearing		Unconscious		Conscious
Authenticity		Encouraging		Autocratic		Genuine		Fake
	Inspirational	Motivational	Authoritarian	Domineering	Authentic	Honest	Inauthentic	False
		Visionary		Overbearing		Sincere		Insincere
Goal		Encouraging		Autocratic		Benefit others		Benefit self
Orientation	Inspirational	Motivational	Authoritarian	Domineering	Pro-Social	Selfless	Pro-Self	Self-focused
		Visionary		Overbearing		Unselfish		Self-interested

Stage	Left key	Right key
	assignment	assignment
1	Inspirational	Authoritarian
2	Authentic	Inauthentic
3	Inspirational	Authoritarian
	Authentic	Inauthentic
4	Inspirational	Authoritarian
	Authentic	Inauthentic
5	Inauthentic	Authentic
6	Inspirational	Authoritarian
	Inauthentic	Authentic
7	Inspirational	Authoritarian
	Inauthentic	Authentic

 Table 12. Schematic Example of IAT

Table 13. IAT Results

Dimension	N	M	SD	95% CI	Τ	D	Rel	Err	drop
Automaticity	300	0.131	0.245	[0.066, 0.197]	3.943***	0.245	0.842	13.88	56
Authenticity	300	0.751	0.438	[0.698, 0.804]	27.784***	1.713	0.808	11.19	54
Goal Orientation	300	0.266	0.445	[0.212, 0.319]	9.738***	0.597	0.647	10.63	51

Note. *** p < .001. M = mean of *ms*. Rel = internal consistency estimate. Err = error proportion. Drop = proportion of participants dropped for > 10% of responses < 300 ms (Greenwald et al., 2003).



Figure 1. Impression Management in Leadership



Figure 2. Model of the Effects of IM on TL Perceptions

Figure 3. Utilities by IM Archetype



REFERENCES

Aiman-Smith, L., Scullen, S. E., & Barr, S. H. (2002). Conducting studies of decision making in organizational contexts: A tutorial for policy-capturing and other regression-based techniques. *Organizational Research Methods*, *5*, 388-414.

Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (2004). The Survey Research Handbook. McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 261-295.
- Arnaud, A. (2010). Conceptualizing and measuring ethical work climate: Development and validation of the ethical climate index. *Business & Society*, *49*, 345-358.
- Avolio, B. J. (2005). *Leadership development in balance: Made/born*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory building. *American Psychologist*, 62, 25–33.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). Multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ). *Mind Garden*, 29.
- Avolio, B. J., & Locke, E. E. (2002). Contrasting different philosophies of leader motivation:Altruism versus egoism. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 169-191.
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 801-823.
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 421-449.

- Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 345-373.
- Back, M. D., Schmukle, S. C., & Egloff, B. (2005). Measuring task-switching ability in the Implicit Association Test. *Experimental Psychology*, *52*, 167-179.
- Balthazard, P. A., Waldman, D. A., Thatcher, R. W., & Hannah, S. T. (2012). Differentiating transformational and non-transformational leaders on the basis of neurological imaging. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 244-258.
- Bargh, J. A., & Chartrand, T. L. (2000). The mind in the middle. *Handbook of Research Methods in Social and Personality Psychology*, *2*, 253-285.
- Barling, J., Christie, A., & Turner, N. (2008). Pseudo-transformational leadership: Towards the development and test of a model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *81*, 851-861.
- Barnett, T., & Vaicys, C. (2000). The moderating effect of individuals' perceptions of ethical work climate on ethical judgments and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 27, 351-362.
- Bass, B. M. (1995). Theory of transformational leadership redux. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*, 463-478.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181-217.
- Batson, C. D. & Powell, A. A. (2003). Altruism and prosocial behavior. In I. B., Weiner, T.
 Millon, & M. J. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology, Personality, and Social Psychology* (pp. 463-484). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Batson, C. D. (2016). Empathy and altruism. In. K. W. Brown & M. R. Leary (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Hypo-egoic Phenomena*. (pp. 161-170). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, A. T., & Clark, D. A. (1997). An information processing model of anxiety: Automatic and strategic processes. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, *35*, 49-58.
- Behrend, T. S., Sharek, D. J., Meade, A. W., & Wiebe, E. N. (2011). The viability of crowdsourcing for survey research. *Behavior Research Methods*, 43, 800-813.
- Bernieri, F. J. (1988). Coordinated movement and rapport in teacher-student interactions. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *12*, 120-138.
- Berson, Y., & Sosik, J. J. (2007). The relationship between self—other rating agreement and influence tactics and organizational processes. *Group & Organization Management*, 32, 675-698.
- Bishop, S. J. (2008). Neural mechanisms underlying selective attention to threat. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1129*, 141-152.
- Bishop, S. J., Cohen, J. D., Fossella, J., Casey, B. J., & Farah, M. J. (2006). COMT genotype influences prefrontal response to emotional distraction. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 6, 62-70.
- Blairy, S., Herrera, P., & Hess, U. (1999). Mimicry and the judgment of emotional facial expressions. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 23, 5-41.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2003). More than one way to make an impression: Exploring profiles of impression management. *Journal of Management*, *29*, 141-160.
- Bolino, M. C., Kacmar, K. M., Turnley, W. H., & Gilstrap, J. B. (2008). A multi-level review of impression management motives and behaviors. *Journal of Management*, *34*, 1080–1109.

- Bolino, M. C., Long, D., & Turnley, W. (2016). Impression management in organizations:
 Critical questions, answers, and areas for future research. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *3*, 377–406.
- Bozeman, D. P., & Kacmar, K. M. (1997). A cybernetic model of impression management processes in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 69, 9-30.
- Brannick, M. T., & Brannick, J. P. (1989). Nonlinear and noncompensatory processes in performance evaluation. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 44, 97-122.
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data?. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *6*, 3-5.
- Buller, D. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1996). Interpersonal deception theory. *Communication Theory*, 6, 203-242.
- Burgoon, J. K., Guerrero, L. & Manusov, V. (2011). Nonverbal signals. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication* (pp. 239-282). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Pay preferences and job search decisions: A personorganization fit perspective. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 317-348.
- Cable, D. M., & Kay, V. S. (2012). Striving for self-verification during organizational entry. *Academy of Management Journal*, *55*, 360-380.
- Carpenter, T., Pogacar, R., Pullig, C., Kouril, M., Aguilar, S. J., LaBouff, J. P., ... Chakroff, A. (2018, September 17). Survey-Based Implicit Association Tests: A Methodological and Empirical Analysis. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/hgy3z

- Chartrand, T. L., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). The chameleon effect: the perception–behavior link and social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*, 893.
- Choi, Y., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (1998). On the leadership function of self-sacrifice. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *9*, 475-501.
- Christie, A., Barling, J., & Turner, N. (2011). Pseudo-Transformational Leadership: Model Specification and Outcomes 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *41*, 2943-2984.
- Clapp-Smith, R., Vogelgesang, G. R., & Avey, J. B. (2009). Authentic leadership and positive psychological capital: The mediating role of trust at the group level of analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *15*, 227-240.
- Cronshaw, S. F., & Lord, R. G. (1987). Effects of categorization, attribution, and encoding processes on leadership perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 97.
- Davidson, R. J., Ekman, P., Saron, C. D., Senulis, J. A., & Friesen, W. V. (1990). Approach-withdrawal and cerebral asymmetry: Emotional expression and brain physiology:
 I. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 330-341.

Dawkins, R. (1976). The selfish gene. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- De Houwer, J. (2003). The extrinsic affective Simon task. Experimental Psychology, 50, 77-85.
- De Houwer, J., & De Bruycker, E. (2007). The implicit association test outperforms the extrinsic affective Simon task as an implicit measure of inter-individual differences in attitudes. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *46*, 401-421.
- DeGroot, T., Kiker, D. S., & Cross, T. C. (2000). A meta-analysis to review organizational outcomes related to charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 17, 356-372.

- Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Abdalla,
 I. A., ... & Akande, B. E. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable
 implicit leadership theories: are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership
 universally endorsed?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 219-256.
- Densten, I. L., & Sarros, J. C. (2012). The impact of organizational culture and social desirability on Australian CEO Leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 33, 342-368.
- DePaulo, B. M., & Kashy, D. A. (1998). Everyday lies in close and casual relationships. *Journal* of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 63-79.
- DePaulo, B. M., Kashy, D. A., Kirkendol, S. E., Wyer, M. M., & Epstein, J. A. (1996). Lying in everyday life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 979-995.
- DePaulo, B. M., Lindsay, J. J., Malone, B. E., Muhlenbruck, L., Charlton, K., & Cooper, H. (2003). Cues to deception. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 74-118.
- Derue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N. E. D., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 7-52.
- Deshpande, S. P. (1996). The impact of ethical climate types on facets of job satisfaction: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *15*, 655-660.
- Dumdum, U. R., Low, K. B., & Avolio, B. J. (2002). A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: An update and extension. In B. J. Avolio & F. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead* (Vol. 2 of Monographs in Leadership and Management; pp. 35-66). St. Louis, MO: Elsevier.

- Dunn, W. S., Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Ones, D. S. (1995). Relative importance of personality and general mental ability in managers' judgments of applicant qualifications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 500-509.
- Eisenberg, N., Guthrie, I. K., Cumberland, A., Murphy, B. C., Shepard, S. A., Zhou, Q., & Carlo, G. (2002). Prosocial development in early adulthood: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 993-1006.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1969). Nonverbal leakage and clues to deception. *Psychiatry*, *32*, 88-106.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1982). Felt, false, and miserable smiles. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 6, 238-252.
- Ekman, P., Davidson, R. J., & Friesen, W. V. (1990). The Duchenne smile: Emotional expression and brain physiology: II. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 342-353.
- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2004). Implicit leadership theories in applied settings: Factor structure, generalizability, and stability over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 293-310.
- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2005). From ideal to real: a longitudinal study of the role of implicit leadership theories on leader-member exchanges and employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 659-676.
- 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. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 858-881.

- Erdogan, B., & Enders, J. (2007). Support from the top: Supervisors' perceived organizational support as a moderator of leader-member exchange to satisfaction and performance relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 321-330.
- Farnham, S. D., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1999). Implicit self-esteem. In D. Abrams & M. Hogg (Eds.), *Social Identity and Social Cognition* (pp. 230-248). Oxford, UK: 10 Blackwell.
- Field, R. G., & Abelson, M. A. (1982). Climate: A reconceptualization and proposed model. *Human Relations*, 35, 181-201.
- Fisk, A. D., & Schneider, W. (1983). Category and word search: generalizing search principles to complex processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 9, 1-24.
- Fisk, G. M., & Friesen, J. P. (2012). Perceptions of leader emotion regulation and LMX as predictors of followers' job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 1-12.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). Social Cognition. McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Ford, C. V., (1999). Lies! Lies!! Lies!!! The Psychology of Deceit. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Press, Inc.
- Galinsky, A. D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Magee, J. C. (2003). From power to action. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85, 453-466.
- Gallese, V., Eagle, M. N., & Migone, P. (2007). Intentional attunement: Mirror neurons and the neural underpinnings of interpersonal relations. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 55, 131-175.

- Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 32-58.
- Gardner, W. L., & Cleavenger, D. (1998). The impression management strategies associated with transformational leadership at the world-class level a Psychohistorical assessment. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 12, 3-41.
- 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. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 343-372.
- Gardner, W. L., Cogliser, C. C., Davis, K. M., & Dickens, M. P. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1120-1145.
- George, J. M., & Bettenhausen, K. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 698-709.
- George, J. M., & Bettenhausen, K. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 698-709.
- Gillespie, N. A., & Mann, L. (2004). Transformational leadership and shared values: The building blocks of trust. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19, 588-607.
- Johnson, R. E. and Lord, R. G. (2004). "Leader categorization theory" Burns, J. M., Cho, K.,
 Goethals, G. R. and Sorenson, G. J. (Eds.) "Encyclopedia of Leadership." pp. 823-828.
 Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

- Grandey, A. A., Fisk, G. M., Mattila, A. S., Jansen, K. J., & Sideman, L. A. (2005). Is "service with a smile" enough? Authenticity of positive displays during service encounters. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 96, 38-55.
- Grant, A. M., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Good soldiers and good actors: Prosocial and impression management motives as interactive predictors of affiliative citizenship behaviors. *Journal* of Applied Psychology, 94, 900-912.
- Grant, A. M., Parker, S., & Collins, C. (2009). Getting credit for proactive behavior: Supervisor reactions depend on what you value and how you feel. *Personnel Psychology*, 62, 31-55.
- Gray, J. H., & Densten, I. L. (2007). How leaders woo followers in the romance of leadership. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 56, 558-581.
- Graziano, W. G., Habashi, M. M., Sheese, B. E., & Tobin, R. M. (2007). Agreeableness, empathy, and helping: A person × situation perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 583-599.
- Green, P. E., Krieger, A. M., & Wind, Y. (2001). Thirty years of conjoint analysis: Reflections and prospects. *Interfaces*, 31, 856-873.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, *102*, 4-27.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Farnham, S. D. (2000). Using the implicit association test to measure selfesteem and self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 1022-1038.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: the implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1464-1480.

- Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the implicit association test: I. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 197-216.
- Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 17-41.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., & Anderson, R.E. (2010). Multivariate Data Analysis, 7.
- Harrison, D. A., Newman, D. A., & Roth, P. L. (2006). How important are job attitudes? Metaanalytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. Academy of Management Journal, 49, 305-325.
- Hecht, D. (2014). Cerebral lateralization of pro-and anti-social tendencies. *Experimental Neurobiology*, *23*, 1-27.
- Hellige, J. B. (1990). Hemispheric asymmetry. Annual Review of Psychology, 41, 55-80.
- Higgins, C. A., & Judge, T. A. (2004). The effect of applicant influence tactics on recruiter perceptions of fit and hiring recommendations: a field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 622-632.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). The managed heart. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, *9*, 169-180.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 184-200.
- Hogue, M. & Lord, R. G. (2007). A multilevel, complexity theory approach to understanding gender bias in leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*, 370-390.

- House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *3*, 81-108.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: submission or liberation? Academy of Management Perspectives, 6, 43-54.
- Howell, J., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *The Academy of Management Review*, *30*, 96-112.
- Huang, G. H., Zhao, H. H., Niu, X. Y., Ashford, S. J., & Lee, C. (2013). Reducing job insecurity and increasing performance ratings: Does impression management matter? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98, 852-862.
- Iacoboni, M. (2009). Imitation, empathy, and mirror neurons. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 653-670.
- Ickes, W., Reidhead, S., & Patterson, M. (1986). Machiavellianism and self-monitoring: As different as "me" and "you". *Social Cognition*, *4*, 58-74.
- Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic wellbeing: Understanding leader–follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 373-394.
- Isen, A. M. (2002). A role for neuropsychology in understanding the facilitating influence of positive affect on social behavior and cognitive processes. *Handbook of Positive Psychology*, 528-540.
- Jensen, S. M., & Luthans, F. (2006). Entrepreneurs as authentic leaders: Impact on employees' attitudes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *27*, 646-666.
- Johnson, S. K. (2008). I second that emotion: Effects of emotional contagion and affect at work on leader and follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 1-19.

- Jones, N. A., Field, T., & Davalos, M. (2000). Right frontal EEG asymmetry and lack of empathy in preschool children of depressed mothers. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 30, 189–204.
- Jost, J. T., Rudman, L. A., Blair, I. V., Carney, D. R., Dasgupta, N., Glaser, J., & Hardin, C. D. (2009). The existence of implicit bias is beyond reasonable doubt: A refutation of ideological and methodological objections and executive summary of ten studies that no manager should ignore. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 29, 39-69.
- Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 261-271.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A metaanalytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 755-768.
- Kalshoven, K., & Hartog, D. N. (2009). Ethical leader behavior and leader effectiveness: The role of prototypicality and trust. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *5*, 102-120.
- Kanungo, R. N. (2001). Ethical values of transactional and transformational leaders. Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 18, 257-265.
- Karren, R. J., & Barringer, M. W. (2002). A review and analysis of the policy-capturing methodology in organizational research: Guidelines for research and practice. *Organizational Research Methods*, *5*, 337-361.
- Kernis, M. H. (2003). Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, *14*, 1-26.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1992). Ethical leaders: An essay about being in love. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11, 479-484.

- Kristof-Brown, A., Barrick, M. R., & Franke, M. (2002). Applicant impression management: Dispositional influences and consequences for recruiter perceptions of fit and similarity. *Journal of Management*, 28, 27-46.
- Krupka, E., & Weber, R. A. (2009). The focusing and informational effects of norms on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 30, 307-320.
- Kunda, Z., & Thagard, P. (1996). Forming impressions from stereotypes, traits, and behaviors: A parallel-constraint-satisfaction theory. *Psychological Review*, *103*, 284-308.
- Lane, K. A., Banaji, M. R., Nosek, B. A., & Greenwald, A. G. (2007). Understanding and using the implicit association test: IV. *Implicit Measures of Attitudes*, 59-102.
- Larson Jr, J. R. (1982). Cognitive mechanisms mediating the impact of implicit theories of leader behavior on leader behavior ratings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 29, 129-140.
- Leary, M. R., Robertson, R. B., Barnes, B. D., & Miller, R. S. (1986). Self-presentations of small group leaders: Effects of role requirements and leadership orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 742-748.
- Leary, M., Kowalski, R., (1990). Impression Management: A literature review and twocomponent model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 34-47.
- Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2007). Measuring faking in the employment interview:
 Development and validation of an interview faking behavior scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1638-1656.
- Ling, W., Chia, R. C., & Fang, L. (2000). Chinese implicit leadership theory. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 729-739.

- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Harvey, J. L., & Hall, R. J. (2001a). Contextual constraints on prototype generation and their multilevel consequences for leadership perceptions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 311-338.
- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., & Harvey, J. L. (2001b). System constraints on leadership perceptions, behavior and influence: An example of connectionist level processes. In M. A. Hogg & R. S. Tindale (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Group Processes* (pp. 283–310). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Lord, R., & Maher, K. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and processes*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- Lord, R., Foti, R., & DeVader, C. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior* and Human Performance, 34, 343-378.
- Maner, J. K., & Mead, N. L. (2010). The essential tension between leadership and power: When leaders sacrifice group goals for the sake of self-interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99, 482-497.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (2010). Cultures and selves: A cycle of mutual constitution. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *5*, 420-430.
- McLeod, B. A., & Genereux, R. L. (2008). Predicting the acceptability and likelihood of lying: The interaction of personality with type of lie. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45, 591-596.
- Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological Methods*, *17*, 437-455.

- Medvedeff, M. E., & Lord, R. G. (2007). Implicit leadership theories as dynamic processing structures. *Follower-centered perspectives on leadership: A tribute to the memory of James R. Meindl.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Mierke, J., & Klauer, K. C. (2003). Method-specific variance in the implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 1180-1192.
- Molleda, J. C. (2010). Authenticity and the construct's dimensions in public relations and communication research. *Journal of Communication Management*, *14*, 223-236.
- Mulvey, P. W., Bowes-Sperry, L., & Klein, H. J. (1998). The effects of perceived loafing and defensive impression management on group effectiveness. *Small Group Research*, 29, 394-415.
- Nadler A. 2002. Inter-group helping relations as power relations: Maintaining or challenging social dominance between groups through helping. *Journal of Social Issues*, *58*, 487–502.
- Nosek, B. A., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: II. Method variables and construct validity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 166-180.
- Oswald, F. L., Mitchell, G., Blanton, H., Jaccard, J., & Tetlock, P. E. (2013). Predicting ethnic and racial discrimination: A meta-analysis of IAT criterion studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105, 171-192.
- Ouellette, J. A., & Wood, W. (1998). Habit and intention in everyday life: The multiple processes by which past behavior predicts future behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*, 54-74.
- Oyserman, D., & Lee, S. W. (2008). Does culture influence what and how we think? Effects of priming individualism and collectivism. *Psychological Bulletin*, *134*, 311-342.

- Oyserman, D., Elmore, K., & Smith, G. (2011). Self, self-concept, and identity. In M. Leary & J. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of Self and Identity*. (pp. 542-570). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Peck, J. A., & Hogue, M. (2018). Acting with the best of intentions... or not: A typology and model of impression management in leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29, 123-134.
- Peck, J. A., & Levashina, J. (2017). Impression Management and Interview and Job Performance Ratings: A Meta-Analysis of Research Design with Tactics in Mind. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8.
- Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior:Multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 365-392.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.
- Pollach, I., & Kerbler, E. (2011). Appearing competent: A study of impression management in US and European CEO profiles. *The Journal of Business Communication, 48*, 355-372.
- Price, Terry L. (2003). The ethics of authentic transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 1048-9843.
- Priem, R. L., Walters, B. A., & Li, S. (2011). Decisions, decisions! How judgment policy studies can integrate macro and micro domains in management research. *Journal of Management*, 37, 553-580.

- Roulin, N., Bangerter, A., & Levashina, J. (2014). Interviewers' perceptions of impression management in employment interviews. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29, 141-163.
- Roulin, N., Bangerter, A., & Levashina, J. (2015). Honest and deceptive impression management in the employment interview: Can it be detected and how does it impact evaluations? *Personnel Psychology*, 68, 395-444.
- Rowold, J., & Heinitz, K. (2007). Transformational and charismatic leadership: Assessing the convergent, divergent and criterion validity of the MLQ and the CKS. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 121-133.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). The darker and brighter sides of human existence: Basic psychological needs as a unifying concept. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 319-338.
- Rynes, S. L., & Lawler, J. (1983). A policy-capturing investigation of the role of expectancies in decisions to pursue job alternatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*, 620-631.
- SAS Institute Inc., (1993). SAS Technical Report R-109, *Conjoint Analysis Examples*, Gary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.
- Schlenker, B. (2011). Self presentation. In M. Leary & J. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of Self and Identity* (pp. 542-570). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Schneider, W., & Chein, J. M. (2003). Controlled & automatic processing: behavior, theory, and biological mechanisms. *Cognitive Science*, *27*, 525-559.
- Schneider, W., & Fisk, A. D. (1982). Concurrent automatic and controlled visual search: Can processing occur without resource cost? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition,* 8, 261-278.
- Schneider, W., & Shiffrin, R. M. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: I. Detection, search, and attention. *Psychological Review*, 84, 1-66.

- Schwartz, M. S. (2013). Developing and sustaining an ethical corporate culture: The core elements. *Business Horizons*, *56*, 39-50.
- Sekiguchi, T., & Huber, V. L. (2011). The use of person–organization fit and person–job fit information in making selection decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 116, 203-216.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference. Boston, MA, US: Houghton, Mifflin and Company.
- Shamir, B. (2007). From passive recipients to active co-producers: Followers' roles in the leadership process. In B. Shamir, R. Pillai, M. Bligh, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.). (2007). *Follower-Centered Perspectives on Leadership*. (pp. ix-xxxix). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4, 577-594.
- Sharma, A., & Grant, D. (2011). Narrative, drama and charismatic leadership: The case of Apple's Steve Jobs. *Leadership*, *7*, 3-26.
- Sheldon, K. M., Elliot, A. J., Kim, Y., & Kasser, T. (2001). What is satisfying about satisfying events? Testing 10 candidate psychological needs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 325-339.
- Shepherd, D. A., Patzelt, H., & Baron, R. A. (2013). "I care about nature, but...": Disengaging values in assessing opportunities that cause harm. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56, 1251-1273.

- Shiffrin, R. M., & Schneider, W. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: II. Perceptual learning, automatic attending and a general theory. *Psychological Review*, 84, 127-190.
- Shondrick, S. J., Dinh, J. E., & Lord, R. G. (2010). Developments in implicit leadership theory and cognitive science: Applications to improving measurement and understanding alternatives to hierarchical leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*, 959-978.
- Siegel, P. A., & Brockner, J. (2005). Individual and organizational consequences of CEO claimed handicapping: What's good for the CEO may not be so good for the firm. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 96, 1-22.
- Singh, N., & Krishnan, V. R. (2007). Transformational leadership in India: Developing and validating a new scale using grounded theory approach. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 7, 219-236.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Turner, R. A. (2014). Unfairness begets unfairness: Victim derogation bias in employee ratings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *124*, 34-46.
- Smeesters, D., Warlop, L., Van Avermaet, E., Corneille, O. & Yzerbyt, V. (2003). Do not prime hawks with doves: The interplay of construct activation and consistency of social value orientation on cooperative behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 972-987.
- Smith, A. N., Watkins, M. B., Burke, M. J., Christian, M. S., Smith, C. E., Hall, A., & Simms, S. (2013). Gendered influence: A gender role perspective on the use and effectiveness of influence tactics. *Journal of Management*, 39, 1156-1183.
- Smith, E. R. (1996). What do connectionism and social psychology have to offer each other? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 893–912.

- Smith, E. R., & DeCoster, J. (2000). Dual-process models in social and cognitive psychology: Conceptual integration and links to underlying memory systems. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 108-131.
- Sosik, J. J., Avolio, B. J., & Jung, D. I. (2002). Beneath the mask: Examining the relationship of self-presentation attributes and impression management to charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 217-242.
- Sparrowe, R. T. (2005). Authentic leadership and the narrative self. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*, 419-435.
- Sprouse, J. (2011). A validation of Amazon Mechanical Turk for the collection of acceptability judgments in linguistic theory. *Behavior Research Methods*, *43*, 155-167.
- Teige-Mocigemba, S., Klauer, K. C., & Rothermund, K. (2008). Minimizing method-specific variance in the IAT: A single block IAT. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 24, 237-245.
- Trevino, L. K. (1986). Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. *Academy of Management Review*, *11*, 601-617.
- Tsai, W. C., Huang, T. C., Wu, C. Y., & Lo, I. (2010). Disentangling the effects of applicant defensive impression management tactics in job interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18, 131-140.
- Turnley, W. H., & Bolino, M. C. (2001). Achieving desired images while avoiding undesired images: exploring the role of self-monitoring in impression management. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 351.
- U.S. Census (2016). Educational Attainment in the United States: 2016. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2016/demo/education-attainment/cps-detailed-tables.html
- U.S. Census (2017). United States Quick Facts. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045217
- Uhlmann, E. L., Leavitt, K., Menges, J. I., Koopman, J., Howe, M., & Johnson, R. E. (2012).Getting explicit about the implicit: A taxonomy of implicit measures and guide for their use in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *15*, 553-601.
- Vacharkulksemsuk, T., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2012). Strangers in sync: Achieving embodied rapport through shared movements. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 399-402.
- Van Lange, P. A. (1999). The pursuit of joint outcomes and equality in outcomes: An integrative model of social value orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 337-349.
- Van Lange, P. A. M., De Bruin, E. M. N., Otten, W. & Joireman, J. A. (1997). Development of prosocial, individualistic, and competitive orientations: Theory and preliminary evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 733-746.
- Verschuere, B., Spruyt, A., Meijer, E. H., & Otgaar, H. (2011). The ease of lying. *Consciousness* and Cognition, 20, 908-911.
- Verser, R. & Wicks, R. H. (2006). Managing voter impressions: The use of images on presidential candidates' web sites during the 2000 campaign. *Journal of Communication*, 56, 178-197.
- Vroom, V. (1964). Work and Motivation. New York: NY, John Wiley & Sons.
- Walter, F., & Bruch, H. (2009). An affective events model of charismatic leadership behavior: A review, theoretical integration, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 35, 1428-1452.

- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008).
 Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34, 89-126.
- Wang, G., Oh, I. S., 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 & Organization Management*, 36, 223-270.
- Westphal, J. D., & Graebner, M. E. (2010). A matter of appearances: How corporate leaders manage the impressions of financial analysts about the conduct of their boards. *Academy* of Management Journal, 53, 15-43.
- Wilhelmy, A., Kleinmann, M., König, C. J., Melchers, K. G., & Truxillo, D. M. (2016). How and why do interviewers try to make impressions on applicants? A qualitative study. *Journal* of Applied Psychology, 101, 313-332.
- Winkler, R. L., & Murphy, A. H. (1973). Experiments in the laboratory and the real world. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 10, 252-270.
- Wladawsky-Berger, I. (2016). The four critical competencies guiding transformational leadership. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from https://blogs.wsj.com/cio/2016/02/05/the-four-critical-competencies-guiding-transformationalleadership/
- Wofford, J. C., & Goodwin, V. L. (1994). A cognitive interpretation of transactional and transformational leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *5*, 161-186.
- Wyld, D. C., & Jones, C. A. (1997). The importance of context: The ethical work climate construct and models of ethical decision making--an agenda for research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16, 465-472.

- Yagil, D. (1998). Charismatic leadership and organizational hierarchy: Attribution of charisma to close and distant leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *9*, 161-176.
- Yammarino, F. J., & Dubinsky, A. J. (1994). Transformational leadership theory: Using levels of analysis to determine boundary conditions. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 787-811.
- Yin, H. H., & Knowlton, B. J. (2006). The role of the basal ganglia in habit formation. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *7*, 464-476.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 285-305.
- Zaccaro, S. J., Foti, R. J., & Kenny, D. A. (1991). Self-monitoring and trait-based variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situations. *Journal* of Applied Psychology, 76, 308-315.
- Zhang, L., Deng, Y., Zhang, X., & Hu, E. (2016). Why do Chinese emplyoees build supervisorsubordinate guanxi? A motivational analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 33, 617-648.
- Zhu, W., Avolio, B. J., Riggio, R. E., & Sosik, J. J. (2011). The effect of authentic transformational leadership on follower and group ethics. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 801-817.
- Zickmund, S. (2007). Deliberation, phronesis, and authenticity: Heidegger's early conception of rhetoric. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, *40*, 406-415.

APPENDIX

Leader Profiles

Automatic, Authentic, Pro-Self (Authentic Representation)

Imagine yourself interacting with your leader at work whose behavior toward you and other employees can be described in the following ways:

Engages in friendly interactions with you in a way that is <u>unconscious rather than a way that takes conscious effort</u>. Responds in a way that is <u>effortless rather than effortful</u>. Provides feedback to employees in a way that is <u>instinctive rather than intentional</u>.

Communicates about what she believes in honestly rather than in a way that is fake.

Gives her opinion on issues in a way that is sincere rather than false.

Tells people about accomplishments that are genuine rather than insincere.

Takes actions to benefit herself rather than to benefits others.

Approaches team goals in a way that is self-interested rather than selfless.

Interacts with others in a self-focused manner rather than an unselfish manner.

Automatic, Authentic, Pro-Social (Cooperative Representation)

Imagine yourself interacting with a leader at work whose behavior toward you and other employees can be described in the following ways:

Engages in friendly interactions with you in a way that is <u>unconscious rather than a way that takes conscious effort</u>. Responds in a way that is <u>effortless rather than effortful</u>. Provides feedback to employees in a way that is <u>instinctive rather than intentional</u>. Communicates about what she believes in <u>honestly rather than in a way that is fake</u>. Gives her opinion on issues in a way that is <u>sincere rather than false</u>. Tells people about accomplishments that are <u>genuine rather than insincere</u>. Takes actions to <u>benefit others rather than to benefit herself</u>.

Approaches team goals in a way that is selfless rather than self-interested.

Interacts with others in an unselfish manner rather than a self-focused manner.

Automatic, Inauthentic, Pro-Self (Inadvertent Misrepresentation)

Imagine yourself interacting with a leader at work whose behavior toward you and other employees can be described in the following ways:

Engages in friendly interactions with you in a way that is <u>unconscious rather than a way that takes conscious effort</u>. Responds in a way that is <u>effortless rather than effortful</u>.

Provides feedback to employees in a way that is instinctive rather than intentional.

Communicates about what she believes in a way that is fake rather than honest.

Gives her opinion on issues in a way that is false rather than sincere.

Tells people about accomplishments that are insincere rather than genuine.

Takes actions to benefit herself rather than to benefits others.

Approaches team goals in a way that is self-interested rather than selfless.

Interacts with others in a self-focused manner rather than an unselfish manner.

Automatic, Inauthentic, Pro-Social (Amiable Misrepresentation)

Imagine yourself interacting with a leader at work whose behavior toward you and other employees can be described in the following ways:

Engages in friendly interactions with you in a way that is <u>unconscious rather than a way that takes conscious effort.</u> Responds in a way that is <u>effortless rather than effortful</u>. Provides feedback to employees in a way that is <u>instinctive rather than intentional</u>. Communicates about what she believes in a way that is <u>fake rather than honest</u>. Gives her opinion on issues in a way that is <u>false rather than sincere</u>. Tells people about accomplishments that are <u>insincere rather than genuine</u>. Takes actions to <u>benefit others rather than to benefit herself</u>. Approaches team goals in a way that is <u>selfless rather than self-interested</u>. Interacts with others in an unselfish manner rather than a self-focused manner.

Controlled, Authentic, Pro-Self (Opportunistic Representation)

Imagine yourself interacting with a leader at work whose behavior toward you and other employees can be described in the following ways:

Engages in friendly interactions with you in a way that takes <u>conscious effort rather than a way that is unconscious</u>. Responds in a way that is <u>effortful rather than effortless</u>.

Provides feedback to employees in a way that is intentional rather than instinctive.

Communicates about what she believes in a way that is honest rather than fake.

Gives her opinion on issues in a way that is sincere rather than false.

Tells people about accomplishments that are genuine rather than insincere.

Takes actions to benefit herself rather than to benefits others.

Approaches team goals in a way that is <u>self-interested rather than selfless</u>.

Interacts with others in a self-focused manner rather than an unselfish manner.

Controlled, Authentic, Pro-Social (Diplomatic Representation)

Imagine yourself interacting with a leader at work whose behavior toward you and other employees can be described in the following ways:

Engages in friendly interactions with you in a way that takes <u>conscious effort rather than a way that is unconscious</u>. Responds in a way that is <u>effortful rather than effortless</u>.

Provides feedback to employees in a way that is intentional rather than instinctive.

Communicates about what she believes in a way that is <u>honest rather than fake</u>.

Gives her opinion on issues in a way that is sincere rather than false.

Tells people about accomplishments that are genuine rather than insincere.

Takes actions to benefit others rather than to benefit herself.

Approaches team goals in a way that is selfless rather than self-interested.

Interacts with others in an unselfish manner rather than a self-focused manner.

Controlled, Inauthentic, Pro-Self (Fraudulent Misrepresentation)

Imagine yourself interacting with a leader at work whose behavior toward you and other employees can be described in the following ways:

Engages in friendly interactions with you in a way that takes <u>conscious effort rather than a way that is unconscious</u>. Responds in a way that is <u>effortful rather than effortless</u>. Provides feedback to employees in a way that is <u>intentional rather than instinctive</u>. Communicates about what she believes in a way that is <u>fake rather than honest</u>. Gives her opinion on issues in a way that is <u>false rather than sincere</u>. Tells people about accomplishments that are <u>insincere rather than genuine</u>. Takes actions to <u>benefit herself rather than to benefits others</u>. Approaches team goals in a way that is <u>self-interested rather than selfless</u>. Interacts with others in a self-focused manner rather than an unselfish manner.

Controlled, Inauthentic, Pro-Social (Tactful Misrepresentation)

Imagine yourself interacting with a leader at work whose behavior toward you and other employees can be described in the following ways:

Engages in friendly interactions with you in a way that takes <u>conscious effort rather than a way that is unconscious</u>. Responds in a way that is <u>effortful rather than effortless</u>.

Provides feedback to employees in a way that is intentional rather than instinctive.

Communicates about what she believes in a way that is *fake rather than honest*.

Gives her opinion on issues in a way that is false rather than sincere.

Tells people about accomplishments that are insincere rather than genuine.

Takes actions to benefit others rather than to benefit herself.

Approaches team goals in a way that is selfless rather than self-interested.

Interacts with others in an unselfish manner rather than a self-focused manner.