Chapter 1

General introduction
General introduction

In everyday life, the way people communicate can make you laugh or make you angry. It can help you understand what they mean or it can totally confuse you. It may make you believe them, want to help them, discuss things more often with them, ... or not. If you can choose who to talk to, this doesn’t really matter; you simply avoid communicating with people that make you angry, confused, irritated, and the like. But what if you can’t choose, for instance in a leader-subordinate situation?

Apart from the leader-subordinate context, there are many situations in which you are ‘forced’ to communicate with specific people. Students have to communicate with teachers, patients with doctors and nurses, and buyers with sellers. Communication is an essential element in these relationships. The way people communicate may severely impact the way those relationships develop, as well as important outcomes. For instance, your teacher explains a theory in such a way that you much better understand what you have just read in the textbook. You may avoid certain shops because the way you are addressed by the person behind the counter irritates you. Or your leader discusses a specific task with you in such a way that you haven’t got a clue on how or where to begin.

Surprisingly, even though the way someone communicates impacts simple everyday life choices as well as important relationships, for long, no integrated framework of interpersonal communication styles existed (Daly & Bippus, 1998). This situation resembled that of research on personality before the five factor personality models were identified through lexical research (Goldberg, 1990). Recently, a study was undertaken to identify an integrated framework of communication styles in a similar way (De Vries, Bakker-Pieper, Alting Siberg, Van Gameren, & Vlug, 2009). Subsequently, a measure of communication styles was developed (the Communication Styles Inventory, CSI, De Vries, Bakker-Pieper, Konings, & Schouten, in press). The CSI is not specifically aimed at capturing the communication styles of a leader, teacher, doctor, or seller: it is a general measure of communication styles. However, it may well be used to investigate the communication styles of leaders, which is the subject of this dissertation.

The starting point for this research project was the idea that the way a leader communicates is related to his/her success, as communication is deemed to be very important in leader-subordinate relationships. In the present dissertation, first, the question of the added value of communication styles over personality traits for predicting leader outcomes is addressed. Subsequently, the CSI model is used to investigate specific aspects of the relations of leader communication styles with leader outcomes.

In the following paragraphs, a short overview will be provided of the literature on lexical personality and communication styles research. Subsequently, to arrive at the research questions of this dissertation, the literature will be reviewed on (1) leader
communication styles, (2) narrow predictors of leader criteria, (3) leader-subordinate agreement on leader predictors and relations with outcomes, (4) perceived expertise and liking as potential mediators of the relations between leader communication styles and leader criteria, and (5) the reasons why the relations of leader expressiveness and leader preciseness with various leader criteria may differ. Finally, an overview of the dissertation chapters is provided.

**Lexical research on Personality**

There are two reasons to (briefly) review the lexical research on personality in this dissertation. The first reason is that lexical research has led to the identification of what has become known as “the Big Five” or the “Five Factor Model” of personality and that a similar approach has been used recently to identify the structure of interpersonal communication styles. The second reason to review personality research is that we consider communication styles to be facets of personality traits (see below for a more detailed explanation). An overview of personality research - albeit a very limited one - hopefully makes it easier to understand our approach to communication styles and our questions regarding leader communication styles.

The identification of the five factor personality model has had a tremendous impact on personality related research. Since the middle of the 1980s, research on personality in relation to a myriad of topics has been undertaken, using a five factor model as an organizing framework both for original research (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001) and for meta-analytic research (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge, Bono, Illies, & Gerhardt, 2002). A frequently used measure of the five factor model is the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The instrument has been found to be reliable and valid, and has been fruitfully used in many cultures and in a wide variety of contexts (McCrae & Costa, 2004). Due to the integrated personality framework and the robust measure, research on personality has become much more coherent (Rothstein & Goffin, 2006).

The five factor model of personality consists of five broad personality dimensions labeled: extraversion, conscientiousness, openness to experience or intellect, emotional stability or neuroticism, and agreeableness (e.g., Costa & McCrae, 1992; Goldberg, 1990). The data in which these dimensions were uncovered were recently reanalyzed and a six factor solution was found that seemed to capture someone’s personality more completely. The model is called the HEXACO model of personality, an acronym of the trait labels: Honesty/Humility, Emotionality, eXtraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to experience (Lee & Ashton, 2004). The dimensions extraversion, conscientiousness and openness to experience correspond closely to the similarly named dimensions of the five factor model as operationalized by the NEO-PI-R (De Vries, De Vries, De Hoogh, & Feij, 2009). HEXACO agreeableness contains (reversed) irritability, which in the five factor model forms part of emotional stability, whereas HEXACO emotionality contains sentimentality, which in the five factor model is part of agreeableness. The sixth dimension of the HEXACO model is honesty/humility, which reflects sincerity, fairness,
greed avoidance, and modesty. This dimension has shown predictive validity for several work related criteria (De Vries, De Vries et al., 2009; De Vries & Van Kampen, 2010). Moreover, the six dimensional model of personality has shown incremental validity for various criteria over the five factor model (Ashton & Lee, 2008; Lee, Ashton, & De Vries, 2005).

The five factor and HEXACO models of personality are grounded in lexical research. This kind of research is based on the assumption that everything that can be said on a topic becomes encoded in language and can therefore be found in a dictionary (Ashton & Lee, 2005; De Raad, 1992; Goldberg, 1990). While scholars still disagree about the exact number (and meaning) of cross culturally replicable personality dimensions that can be identified in the lexical data (Ashton et al., 2004; Barrick & Mount, 1991; De Raad et al., 2010), since the identification of the five factor and HEXACO models, they do agree that a limited number of broad personality dimensions can describe someone’s personality. For instance, the fact that five factor models are used in numerous studies is an indication of their added value for research. In Google scholar, searching for “Big Five personality” yields 897,000 results and searching for “Five Factor model personality” 1,570,000. In practice, the model is increasingly used as a basis for selection procedures (Rothstein & Goffin, 2006). We may conclude that, although the lexical approach has been debated (e.g., Block, 1995), it has generated models of personality that have demonstrated their scientific and practical merit convincingly.

**Communication styles research**

Unlike the situation in personality research, research in the communication styles field is still fragmented. Communication scholars have deplored the lack of integration in their field (Beatty, 1998; Miles, Arnold, & Nash, 1990) and have called for the identification of a comprehensive framework of interpersonal communication styles in order to be able to better organize research (Beatty, 1998; Daly & Bippus, 1998). Recently, De Vries, Bakker-Pieper et al. (2009), followed in the footsteps of personality researchers by proposing and using a lexical approach to explore the dimensional structure of interpersonal communication styles. In their study, interpersonal communication style was defined as: “the characteristic way a person sends verbal, paraverbal, and nonverbal signals in social interactions denoting a) who s/he is or wants to (appear to) be, b) how s/he tends to relate to people with whom s/he interacts, and c) in what way his/her messages should usually be interpreted” (p. 179). This definition is not limited to the interpretation of the communicated message, but includes identity and interactional elements of communication styles. Self-ratings were provided on a selection of adjectives and verbs that described communication behaviors and based on a combination of statistical and content analyses, five to seven communication style dimensions were identified (De Vries, Bakker-Pieper et al., 2009). These were labeled expressiveness, preciseness, niceness, supportiveness, threateningness, emotionality, and reflectiveness.
In a subsequent study, a measurement instrument was developed, the Communication Styles Inventory (CSI, De Vries et al., in press). During the development process, the items that were written to reflect niceness, supportiveness, and threateningness repeatedly loaded on the same factor and ultimately it was decided that one overarching dimension would be created: verbal aggressiveness. Additionally, in the literature deceptive communicative behavior and impression management are considered important aspects of interpersonal behavior (Burgoon, Buller, Floyd, & Grandpre, 1996; Leary & Kowalski, 1990). These constructs seem to represent the communicative component of the personality trait honesty/humility. Somewhat surprisingly, even though in the definition of communication styles the communicator’s personality plays a role, the trait honesty/humility was not clearly identifiable in the lexical scales. The researchers decided to include items to represent a manipulative communication style.

In the final version, the CSI operationalized six main communication style dimensions, labeled expressiveness, preciseness, verbal aggressiveness, questioningness, emotionality, and impression manipulativeness (De Vries et al., in press). Expressiveness refers to a tendency to be talkative and to communicate informally, use humor, and ‘steer’ a conversation. Preciseness refers to a tendency to communicate well structured, to-the-point, and well thought-through. Verbal aggressiveness refers to a tendency to overpower a communication partner, i.e., by demonstrating anger and communicating authoritatively, but also in a non-supportive and merciless way. Questioningness refers to a tendency to communicate in an unconventional way and to have deeper discussions and be provocative, to actively seek other people’s views and opinions. Emotionality refers to a tendency to display negative emotions such as worries and tension, to be defensive in communications and to show sentimentality. And lastly, impression manipulativeness refers to a tendency to communicate in a manipulative way, e.g., by charming others or otherwise ingratiate oneself, and by not always displaying all of one’s thoughts and feelings. De Vries et al. (in press) found that the discriminant validities of the CSI scales were adequate. Furthermore, the CSI scales demonstrated the expected convergent validities with the lexical marker scales (derived from the lexical study, De Vries, Bakker-Pieper et al., 2009) and with the behavior-related communication styles scales of Gudykunst, Matsumoto, Ting-Toomey, Nishida, Kim, and Heyman (1996), Infante and Rancer (1982), and Infante and Wigley (1986).

In the abovementioned definition, communication styles are conceptualized as a reflection of the communicator’s personality. De Vries et al. (in press) found convergent correlations of the communication style scales with relevant HEXACO and NEO personality domain-level scales ranging from .25 to .74. Notably, even though measures for the personality dimension extraversion contain a relatively high number of items that reflect communication related behaviors, De Vries et al. (in press) found that the convergent correlation with the communication style expressiveness was not higher than most of the other convergent correlations. Only the correlations between CSI preciseness and
conscientiousness from both personality inventories were weak to modest; they were the lowest of the convergent correlations. This implies that someone who is highly conscientious is not necessarily a very precise communicator. CSI preciseness strongly correlated with Gudykunst et al.’s (1996) preciseness, however, the latter also strongly correlated with CSI questioningness. It seems as if CSI preciseness captures very specific behaviors, not encompassed by personality measures and more specific than other preciseness scales, which may well represent important and distinguishing aspects of someone’s communication style.

The potential contribution of the CSI to the literature is twofold. First, it may function as an organizing framework for investigating interpersonal communication styles, comparable to the five or six factor personality models for personality research (Beatty, 1998; Daly & Bippus, 1998). The CSI model provides a parsimonious set of dimensions, which have so far demonstrated weak to modest intercorrelations, - an indication that they are sufficiently independent -, whereas they seem to have convergent validity as they capture content that is included in the lexical marker scales and in several existing behavioral scales. The second contribution of the CSI is that we may use the model to investigate relations of actors’ communication styles with important life outcomes. De Vries, Bakker-Pieper et al. (2009, in press) indicated that there are several areas in which communication styles are predominant, such as relationship satisfaction and interpersonal conflict, and several settings in which interpersonal communication is central, such as leadership, teaching, sales, healthcare, and consultancy. In these areas and settings, communication style related research may further our understanding of these relations and outcomes. However, as the broad personality dimensions have been related to several important life outcomes, e.g., relation satisfaction (Watson, Hubbard, & Wiese, 2000; White, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2004), job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991), study results (O’Connor & Paunonen, 2007), and leadership success (Judge et al., 2002), the question is whether the CSI dimensions have incremental validity over personality dimensions for these important outcomes.

The present dissertation investigates leader communication styles and starts by addressing the question whether they have incremental validity for leader criteria over broad personality dimensions. Subsequently, specific aspects of the relations of leader communication styles with criteria will be investigated. Figure 1.1. depicts the research model, which will be described in detail below.
Research questions

Leader communication style research

The relevance of communication for leadership has long been acknowledged and there is ample research on leader communication, undertaken in various disciplines and from varying viewpoints. For this dissertation, leadership is defined as “the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives” (Yukl, 2010, p. 26). In the literature, different kinds of leaders are distinguished. Two important distinctions are appointed (by superiors in organizations) versus emerged (formally or informally elected in any kind of group) and distant versus proximal. There are several ways to define distance or proximity for leadership (Antonakis & Atwater, 2002), but we limit the definition to the hierarchical distance in an organization, i.e., direct versus indirect leaders (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004). In this dissertation, the focus is on the communication of proximal appointed leaders in organizations, often referred to as everyday supervisors. Consequently, the terms ‘leader’ and ‘supervisor’ are used interchangeably.

Scholars have recognized the importance of leader communication styles for understanding leader outcomes. In a review of the leader communication literature, Jablin (1979) summarized - among other - the findings of research on the differences in communication of effective versus ineffective supervisors. Although he concluded that the effects of situational factors needed to be further investigated, he also stated that “[c]lear evidence has been presented that suggests a certain profile that characterizes the
communication behaviors of effective supervisors” (p. 1211). In their study on communication behaviors of supervisors, Penley and Hawkins (1985) noted that “[...] what is communicated between supervisor and subordinate is intimately tied to how it is communicated” (p. 322), thus underlining the importance of leader communication styles. This dissertation will build on to these findings and will argue that effective leaders may differ from ineffective ones in the way they communicate.

There is an abundance of literature on a concept that at face value seems akin with communication styles in a leadership context: leadership styles (1,600,000 hits in Google Scholar). The early leadership style literature focused on consideration (or human-oriented) and initiating structure (task-oriented), which were later supplemented with charismatic-transformational leadership styles based on Burns’ (1978, in: Bass, 1999) model of leadership. Later the full range model of leadership was developed (Bass, 1999). Although the full range model of leadership and the instrument to measure its factors, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, have helped to organize research in the field (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003), several leadership styles are still investigated that may be outside the full range model scope, e.g., servant leadership (Van Dierendonck, 2011), so-called ‘dark’ leadership (Conger, 1990), authentic leadership (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008), and ethical leadership (Brown & Trevino, 2006). To (again) organize the research in this field, recently Redeker, De Vries, Roukhout, Vermeren, and De Fruyt (2011) have proposed the Circumplex Leadership Scan (CLS) model, which is based on the interpersonal circumplex (Wiggins, 1996). As interpersonal behavior is central in leadership styles as well as in communication styles, it seems reasonable to assume that the concepts are related. Indeed, De Vries, Bakker-Pieper, and Oostenveld (2010) used an early version of the CSI and found that communication styles predict leadership styles. However, not all leadership styles were predicted to a similar extent or by the same communication styles. As expected, the human-oriented and charismatic leadership styles were strongly but differentially related communication styles and task-oriented leadership was much less strongly related to communication styles. A better understanding of the differences in the concepts needs to be gained before hypothesizing about the possible relations and testing can take place. Although relevant for the leadership literature, the question of the exact relations between communication styles and leadership styles lies outside the scope of this dissertation.

Comparable to the research on personality before the conception of the five- or six-factor trait models and comparable to current research on leadership styles, research on leader communication styles so far has been rather fragmented. An abundance of instruments is available for measuring communication styles in general (Burgoon & Hale, 1987; Gudykunst et al., 1996; Norton, 1983) or in specific contexts (for an overview, see Rubin, Rubin, Graham, Perse, & Seibold, 2009). In the literature, sometimes communication style and communication delivery are distinguished from each other (e.g.,
Den Hartog & Verburg, 1997), but sometimes one of the two is used with highly comparable definitions (e.g., Awamleh & Gardner, 1999; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). Whether ‘style’ is used or ‘delivery’, the concept generally refers to attributes of the communicating individual, which is also reflected in the definition of interpersonal communication style that is used in this dissertation.

Findings for leader communication styles so far indicate that they are related to leader criteria; e.g., strong delivery predicted subordinate perceptions of leader charisma and effectiveness (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999), perceived leader coordinating and participating styles were related to the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX, Yrle Hartman, & Galle, 2002), leader communication style impacted team performance (Sagie, 1996), leader assertiveness and responsiveness were related to subordinate attitudes towards the leader (McCroskey & Richmond, 2000), and management communication style was related to several dimensions of employee satisfaction (Richmond, McCroskey, & Davis, 1982). Each of these studies used a different operationalization of the communication style concept, making it hard to interpret and integrate the various results. The CSI may contribute to a more coherent investigation of leader communication styles. However, as the communication styles of the CSI are so closely linked to personality traits (De Vries et al., in press), the question remains whether the CSI dimensions have incremental validity over personality dimensions for leader criteria.

**Narrow predictors of leader criteria**

We expect that communication styles indeed have incremental validity over personality traits for leader criteria. The reason for this expectation is that communication styles may be considered more restricted or more “narrow” constructs than personality traits. There is an ongoing debate in the literature on the use of broad versus narrow predictors in personality related research (Rothstein & Goffin, 2006). Ones and Visweswaran (1996) argued that broad dimensions may be preferable (i.e., have higher predictive validities) when the criterion is also broad, such as general job performance. However, there is ample research on the (incremental) validity of narrow constructs for predicting variables that vary considerably in underlying ‘broadness’, such as various human behaviors (e.g., Paunonen, Haddock, Forsterling, & Keinonen, 2003), study-related outcomes (e.g., De Vries, De Vries, & Born, 2011), and general work-related outcomes (e.g., Ashton, 1998). For leader criteria, we have identified two studies so far that investigated the incremental predictive validity of narrow constructs. The findings seem to confirm the added value of such constructs: Bergner, Neubauer, and Kreuzthaler (2010) found that narrow constructs that were conceptually linked with the criteria were more predictive than broad constructs, and Christiansen and Robie (2011) concluded that using a set of several narrow predictors to represent leader personality dimensions (rather than a combination of those broad dimensions) improved predictive validities for leader criteria.
Interpersonal communication styles are reflected in a subset of all human behaviors, i.e., communicative behaviors. Personality is reflected not only in interpersonal leader-role related behavior, but also in interpersonal non-leader-role related behavior, such as asking advice from a friend, and in intrapersonal states, such as attitudes and preferences. The broad personality dimensions take all of these elements into consideration (De Raad, 1995) and a number of items in general personality measures may therefore be hard to assess in a leader-subordinate situation. However, someone’s communication style can only be assessed by rating his/her communication related behavior, which is highly relevant in the leader-subordinate relationship. The CSI measures this specific subset of behavior.

Of the personality traits, leader extraversion and conscientiousness have consistently been found to be strongly related to leader criteria (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Judge et al., 2002). CSI expressiveness and preciseness are the strongest communication style correlates of these personality dimensions (De Vries et al., in press). The first research question for this dissertation therefore is:

**RQ1:** What is the incremental predictive validity of leader expressiveness and preciseness for leader criteria over leader extraversion and conscientiousness?

**Leader-subordinate agreement on leader communication styles and relations with outcomes**

There are two reasons why self-other agreement on predictor variables may be relevant. First, it may lead to behavioral adjustments, as awareness of a discrepancy in how another person rates your standing on a variable versus your own rating may lead you to change your behavior (Atwater, Waldman, Ostroff, Robie, & Johnson, 2005; Carver & Scheier, 1982). The second reason why self-other agreement may be relevant is that it may increase predictive validity for criteria (Atwater, Ostroff, Yammarino, & Fleenor, 1998; Oh, Wang, & Mount, 2011). Recently, scholars have argued that using both self- and other-ratings on a predictor variable may improve overall predictive validity as each rater uses unique information to come to his/her rating (Hogan, 2005; Hough & Oswald, 2005; Oh et al., 2011). Furthermore, the level of agreement (or the discrepancy) between the two ratings may also be related to the outcome. Thus the combined ratings may provide the most complete assessment. In the present dissertation, polynomial regression analyses are used, as both ratings can then be included in the analyses (Edwards, 1993, 1994).

In the literature, findings on the relations between leader self-ratings of various predictor variables, other-ratings, the level of self-other agreement, and outcomes are inconsistent. For predictors that are positively related to a criterion, the ‘general’ expectation was that self-other agreement at the most positive rating-level would be associated with the highest outcome ratings and that disagreement would be negatively
related to those outcomes (Fleenor, Smither, Atwater, Braddy, & Sturm, 2010). However, several studies found that over- or underrating by the leader was associated with the highest outcome ratings, that larger disagreement was positively related to outcomes, and some studies found no relation at all between self-other agreement and criteria (Fleenor et al., 2010). Explanations were proposed, but they seem incomplete and have not been tested. Nevertheless, given the importance of communication in the leader-subordinate relation, we expected that agreement on the nature of leader-subordinate interpersonal communication would be a prerequisite for positive outcomes. In line with previous studies, the second research question to be investigated in this dissertation therefore is:

**RQ2:** How is self-subordinate agreement on leader communication styles related to leader criteria?

**Perceived expertise and liking as potential mediators**

In the dissertation we will provide evidence for the expected relations of leader communication styles with leader criteria. However, a clear theoretical understanding of the nature of these relations has been lacking. We therefore focused on identifying potential mediators, bearing in mind that influencing others is a core element of most leadership definitions (Fairhurst, 2008; Vroom & Jago, 2007; Yukl, 2010; Zaccaro, 2007). In the literature, perceived expertise and liking have repeatedly been found to be important influence bases (e.g., Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1994; Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowski, 1998; Yukl & Falbe, 1991).

If a leader is perceived to be an expert, it may help him/her to influence subordinates, as they will assume that he/she knows best how to achieve certain goals. Indeed, in the literature, perceived expertise of the leader has frequently been related to leader criteria (e.g., Hysong, 2006; Lines, 2007). Leader behavior is assumed to contribute to him/her being perceived as an expert (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1994; Rahim, 1989; Yukl, 2010) and communicative behavior is important leader behavior that possibly also contributes to such perception. In the first studies of this dissertation (Chapters 2 and 3), evidence will be provided that leader expressiveness and preciseness are important predictors of various leader criteria. More specifically, behaviors related to expressiveness signal that the leader is at ease, feels comfortable and certain, and behaviors related to preciseness emit that the leader knows exactly what needs to be done. Hence, subordinates may perceive their leader to be an expert when he/she employs these communication styles. This reasoning leads to the following research question:

**RQ3a:** What is the role of perceived expertise in the relation of leader expressiveness and preciseness with leader criteria?
Equally, a leader who is liked may find it easier to influence subordinates than a leader who is disliked, however, in a different way: subordinates will want to help him/her to achieve goals. Liking has also repeatedly been related to leader criteria (e.g., Brown & Keeping, 2005; Rahim, 1989). Arguably, the way a leader communicates will contribute to him/her being liked by his/her subordinates. In our first studies (Chapters 2 and 3), we will provide evidence that, not only leader expressiveness, but also verbal aggressiveness is strongly predictive of affect-related criteria (i.e., satisfaction with the leader and quality of leader-member exchange). Whereas the highly social character of leader expressiveness presumably makes subordinates feel good, leader verbal aggressiveness may scare and antagonize them. Subordinates probably like a leader who makes them experience positive emotion and dislike one who makes them experience negative emotions. The next research question to be addressed in the dissertation therefore is:

*RQ3b:* What is the role of liking in the relation of leader expressiveness and verbal aggressiveness with leader criteria?

Theory on influence bases may help explain relations between leader communication styles and outcomes. Furthermore, two different routes to leader outcomes may be recognized. In the literature, four leader criteria domains are distinguished; effectiveness-related, attitude-related, cognition-related, and behavior-related (Avolio, Reichard, Hannah, Walumbwa, & Chan, 2009; Hiller, DeChurch, Murase, & Doty, 2011). We will argue that cognitions are more likely to play a role when another person’s expertise is judged. Leader effectiveness-related criteria - such as performance - are variables measuring personal and organizational results. Presumably, performance related information is cognitively processed to rate such criteria. On the other hand, we will argue that affect is more likely to play a role when liking is assessed. Leader attitude-related criteria - such as satisfaction - are variables related to emotions and feelings. If so, the relation of perceived expertise with leader performance will be stronger than that of perceived expertise with satisfaction with the leader, whereas for liking the opposite will hold true. In the dissertation the following research question will be investigated:

*RQ3c:* What is the difference in the relation of perceived expertise with leader criteria versus that of liking with those criteria?

Differential relations between leader communication styles and criteria

In the dissertation, we will propose that the underlying reason why leader expressiveness and preciseness may be related to outcomes is that they serve to help meet two basic human needs, i.e., the need to belong and the need to feel certain or reduce subjective uncertainty. The need to belong has long been identified as a fundamental human need (Ferguson, 1989). It leads people to interact and bond
(Baumeister & Leary, 1995). The need to reduce uncertainty leads to behavior that enables people to predict other people’s behavior and to determine their own future behavior (Hogg & Grieve, 1999; Olivares, 2010). Scholars argue that fulfillment of these needs brings both individual and social advantages (Berger, 1986; DeWall & Bushman, 2011; Hogg & Grieve, 1999). We will propose that leader expressiveness may serve to initiate and encourage interaction, thus creating a bond with subordinates which promotes feelings of belonging, whereas leader preciseness may serve to provide clarity for subordinates, thus enhancing their feeling of certainty.

In a similar vein, ratings on different criteria may depend on the fulfillment of a specific human need. Based on the above described distinction of four criteria domains in the literature (Avolio et al., 2009; Hiller et al., 2011), we will propose that the need to belong may underlie the relation of leader expressiveness with attitude- and behavior-related criteria, whereas the need to reduce uncertainty may underlie the relation of leader preciseness with effectiveness- and cognition-related criteria. If this is true, relations of leader expressiveness and preciseness with a criterion will differ depending on the criterion domain. Hence, the research question that will be investigated is:

\[ \text{RQ4: What are the differences in the relation of leader expressiveness with various leader criteria and that of leader preciseness with those criteria?} \]

**Overview of the chapters**

This dissertation consists of four empirical chapters. Possible redundancies between chapters 2, 3, and 4 are due to the fact that they were written as independent papers. Since chapters 2 to 5 were written in cooperation with co-authors, references to authors in these chapters are in ‘we’-form.

**Chapter 2** focuses on the investigation of potential incremental predictive validity of leader communication styles over broad leader personality dimensions (RQ1). We propose that expressiveness and preciseness are narrow constructs that are more predictive of leader criteria than the broad personality dimensions extraversion and conscientiousness. To examine this, two cross-sectional field studies were conducted. In the first, one questionnaire was used in which leader personality, leader communication styles, and two leader criteria were measured. In the second study, leader communication styles were measured at T1 and leader personality and five leader criteria were measured at T2 (about one week later). We report results of the statistical comparison of the studies and present the findings of the combined data.

**Chapter 3** describes the relation of self-subordinate agreement on leader communication styles with leader criteria (RQ2). Notwithstanding the findings in previous studies with other leader predictors, in view of the importance of communication for leadership, we propose that for variables that are positively related to a criterion, self-subordinate agreement on leader communication styles has incremental validity. Three
cross-sectional field studies were conducted in three organizations. Self- and subordinate-ratings on leader communication styles were obtained together with ratings on two leader criteria. Relations were investigated using polynomial regressions. We report results of the comparison of the three studies and present the findings of the combined data.

Chapter 4 focuses on two influence bases - perceived expertise and liking - as potential mediators of the relation between leader communication styles and criteria (RQ3). Based on 1) previously found relations of perceived expertise and liking with leader criteria, 2) proposed relations of expressiveness and preciseness with perceived expertise, and 3) proposed relations of expressiveness and verbal aggressiveness with liking, we suggest that perceived expertise and liking mediate the relations of these communication styles with leader criteria (RQ3a and 3b). Additionally, we discuss two pathways of processing information (a cognitive and an affective one), which leads us to hypothesize that perceived expertise is more strongly related to leader performance than to satisfaction with the leader, whereas for liking the opposite holds (RQ3c). The results from three cross-sectional field studies are reported; in the first, mediation through perceived expertise is tested, in the second mediation through liking, and in the third both proposed mediators are included.

Chapter 5 proposes a theoretical framework to explain why expressiveness and preciseness may be related to leader criteria. We argue that leader expressiveness and preciseness serve to meet two different fundamental human needs; the need to belong and the need to reduce uncertainty. We furthermore propose that ratings for variables in four different criteria domains are dependent on the level of fulfillment of one of the two needs. In a scenario study, leader expressiveness and preciseness were manipulated. Four criteria domains were represented by eight variables. The study was conducted to explore whether differential relations of leader expressiveness and preciseness with outcomes exist (RQ4). Additionally, we replicated part of the mediation studies (Chapter 4) to assess whether similar direct and indirect relations could be identified in this sample.

Chapter 6 presents the key findings from chapters 2 to 5, provides a discussion of the theoretical and practical implications of the findings, indicates potential weaknesses of the empirical studies, and outlines suggestions for further research.