14

A Passion for Leadership

MELISSA TRIVISONNO AND JULIAN BARLING

> A great leader's courage to fulfill his vision comes from passion, not position.
>
> —JOHN C. MAXWELL
>
> It is the love of what leaders do that keeps them motivated. Without passion, leading soon becomes stagnant and dull.
>
> —DONALD W. EKSTRAND

Leadership has long been a topic of substantial public interest, as is evident from the way in which it is so deeply embedded in our popular culture. Historians and philosophers have shared in this interest for centuries. Leadership in organizations is equally fascinating, and organizational psychologists across the world have been studying the topic intensively for decades (Barling, 2014). Most of this research has focused on leadership effectiveness, or the consequences

of leadership; thus, we now know what outcomes result from good (e.g., transformational leadership; Bass & Riggio, 2006) and bad (e.g., abusive supervision; Tepper, 2007) leadership behaviors. In contrast, much less attention has been devoted to understanding why these effects take place. Our goal in this chapter is to redress this situation, and we focus on the nature and consequences of a passion for leadership.

We begin with our initial conceptualization of the nature of the passion for leadership and generate a model of its potential behavioral and psychological consequences. In doing so, we draw from the dualistic model of passion (Vallerand et al., 2003) to introduce the harmonious and obsessive passion for leadership. Grounded in the existing developmental and organizational literatures, we then explain how the harmonious and obsessive passion for leadership may affect leaders' behaviors and well-being differently. Last, we raise several research questions that could advance our understanding of the nature and consequences of passion for leadership and discuss its applicability for practitioners in the field.

A PASSION FOR LEADERSHIP

Leadership involves influencing the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of others in an inspirational, relational, developmental, and ethical manner. According to Hannah, Avolio, Luthans, and Harms (2008), leaders must exert consistently high levels of effort to fulfill their leadership roles successfully. For example, leaders are expected to establish and implement a vision, motivate their followers (and sometimes their peers and leaders), set goals, develop future leaders, mentor, advise, listen, be empathic, and provide recognition (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Given the enormity of their roles, what could possibly sustain their persistence throughout this process? And in doing so, why are some leaders viewed as internally driven and others are described as slaves to external forces?

Based on the theoretical framework developed by Vallerand et al. (2003), which demonstrates the broad role of passion as a motivational

force toward specific activities (Vallerand et al., 2003) and specifically shows how the two components of passion are associated with various different outcomes (Marsh et al., 2013), an understanding of the passion for leadership using a dualistic approach may help answer these questions.

Accordingly, we define *passion for leadership* as a strong inclination toward engaging in leadership that one loves, values, and invests time and energy in on a regular basis and that is part of one's identity. Like Vallerand et al. (2003), we conceptualize two types of passion: harmonious and obsessive passion for leadership. Harmonious passion for leadership refers to a strong and controllable desire to engage in the activity; in this case, individuals choose to engage in leadership freely and willingly rather than from a feeling of obligation to do so. Given the flexible nature of harmonious passion (Vallerand et al., 2003), these leaders would know, for example, when to be engaged in leadership and when to turn their focus and attention to other activities. Furthermore, a harmonious passion for leadership occupies a meaningful, but not overwhelming, part of one's identity, as a result of which involvement in leadership would not come at the expense of other important roles (e.g., parent, spouse).

An obsessive passion for leadership would be very different. Motivated by the need to feel socially accepted and to protect one's self-worth (Lafrenière, Bélanger, Sedikides, & Vallerand, 2011; Mageau, Carpentier, & Vallerand, 2011), an obsessive passion for leadership would involve a strong and uncontrollable need to engage in leadership. Given these feelings of external control (Vallerand et al., 2003), an obsessive passion for leadership would manifest, for instance, in a relentless pursuit of and unhealthy involvement in the goal at hand, with leaders failing to establish reasonable expectations. As a result, an obsessive passion for leadership consumes leaders, yielding possible work–family conflicts and dysfunctional relationships.

It is important to note that, like previous scholars (Murnieks, Mosakowski, & Cardon, 2014; Vallerand et al., 2003), we view passion for leadership as a motivational construct. There is an underlying drive, desire, impulse, tendency, or striving to engage in leadership, and in this

sense, passions are viewed as active and purposive (Vallerand, 2015). Given its core motivational nature, it is also imperative to distinguish the passion for leadership from separate constructs existing within the leadership literature, namely, the motivation to lead (MTL; Chan & Drasgow, 2001). Differentiating these two constructs also helps bring greater clarity to the nature of the passion for leadership.

A Passion for Leadership Versus the Motivation to Lead

Chan and Drasgow (2001) define MTL as "an individual-differences construct that affects a leader's or leader-to-be's decisions to assume leadership training, roles, and responsibilities and that affect his or her intensity of effort at leading and persistence as a leader" (p. 482). Furthermore, MTL is composed of three related but distinct dimensions: the affective, social-normative, and noncalculative motivation to lead. Affective MTL refers to a natural tendency to lead others; individuals enjoy leading and see themselves as leaders. Social-normative MTL involves leading out of a sense of duty or responsibility. Noncalculative MTL centers on the agreement to lead without calculating the costs and benefits; individuals lead because of their agreeable disposition and the value they place on group harmony, rather than because they expect rewards or privileges (Chan & Drasgow, 2001).

Although MTL and passion for leadership are both motivational constructs, they differ significantly with regard to affective intensity, meaningfulness, identity, persistence, and overall purpose. First, both constructs refer to different intensities of affect; affective MTL is defined as a liking for leadership, whereas passion entails a profound or deep love for leadership. Research by Kelloway, Inness, Barling, Francis, and Turner (2010) provides similar support for this intensity distinction by differentiating between job satisfaction and the love for one's work. In particular, these authors point out that job satisfaction describes how content individuals are with their work (Spector, 1997), whereas love

of the job refers to a more intense longing for one's work (Kelloway et al., 2010).

Second, MTL and the passion for leadership differ in terms of the meaningful role that leadership plays in leaders' lives. As already noted, Chan and Drasgow (2001) conceptualize MTL as the enjoyment derived from leading others, a felt obligation to lead, or a noncalculative involvement. In sharp contrast, passion for leadership explicitly recognizes that engagement in a leadership role is highly prioritized. In certain cases, engaging in leadership may be so valuable that it is the only way that leaders can gain a sense of meaning; indeed, Vallerand (2015) states that "people come to 'live life in brackets' until they rejoin the object of their devotion" (p. 29).

Third, unlike MTL, passion for leadership states that individuals identify with their role as leaders. In particular, and consistent with self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000), individuals develop a harmonious or obsessive passion depending on whether they experience an autonomous (i.e., purely out of choice and love for the activity) or controlled (i.e., forced choice and conflict of own interests) internalization process, respectively (see Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2003, for a more comprehensive review). This distinction is important because not only do individuals internalize leader identities but also they identify with their leadership roles in adaptive or maladaptive ways (Vallerand, 2015). As a result, differentiating between these two identification processes may be conducive to different leadership experiences.

Fourth, although both constructs are associated with effort investment and long-term persistence, the passion for leadership describes this in some detail. Specifically, in line with Vallerand et al. (2003), our conceptualization identifies and differentiates between flexible or rigid persistence, which depends on whether harmonious or obsessive passion for leadership is experienced, respectively. Distinguishing between the two is important because the extent of the persistence may be sufficient to explain when leader persistence becomes detrimental rather than beneficial.

Last, MTL is theorized to influence why individuals participate in leadership roles, but our dualistic model of the passion for leadership goes

further, with an understanding of the differential outcomes of harmonious and obsessive passion. Specifically, the MTL model has been used to predict individuals' motivation to occupy a leadership role, often referred to as leadership role occupancy (Barling, 2014). There has been no attempt to extend the MTL model to an understanding of how leaders might behave once in that leadership role. In contrast, based on the dualistic model of passion (Vallerand et al., 2003), the nature of a harmonious versus obsessive passion for leadership allows us to suggest how they will result in different leadership behaviors, and how each might affect leader well-being differently.

To illustrate these differences, if a group of students were randomly assigned to complete a task, the motivation to lead (out of enjoyment, obligation, or noncalculative involvement) could help identify who emerges as the group's leader. However, once assuming the leadership role, the motivation to lead would not explain *why* the leader engages in various positive or negative leadership behaviors to ensure task completion. Instead, given the intensity, meaningfulness, persistence, identity, and dualistic elements of passion, the harmonious and obsessive passion for leadership would help clarify, for example, why the leader may enact high-quality (e.g., inspirational) or poor-quality (e.g., overcontrolling) leadership behaviors, respectively.

Taken together, the dualistic model of a passion for leadership will help us understand the determinants of positive and negative leadership. In a literature that has been dominated by a focus on leadership effectiveness (Barling, 2014), understanding the antecedents of high- and poor-quality leadership is much needed. We therefore turn our attention to this idea in the next section.

HARMONIOUS PASSION FOR LEADERSHIP AND HIGH-QUALITY LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS

As noted throughout this Handbook, harmonious passion is associated with a host of positive outcomes (e.g., flow, positive affect, relationship quality). Similarly, much of the existing leadership literature shows the

positive effects of high-quality leadership on a range of organizational outcomes (Barling, 2014). Based on these two different literatures, we now explain why the harmonious passion for leadership would result in high-quality leadership. However, an important note: There is no shortage of theories of high-quality leadership, and these would include transformational leadership, leader–member exchange, authentic leadership, ethical leadership, authoritarian leadership, servant leadership, and spiritual leadership. We focus our discussion on transformational leadership and leader–member exchange for several reasons: First, space simply precludes a more comprehensive analysis. Second, despite some differences, there are substantial similarities across these theories, such that examining them all would be redundant (Anderson & Sun, 2015). Last, extensive research has been conducted on transformational leadership and leader–member exchange (Barling, 2014), providing a more robust basis for this discussion.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is composed of four separate but related leadership behaviors (Bass & Riggio, 2006). First, *idealized influence* refers to the ethical component of transformational leadership, through which leaders serve as role models, act with humility and integrity, and show a profound respect for others. Leaders high in idealized influence transcend their own self-interest and are not influenced by organizational pressures for short-term financial outcomes, but rather focus on the long-term benefits for the collective good of the organization. Second, *inspirational motivation* reflects behaviors that inspire and encourage others to perform beyond their own expectations (Bass, 1985). Leaders high in inspirational motivation instill a mindset in others that they can overcome obstacles or setbacks, therefore nurturing a sense of employee self-efficacy. Third, *intellectual stimulation* involves behaviors that encourage employees to think for themselves, question their long-held ideas and beliefs, and restructure the way in which they conduct their work. Finally,

individualized consideration centers on behaviors such as listening, compassion, care, empathy, and recognition that support employee development and, more broadly, well-being. By recognizing followers' needs and capabilities, mutual trust is established and high-quality leader–follower relationships are formed (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Nonetheless, empirical studies have often failed to confirm the distinctive nature of the four components of transformational leadership, typically combining the four components to reflect a unidimensional measure (e.g., Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). We follow suit as we discuss the potential effects of harmonious passion for leadership on transformational leadership.

Whether spending time on helping employees achieve their goals, making sacrifices for the good of the group, or providing organizational support, these examples of transformational leadership center on the development and general well-being of employees rather than leaders' own self-interest (Bass, 1985). We suggest that the harmonious passion for leadership plays an important role in predicting transformational leadership for several reasons. First, harmonious passion involves a willingness or desire to engage in the targeted activity (Vallerand et al., 2003) and is associated with positive affect (Vallerand et al., 2006). As such, leaders high in harmonious passion may freely and willingly choose to help others because of the joy they experience from watching others succeed.

Second, in addition to representing a willingness to engage in leadership, harmonious passion for leadership also reflects a significant but healthy part of the leader's identity. In turn, this internalization may generate a sense of responsibility for leaders to act in ways that benefit or support others and focus on group interests (what Johnson, Venus, Lanaj, Mao, & Chang, 2012, refer to as collective identity)—the essence of transformational leadership. In a cross-sectional field study of 310 leaders, Gilbert, Horsman, and Kelloway (2016) found a significant association between the motivation for transformational leadership—conceptualized as intrinsic motivation; integrated, identified, introjected, and external regulation; and amotivation—and transformational leadership over and above the effects of general MTL. In particular, identified regulation, external

regulation, and amotivation were significant unique predictors of transformational leadership, although intrinsic motivation was not (Gilbert et al., 2016). Given that intrinsic motivation was hypothesized to best predict transformational leadership, the authors speculate that intrinsic motivation may not be sufficient to prompt individuals to sacrifice their own interests. We agree and suggest that it is the integration of personal values and beliefs that is consistent with the identity element of harmonious passion for leadership that would precede transformational leadership.

Third, findings demonstrate that fostering an autonomous orientation, a tendency toward volitional engagement, positively influences harmonious passion (Vallerand et al., 2006), as well as prosocial behaviors (Gagné, 2003), which are similar to the behaviors described in transformational leadership (Gilbert et al., 2016). Given that harmonious passion results from an autonomous internalization process (Vallerand et al., 2003), harmonious passion may act as a mechanism for transformational leadership. In other words, leaders may be autonomously motivated to help others because they are harmoniously passionate about leadership.

Empirical studies are beginning to examine the link between harmonious passion and transformational leadership in related contexts. In one study, survey data collected from 139 leader–follower dyads in North America identified the role of harmonious passion for the environment. Robertson and Barling (2013) showed that environmentally specific transformational leadership was indirectly associated with employees' environmental behaviors, and that this relationship was mediated by employees' pro-environmental harmonious passion. In a separate study, Sirén, Patel, and Wincent (2016) investigated the association between CEO strategic change leadership and firm financial performance among 80 CEOs and 163 followers in the Finnish software industry. They again identified a role for harmonious passion, in this case, the harmonious passion for work. More specifically, their results showed that CEO harmonious passion for work strengthened the positive association between CEO change-oriented leadership and firm performance in terms of both sales and profit growth (Sirén et al., 2016). Although the findings from both studies begin to demonstrate the influential role of harmonious passion on follower and

organizational outcomes, more research is needed to extend this focus by investigating the effects of leaders' own passion—in particular, whether and how harmonious passion for leadership relates to transformational leadership.

Leader–Member Exchange

Compared to transformational leadership, which mainly focuses on the behavior of the leader, leader–member exchange (LMX) takes a relational perspective and highlights the quality of the leader–member relationship. LMX postulates that leaders develop unique relationships with each of their employees and in time mutually influence one another (Graen & Cashman, 1975). In other words, rather than assume a top-down approach from leader to follower, LMX emphasizes the bidirectional influence of leader–follower dyads. As a result, high-quality LMX relationships, defined by aspects such as role latitude, autonomy, trust, support, and involvement in decision making, result in better organizational outcomes than poor-quality LMX relationships, characterized by elements such as one-way communication and downward influence, role distinctions, contractual obligations, and social distance (Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999).

We propose that harmonious passion for leadership will likely be associated with high-quality LMX for several reasons. First, as discussed in the previous section, individuals identify with their roles as leaders. However, rather than internalize values that focus on benefiting the group, leaders may identify with forming close relationships that demonstrate personal concern and support with each employee (what Johnson et al., 2012, refer to as relational identity), which is consistent with behaviors characteristic of high-quality LMX relationships. Second, because harmonious passion involves adaptability to changing situations (Vallerand et al., 2003), leaders high in harmonious passion may also be in a better position to understand relational dynamics, such as knowing when to be more or less involved in relationships with different subordinates (e.g., knowing when to provide social support, role latitude).

Some support for the influence of harmonious passion on relationship quality emerges from outside of the organizational context. Within the sports domain, Lafrenière, Jowett, Vallerand, Donahue, and Lorimer (2008) investigated the role of harmonious passion on the quality of the coach–athlete relationship. Data from 106 coaches showed that harmonious passion toward sport predicted higher quality coach–athlete relationships, and that this effect was mediated by positive emotions. Similar findings emerged in a separate study. Using 103 coach–athlete dyads, coaches' autonomy-supportive behaviors mediated the positive relationship between coaches' harmonious passion toward coaching and coach–athlete relationship quality (Lafrenière, Jowett, Vallerand, & Carbonneau, 2011).

Further evidence for the idea that harmonious passion influences relationship quality comes from research on interpersonal relationships. For example, in regards to romantic relationships, Carbonneau and Vallerand (2013) showed in a diary study over a 10-day period that harmonious passion positively predicted reparative behaviors following conflict and was negatively related to destructive conflict behavior. Separately, Ratelle, Carbonneau, Vallerand, and Mageau (2013) examined the broad effects of romantic passion on relationship quality in three studies. The results demonstrated that harmonious passion predicted better adaptive relationship outcomes, such as commitment, satisfaction, intimacy, trust, sexual passion, and love, compared to obsessive passion toward one's partner (Studies 1 and 2), and that one was more likely to still be involved in a romantic relationship with the same partner 3 months later (Study 3; Ratelle et al., 2013).

Studies within the organizational context may be even more revealing for an understanding of the passion for leadership, and it is in this respect that Philippe, Vallerand, Houlfort, Lavigne, and Donahue's (2010) study is especially relevant. Based on survey data collected from 195 employees, they found that positive emotions positively mediated the relationship between harmonious passion and interpersonal relationship quality (Philippe et al., 2010). The findings from both relational and work contexts provide empirical support for the influence of

harmonious passion on high-quality relationships and may lead one to ask the question of whether its positive effects also emerge in a leadership setting.

In our own organizational research (Trivisonno & Barling, 2017), we investigated the relationship between harmonious passion for leadership and employee perceptions of LMX. Participants were recruited via Clearvoice Research (http://clearvoiceresearch.com) and asked to complete an online survey. The sample consisted of 65 leaders (39% male) and 65 followers (52% male) from various industries, including financial, manufacturing, education, health care, and sales and services. After controlling for obsessive passion for leadership, the results demonstrated that harmonious passion for leadership predicted high-quality LMX. However, because the study was cross-sectional in nature, future research should also examine whether harmonious passion for leadership has long-term benefits on the quality of the LMX relationship.

Taken together, the findings begin to point toward the role of harmonious passion for leadership in high-quality leadership. Specifically, individuals who love, freely engage in, and invest time on leadership that is meaningful and considered a part of their identity may be more likely to exhibit transformational leadership and high-quality LMX behaviors. Although the association between harmonious passion for leadership and transformational leadership remains to be investigated, initial results suggest that harmonious passion for leadership positively influences LMX.

OBSESSIVE PASSION FOR LEADERSHIP AND POOR-QUALITY LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS

Although our discussion thus far has focused on the potential beneficial effects of harmonious passion for high-quality leadership, the role of obsessive passion in the development of poor-quality leadership is equally intriguing. In the following section, we review different literatures to understand how obsessive passion for leadership could influence

poor-quality leadership, most notably abusive supervision and supervisor overcontrol.

Abusive Supervision

First introduced by Ben Tepper in 2000, abusive supervision has become one of the most frequently studied negative leadership behaviors (Martinko, Harvey, Brees, & Mackey, 2013). Abusive supervision is defined as "subordinates' perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact" (Tepper, 2000, p. 178), and examples include mocking, yelling at, and lying to employees; criticizing and belittling employees in front of others; and blaming employees for one's own mistakes. These behaviors are displayed periodically rather than frequently, which is harmful as it gives employees false hope that their psychological abuse has finally ended (Barling, 2014). More troublesome, Duffy, Ganster, and Pagon (2002) found that switching between considerate and abusive supervision had more detrimental effects on the individual than a consistent pattern of abusive management.

Abusive supervision results in an abundance of negative outcomes, such as diminished psychological health, employee deviance, and turnover (see Tepper, 2007, for a review), and we seek to understand why leaders engage in such ineffective, and indeed harmful, behaviors and turn our attention to an obsessive passion for leadership for some guidance. Given the rigid nature of persistence characterized by obsessive passion, in which the activity comes to control and overwhelm the individual (Vallerand et al., 2003), leaders may feel a loss of control and, as a result, engage in angry or hostile behaviors in an attempt to maintain or regain control. Research lends support for this notion, showing that feelings of injustice and low self-control coupled with trait anger predict hostile coping behaviors of interpersonal sabotage (Ambrose, Seabright, & Schminke, 2002) and verbal assaults (Douglas & Martinko, 2001), respectively, which are similar to the behaviors found in abusive supervision. In addition, data collected

on 40 mothers showed that feeling that one had little parental control (but that the child in question yielded more control) was associated with child abuse and a greater use of coercive force in interactions with their children (Bugental, Blue, & Cruzcosa, 1989).

Furthermore, because various pressures (e.g., self-esteem) are attached to activity engagement in obsessive passion (Vallerand et al., 2003), we suggest that leader identity may be threatened by various organizational factors, such as poor employee performance. To clarify, leaders high in obsessive passion who perceive their employees to be performing well below their expectations could internalize the poor performance as a failure that threatens their identity as competent leaders. Supporting this, Tepper, Moss, and Duffy (2011) showed that abusive supervisors were more likely to target lower performing employees. Thus, assuming that leaders resort to using hostile coping mechanisms, poor employee performance could moderate the link between obsessive passion for leadership and abusive supervision.

Supporting the effects of an obsessive passion for leadership on abusive supervision, the study by Trivisonno and Barling (2017) described earlier investigated the influence of obsessive passion for leadership on despotic leadership, defined as behaviors that are self-aggrandizing and exploitative of others, domineering, vengeful, and controlling (Aronson, 2001; De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2008). After controlling for harmonious passion for leadership, the obsessive passion for leadership predicted despotic leadership, suggesting that individuals being obsessively passionate about leadership may have deleterious consequences for employees.

Supervisor Overcontrol

Overcontrol refers to directing or constraining the actions, thoughts, or emotions of others (e.g., spouses; Ehrensaft, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Heyman, O'Leary, & Lawrence, 1999). From a workplace perspective, overcontrolling supervision would include pressuring employees to work at a certain pace, closely monitoring employees' performance for

errors, and placing constraints on employees' breaks from work (Dupré & Barling, 2006).

A certain amount or type (e.g., interactional monitoring; Liao & Chun, 2016) of supervisory control is appropriate, but too much control, or control achieved with no input from employees (what Liao & Chun, 2016, refer to as observational control), has detrimental consequences for subordinates (Dupré, Barling, & LeBlanc, 2004; Shirom, Melamed, & Nir-Dotan, 2000). For example, Dupré and Barling (2006) showed that feeling overcontrolled indirectly predicted lower quality work performance and psychological and physical aggression directed at supervisors through feelings of unfairness. Similarly, observational control resulted in employees' distrust of their supervisors, and ultimately poor-quality idea generation (Liao & Chun, 2016). Given its negative consequences, why supervisors might choose to behave this way is a crucial question for leadership scholars and organizational practitioners alike, and we suggest that obsessive passion for leadership plays an important role.

Obsessive passion toward any target involves an engagement born of a sense of insecurity and uncertainty, one in which negative events are experienced as a threat to one's identity (Vallerand, 2015). From a leadership perspective, this obsessive passion results in a strong and uncontrollable need to engage in leadership. Thus, when leaders feel threatened, either interpersonally or by the difficulties inherent in leadership, they are likely to enact self-protective or self-enhancing behaviors in an attempt to keep or regain control. However, rather than engage in hostile coping behaviors, leaders may succumb to supervisory overcontrol. Based on evidence from the social psychology literature, we suggest that one reason for the tendency to submit to overcontrol is that failure in the leadership role would be a significant and unacceptable threat to their self-worth (Ng, Pomerantz, & Deng, 2014). As a result, leaders resort to rigorous control of the situation to maintain or restore a secure sense of self. Supporting this notion, Bélanger, Lafrenière, Vallerand, and Kruglanski (2013) demonstrated that fear of failure positively mediated the association between obsessive passion and task performance, but only when task performance entailed important negative consequences for the self.

Research on parenting and child behavior provides some support of a link between obsessive passion and overcontrolling behavior. A study of 160 women demonstrated a negative relationship between low perceived control and high levels of defensive arousal and negative affect with unresponsive children (Bugental et al., 1993). More recently, using a sample of 66 dual-earner mothers and fathers, Guzell and Vernon-Feagans (2004) found an association between low perceived parental control and more directive play with infants, which included more questioning, reminding, correcting, urging, and restraining of their infants during play. Given potential similarities in the negative effects of perceived low control within dyadic relationships, we propose that feelings of low or external control in leadership would predict supervisory overcontrol.

Thus, we suggest that there is a plausible link between obsessive passion for leadership and poor-quality leadership, expressed as either abusive or overcontrolling supervision. However, we propose not only that harmonious and obsessive passion affect leadership quality but also that these two passions for leadership influence leaders' own well-being; we now turn our attention to this issue in the next section.

PASSION FOR LEADERSHIP AND LEADERS' WELL-BEING

There is a long tradition of research examining the effects of positive and negative leadership on employees' well-being (e.g., Arnold, Turner, Barling, Kelloway, & McKee, 2007; Bamberger & Bacharach, 2006; Barling & Frone, 2017), yet leaders' own well-being has received far less attention. The discrepancy in the extent to which employees and leaders have been the focus of research is so large that it is worthy of research in itself (Barling & Cloutier, 2017), but we limit ourselves in this chapter to an examination of how the passion for leadership affects leaders' well-being, and how the two types of passion may influence leaders' well being differently.

Based on conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989, 2001), individuals seek to obtain and protect a limited supply of resources (e.g., personal characteristics, objects, energies, or conditions) that they value. However, once resources are depleted, lost, or difficult to replenish, individuals will experience stress, and may also be prone to further resource loss. We propose that passion for leadership may be viewed as a valued resource for leaders and may have positive or negative outcomes for leader well-being depending on whether the quality of the leadership is harmonious or obsessive, respectively.

Given the flexible nature of harmonious passion, in which the individual is able to freely engage in and disengage from the activity without negative repercussions (Vallerand et al., 2015), as well as its association with positive affect (Mageau & Vallerand, 2007), leaders may be less likely to feel depleted because they may not be required to expend as many resources. As a result, harmonious passion for leadership may be more likely to promote leader well-being. Empirical research provides support for the positive effects of harmonious passion on various psychological adjustment indices, including flow (Carpentier, Mageau, & Vallerand, 2012), feelings of vitality (Vallerand et al., 2006), and life satisfaction (Lafrenière, Vallerand, Donahue, & Lavigne, 2009).

In contrast, based on the rigid persistence of obsessive passion, whereby the individual becomes fixated or controlled by the activity and thus it conflicts with other aspects of one's life (Vallerand, 2015) and results in higher levels of negative affect (Vallerand et al., 2006), leaders may be more likely to feel depleted due to the high expenditure of resources. Consequently, obsessive passion for leadership may lead to poor outcomes of psychological and/or physical well-being. Supporting this, several studies demonstrate that obsessive passion is associated with greater rumination (Ratelle, Vallerand, Mageau, Rousseau, & Provencher, 2004), increased stress levels (Philippe, Vallerand, Andrianarisoa, & Brunel, 2009), and psychological burnout (Vallerand, Paquet, Philippe, & Charest, 2010).

Examining the potential effects of harmonious and obsessive passion for leadership on leader well-being is crucial because it may also shed light on

leader behavior. For example, from the limited research examining leaders' mental health, several studies provide support for the negative influence of leaders' depression and anxiety on leadership quality. Byrne et al. (2014) demonstrated that leaders' symptoms of depression and anxiety negatively related to transformational leadership and positively related to abusive supervision. Using data from 215 leader–follower dyads, Mawritz, Folger, and Latham (2014) showed that both leaders' anxiety and anger mediated the relationship between exceedingly difficult job goals and abusive supervision.

Moving beyond depression and anxiety, empirical research also highlights the prevalence of alcohol use at work, as well as its negative effects on leadership behaviors. Based on a national probability sample of 2,805 employed adults in the United States, managers were more likely to consume alcohol while at work, be under the influence of alcohol during the workday, and work with a hangover compared to other high-risk occupations (Frone, 2006). Furthermore, alcohol consumption at work showed a negative effect on both transformational leadership and abusive supervision (Byrne et al., 2014).

Taken together, the findings suggest that leaders need to be psychologically equipped to function effectively. Although factors such as depression, anxiety, and alcohol consumption are critical in explaining the way leaders behave with others, harmonious and obsessive passion may help to clarify why leaders' experience well-being to begin with. Based on the potential similarities in the effects of harmonious and obsessive passion on well-being across different contexts, future research is warranted to investigate whether harmonious and obsessive passion for leadership may also predict leaders' well- and ill-being, respectively.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Given that our understanding of the nature of the passion for leadershi is still in its infancy, we propose several avenues for future research tha could advance its conceptualization. Specifically, we suggest that futu

research might focus on (a) the development of the harmonious and obsessive passion for leadership, (b) individual differences in the passion for leadership, and (c) understanding how the harmonious and obsessive passion for leadership exert their direct and indirect effects (i.e., mediators, moderators).

First, given that our model focused on potential behavioral and psychological consequences of passion for leadership, we encourage scholars to examine various determinants that may explain whether and how passion for leadership is developed. Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) states that individuals learn behaviors by direct experience or by observing others, and maintain these same behaviors through reinforcement. It may be the case that individuals develop, and possibly maintain, the passion for leadership by observing and modeling the behavior of others, such as parental and nonparental influences. For instance, overcontrolling parenting undermined children's lower self-regulation, competence, and achievement in school, and was associated with higher levels of acting out (Grolnick & Apostoleris, 2002). Separately, in two studies, Mageau et al. (2009) showed that perceived (Study 1) and actual (Study 2) parental autonomy support were conducive to children's harmonious passion toward an activity.

From a leadership perspective, Zacharatos, Barling, and Kelloway (2000) investigated the effects of transformational parenting behaviors on adolescents' leadership behavior. Based on data collected from 112 adolescents from three different sources (self-report, their peers, and their coach), adolescents who perceived their fathers to use child-rearing behaviors consistent with transformational leadership when interacting with them were more likely to display these behaviors themselves in a sports context (Zacharatos, Barling, & Kelloway, 2000). Tucker, Turner, Barling, and McEvoy (2010) examined the influence of parents' and coaches' transformational leadership behaviors on players' on-ice aggression. The results demonstrated that higher levels of team-level coach transformational leadership, but not parents' transformational leadership, predicted lower levels of team-level aggression, which in turn predicted lower levels of player aggression (Tucker et al., 2010). These findings suggest that passion

for leadership may also be explained in a social learning framework (e.g., observation, direct experience; Bandura, 1977). Future research is warranted to explain whether individuals develop a passion for leadership by observing and modeling the behavior of salient others (e.g., parents and coaches).

Second, it may be interesting to investigate individual differences associated with harmonious and obsessive passion for leadership. To clarify, Vallerand (2015) states that although one type of passion may be more prevalent than the other, both types of passion are nevertheless present within individuals to varying degrees. It may be possible to trigger either type of passion by activating various personal or situational factors (Vallerand, 2015). For example, given the negative correlation between neuroticism and transformational leadership (Bono & Judge, 2004), the positive effects of harmonious passion for leadership on transformational leadership may be attenuated when leaders are perceived as anxious, distressed, or insecure (i.e., exhibiting a neurotic personality).

Finally, more research is necessary to investigate the mechanisms or conditions under which passion for leadership exerts its influence. For instance, because passion for leadership may influence leaders' well-being, and leaders' well-being affects the quality of their leadership behaviors (e.g., Barnes, Lucianetti, Bhave, & Christian, 2015; Byrne et al., 2014) research could investigate if any effects of passion for leadership on leadership behaviors are mediated by leaders' well-being. Furthermore, more research is needed to investigate whether obsessive passion for leadership results in abusive or overcontrolling supervision, as well as examine various personal or social factors that may exacerbate or mitigate these relationships. For example, self-control moderated the association between parental undermining and abusive supervision such that parental undermining was less likely to influence abusive supervision when supervisor self-control was high (Kiewitz et al., 2012). Kremen and Block (1998) also suggest that the effects of self-control may be curvilinear, such that individuals with very low self-control may be prone to engage in impulsive, risky or otherwise destructive behaviors (i.e., similar to abusive supervision

whereas those with very high self-control may be more involved in activities that constrain or inhibit the behaviors of others (i.e., similar to supervisory overcontrol).

In addition, our chapter thus far assumes that harmonious passion and obsessive passion for leadership result in positive and negative outcomes, respectively. However, data collected from 233 elite hockey players showed that, in highly competitive leagues, athletes with obsessive passion reported better psychological adjustment than athletes with harmonious passion. In contrast, in less competitive leagues, athletes with harmonious passion predicted higher psychological adjustment indices compared to those with obsessive passion (Amiot, Vallerand, & Blanchard, 2006). Based on these findings, context seems to be an important boundary condition, and just how context moderates the effects of harmonious and obsessive passion for leadership needs to be understood further.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Understanding the nature and effects of passion for leadership could provide important managerial implications. One area where this understanding might be useful is for leader selection. Much of the early research shows that decisions were based solely on "hard" skills (Barling, 2014), such as intellectual ability, experience, and job-relevant knowledge (Fiedler, 1996). In contrast, new-genre leadership theories (e.g., transformational leadership, LMX) emphasize the inspirational or relational nature of leadership, or what are currently described as "soft" skills. Organizations are now targeting soft skills to improve organizational performance (Pfeffer, 2010; Pfeffer & Veiga, 1999), and we extend this notion by suggesting that organizations might consider whether screening individuals for passion for leadership enhances the validity of the selection process. As research findings emerge showing that the two types of passion are associated with different leadership behaviors, translating these findings into the leadership selection process could become increasingly credible.

Examining the nature and consequences of passion for leadership may also provide some benefit to leadership development initiatives. Currently, organizations tend to select leaders to attend leadership development workshops based on high performance and organizational loyalty (Barling, 2014). This makes superficial sense; why should organizations allocate considerable resources toward underperforming or less committed individuals? However, Barling (2014) questions the adequacy of this approach in that involvement in leadership development is a way of rewarding high-performing leaders rather than helping struggling leaders to improve their leadership. One way to remedy this issue would be to assess which individuals might benefit most from attending leadership development initiatives; after all, it would make little sense for those not motivated to engage in the demands of leadership to be sent on such initiatives. If research findings do indeed confirm that harmonious passion for leadership is associated with high-quality leadership and with leadership effectiveness, as early findings suggest (Trivisonno & Barling, 2017), organizations might now be able to preselect those who are most likely to benefit from costly leadership development initiatives based on their specific passion for leadership.

CONCLUSION

Much is known about the outcomes of leadership, but much less is known about the antecedents of high- and low-quality leadership. Based on the dualistic model of passion (Vallerand et al., 2003), we introduce the idea of a dualistic passion for leadership and describe the nature of a harmonious and an obsessive passion for leadership. As research on the two components of passion for leadership unfolds, the potential exists for new conceptual knowledge about the passion for leadership and the antecedents and development of leadership behaviors, which may offer important ideas for the selection and development of organizational leaders.

REFERENCES

Ambrose, M. L., Seabright, M. A., & Schminke, M. (2002). Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 89*, 947–965.

Amiot, C. E., Vallerand, R. J., & Blanchard, C. M. (2006). Passion and psychological adjustment: A test of the person-environment fit hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 220–229.

Anderson, M. H., & Sun, P. Y. (2015). Reviewing leadership styles: Overlaps and the need for a new "full-range" theory. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 19*, 76–96. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12082

Arnold, K. A., Turner, N., Barling, J., Kelloway, E. K., & McKee, M. C. (2007). Transformational leadership and psychological well-being: The mediating role of meaningful work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*, 193–203.

Aronson, E. (2001). Integrating leadership styles and ethical perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 18*, 244–256.

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

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Barling, J. (2014). *The science of leadership: Lessons from research for organizational leaders*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Barling, J., & Cloutier, A. (2017). Leaders' mental health at work: Empirical, methodological, and policy directions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*, 394–406.

Barling, J., & Frone, M. R. (2017). If only my leader would just do something! Passive leadership undermines employee well-being through role stressors and psychological resource depletion. *Stress and Health, 33*, 211–222. doi:10.1002/smi.2697

Barnes, C. M., Lucianetti, L., Bhave, D. P., & Christian, M. S. (2015). "You wouldn't like me when I'm sleepy": Leaders' sleep, daily abusive supervision, and work unit engagement. *Academy of Management Journal, 58*, 1419–1437.

Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bélanger, J. J., Lafrenière, M. A. K., Vallerand, R. J., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2013). Driven by fear: The effect of success and failure information on passionate individuals' performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*, 180–195.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 901–910.

Bugental, D. B., Blue, J., Cortez, V., Fleck, K., Kopeikin, H., Lewis, J. C., & Lyon, J. (1993). Social cognitions as organizers of autonomic and affective responses to social challenge. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*, 94–103.

Bugental, D. B., Blue, J., & Cruzcosa, M. (1989). Perceived control over caregiving outcomes: Implications for child abuse. *Developmental Psychology, 25*, 532–539.

Byrne, A., Dionisi, A. M., Barling, J., Akers, A., Robertson, J., Lys, R., . . . & Dupré, K. (2014). The depleted leader: The influence of leaders' diminished psychological resources on leadership behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 25*, 344–357.

Carbonneau, N., & Vallerand, R. J. (2013). On the role of harmonious and obsessive romantic passion in conflict behavior. *Motivation and Emotion, 37*, 743–757.

Carpentier, J., Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2012). Ruminations and flow: Why do people with a more harmonious passion experience higher well-being? *Journal of Happiness Studies, 13*, 501–518.

Chan, K. Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 481–498.

De Hoogh, A. H., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *Leadership Quarterly, 19*, 297–311.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.* New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 227–268.

Den Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70*, 19–34.

Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 547–559.

Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 331–351.

Dupré, K. E., & Barling, J. (2006). Predicting and preventing supervisory workplace aggression. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*, 13–26.

Dupré, K. E., Barling, J., & LeBlanc, M. M. (2004). The many faces of control at work. In C. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Handbook of stress, medicine and health* (pp. 375–398). London, UK: CRC Press.

Ehrensaft, M. K., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Heyman, R. E., O'Leary, K. D., & Lawrence, E. (1999). Feeling controlled in marriage: A phenomenon specific to physically aggressive couples? *Journal of Family Psychology, 13*, 20–32.

Fiedler, F. E. (1996). Research on leadership selection and training: One view of the future. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*, 241–250.

Frone, M. R. (2006). Prevalence and distribution of alcohol use and impairment in the workplace: A U.S. national survey. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 67*, 147–156.

Gagné, M. (2003). The role of autonomy support and autonomy orientation in the engagement of prosocial behavior. *Motivation and Emotion, 27*, 199–223.

Gilbert, S., Horsman, P., & Kelloway, K. (2016). The motivation for transformational leadership scale: An examination of the factor structure and initial tests. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 37*, 158–180.

Graen, G. B., & Cashman, J. (1975). A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers* (pp. 143–166). Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Grolnick, W. S., & Apostoleris, N. H. (2002). What makes parents controlling? In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 161–182). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

Guzell, J. R., & Vernon-Feagans, L. (2004). Parental perceived control over caregiving and its relationship to parent–infant interaction. *Child Development, 75*, 134–146.

Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., & Harms, P. D. (2008). Leadership efficacy: Review and future directions. *Leadership Quarterly, 19*, 669–692.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*, 513–524.

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50*, 337–370.

Johnson, R. E., Venus, M., Lanaj, K., Mao, C., & Chang, C. H. (2012). Leader identity as an antecedent of the frequency and consistency of transformational, consideration, and abusive leadership behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*, 1262–1272.

Kelloway, E. K., Inness, M., Barling, J., Francis, L., & Turner, N. (2010). Loving one's job: Construct development and implications for well-being. In P. L. Perrewe & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *Research in occupational stress and well being* (pp. 109–136). Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing.

Kiewitz, C., Restubog, S. L. D., Zagenczyk, T. J., Scott, K. D., Garcia, P. R. J. M., & Tang, R. L. (2012). Sins of the parents: Self-control as a buffer between supervisors' previous experience of family undermining and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervision. *Leadership Quarterly, 23*, 869–882.

Kremen, A. M., & Block, J. (1998). The roots of ego-control in young adulthood: Links with parenting in early childhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1062–1075.

Lafrenière, M. A. K., Bélanger, J. J., Sedikides, C., & Vallerand, R. J. (2011). Self-esteem and passion for activities. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*, 541–544.

Lafrenière, M. A. K., Jowett, S., Vallerand, R. J., & Carbonneau, N. (2011). Passion for coaching and the quality of the coach–athlete relationship: The mediating role of coaching behaviors. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 12*, 144–152.

Lafrenière, M. A. K., Jowett, S., Vallerand, R. J., Donahue, E. G., & Lorimer, R. (2008). Passion in sport: On the quality of the coach-athlete relationship. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 30*, 541–560.

Lafrenière, M. A. K., Vallerand, R. J., Donahue, E. G., & Lavigne, G. L. (2009). On the costs and benefits of gaming: The role of passion. *Cyber Psychology & Behavior, 12*, 285–290.

Liao, E. Y., & Chun, H. (2016). Supervisor monitoring and subordinate innovation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37*, 168–192.

Mageau, G. A., Carpentier, J., & Vallerand, R. J. (2011). The role of self-esteem contingencies in the distinction between obsessive and harmonious passion. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 720–729.

Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2007). The moderating effect of passion on the relation between activity engagement and positive affect. *Motivation and Emotion, 31*, 312–321.

Mageau, G. A., Vallerand, R. J., Charest, J., Salvy, S. J., Lacaille, N., Bouffard, T., & Koestner, R. (2009). On the development of harmonious and obsessive passion: The role of autonomy support, activity specialization, and identification with the activity. *Journal of Personality, 77*, 601–646.

Marsh, H. W., Vallerand, R. J., Lafrenière, M. A. K., Parker, P., Morin, A. J., Carbonneau, N., . . . & Paquet, Y. (2013). Passion: Does one scale fit all? Construct validity of two-factor passion scale and psychometric invariance over different activities and languages. *Psychological Assessment, 25*, 796–809.

Martinko, M. J., Harvey, P., Brees, J. R., & Mackey, J. (2013). A review of abusive supervision research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*, 120–137.

Mawritz, M. B., Folger, R., & Latham, G. P. (2014). Supervisors' exceedingly difficult goals and abusive supervision: The mediating effects of hindrance stress, anger, and anxiety. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*, 358–372.

Murnieks, C. Y., Mosakowski, E., & Cardon, M. S. (2014). Pathways of passion identity centrality, passion, and behavior among entrepreneurs. *Journal of Management, 40*, 1583–1606.

Ng, F. F. Y., Pomerantz, E. M., & Deng, C. (2014). Why are Chinese mothers more controlling than American mothers? "My child is my report card." *Child Development, 85*, 355–369.

Pfeffer, J. (2010). Building sustainable organizations: The human factor. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 24*, 34–45.

Pfeffer, J., & Veiga, J. F. (1999). Putting people first for organizational success. *Academy of Management Executive, 13*, 37–48.

Philippe, F. L., Vallerand, R. J., Andrianarisoa, J., & Brunel, P. (2009). Passion in referees: Examining their affective and cognitive experiences in sport situations. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 31*, 77–96.

Philippe, F. L., Vallerand, R. J., Houlfort, N., Lavigne, G. L., & Donahue, E. G. (2010). Passion for an activity and quality of interpersonal relationships: The mediating role of emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*, 917–932.

Ratelle, C. F., Carbonneau, N., Vallerand, R. J., & Mageau, G. (2013). Passion in the romantic sphere: A look at relational outcomes. *Motivation and Emotion, 37*, 106–120.

Ratelle, C. F., Vallerand, R. J., Mageau, G. A., Rousseau, F. L., & Provencher, P. (2004). When passion leads to problematic outcomes: A look at gambling. *Journal of Gambling Studies, 20*, 105–119.

Robertson, J. L., & Barling, J. (2013). Greening organizations through leaders' influence on employees' pro-environmental behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*, 176–194.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2003). On assimilating identities to the self: A self-determination theory on internalization and integrity within cultures. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 253–272). New York, NY: Guilford.

Schriesheim, C. A., Castro, S. L., & Cogliser, C. C. (1999). Leader-member exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*, 63–113.

Shirom, A., Melamed, S., & Nir-Dotan, M. (2000). The relationships among objective and subjective environmental stress levels and serum uric acid: The moderating effect of perceived control. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 374–385.

Sirén, C., Patel, P. C., & Wincent, J. (2016). How do harmonious passion and obsessive passion moderate the influence of a CEO's change-oriented leadership on company performance? *Leadership Quarterly, 27*, 653–670.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Tepper, B. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 178–190.

Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and directions for future research. *Journal of Management, 33*, 261–289.

Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., & Duffy, M. K. (2011). Predictors of abusive supervision: Supervisor perceptions of deep-level dissimilarity, relationship conflict, and subordinate performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*, 279–294.

Trivisonno, M., & Barling, J. (2017). *Igniting the passion for leadership: Model conceptualization and measurement.* Unpublished manuscript.

Tucker, S., Turner, N., Barling, J., & McEvoy, M. (2010). Transformational leadership and childrens' aggression in team settings: A short-term longitudinal study. *Leadership Quarterly, 21*, 389–399.

Vallerand, R. J. (2015). *The psychology of passion: A dualistic model.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Vallerand, R. J., Blanchard, C., Mageau, G. A., Koestner, R., Ratelle, C., Léonard, M., . . . Marsolais, J. (2003). Les passions de l'âme: On obsessive and harmonious passion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 756–767.

Vallerand, R. J., Paquet, Y., Philippe, F. L., & Charest, J. (2010). On the role of passion for work in burnout: A process model. *Journal of Personality, 78*, 289–312.

Vallerand, R. J., Rousseau, F. L., Grouzet, F. M., Dumais, A., Grenier, S., & Blanchard, C. M. (2006). Passion in sport: A look at determinants and affective experiences. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 28*, 454–478.

Zacharatos, A., Barling, J., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Development and effects of transformational leadership in adolescents. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*, 211–226.