



Leading day-to-day: A review of the daily causes and consequences of leadership behaviors[☆]

Thomas K. Kelemen^{a,*},¹ Samuel H. Matthews^{b,1}, Kimberley Breevaart^c

^a Division of Management & International Business, Price College of Business, University of Oklahoma, 307 W. Brooks - Rm. 206, Norman, OK 73019-0450, United States of America

^b College of Business Administration, University of Northern Iowa, 244 Curris Business Bldg., Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0123, United States of America

^c Department of Work and Organizational Psychology, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Burgemeester Oudlaan 50, 3000 DR Rotterdam, The Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Review
ESM
Leadership
Daily diary
Daily leadership

ABSTRACT

A recent trend in leadership research is to explore the daily causes and consequences of leadership behaviors. As this type of research has grown dramatically in the past several years, we seek to provide a systematic review of existing empirical research that has used a daily ESM study design to examine the leadership process. In this review, we reflect on the unique and important benefits a daily perspective on leadership provides for leadership research. We also provide a systematic review of the existing research on daily leadership, discuss the methodological and theoretical aspects of the studies identified in the review, and highlight the important findings of this research. Finally, we conclude by drawing upon the reviewed articles to provide recommendations for future scholarly work. Specifically, we give recommendations that will both broaden scholars' understanding of the daily leadership process as well as deepen understanding.

Every workday, leaders are responsible for the performance and well-being of their followers, and the ways in which leaders interact with their followers may differ from day to day or even within the day. For example, research shows that ethical behavior – such as role-modeling ethical behaviors to followers – drains leaders' ego resources, which increases the likelihood that they will behave more abusively towards their followers the next day (Lin, Ma, & Johnson, 2016). This and other studies show that leadership is a daily and fluctuating phenomenon. Prior scholarly work in the leadership field has primarily explored the consequences of leaders' general behavioral patterns on follower outcomes (e.g., some leaders are generally more abusive than others, and how does that affect followers; Tepper, Simon, & Park, 2017). Recently, however, leadership researchers have begun to explore the dynamics of daily leadership behaviors (e.g., some leaders were particularly abusive today, and how does that affect followers; Vogel & Mitchell, 2017). This daily perspective to understand leadership has grown rapidly in the past few years, refining our understanding of leadership, expanding our understanding of the daily consequences of leadership behaviors, and extending our understanding of the immediate origins of leadership behaviors.

The behaviors of all individuals can be explored as general patterns of consistent actions in a trait-like fashion (e.g., Jane is generally helpful), but can also be examined at specific moments in time in a state-like fashion (e.g., Jane was not helpful today). Likewise, leadership behaviors, such as transformational or abusive leader behaviors, can be examined as a general pattern of behavior (e.g., to what extent does your leader inspire you overall?) or as a behavior that fluctuates within short time periods (e.g., did your leader inspire you this morning?). Previous research supports this idea, showing that some leaders are more transformational than others (e.g., Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Howell & Avolio, 1993) and that the use of transformational leadership often fluctuates within the same leader on a daily basis (e.g., Breevaart et al., 2014; Tims, Bakker, & Xanthopoulos, 2011). Prior research has also highlighted how followers' daily reports of a leader's behavior are significantly different from their reports of the same leader's general leadership behavior (Hopton, 2016).

In this paper, we look to review existing research that examines the daily causes and consequences of leadership. In doing so, we build on prior reviews that have discussed daily leadership (e.g., McClean, Barnes, Courtright, & Johnson, in press; Ohly & Gochmann, 2017).

[☆] The authors would like to thank David Day and the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback and suggestions.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: thomas.kelemen@ou.edu (T.K. Kelemen), samuel.matthews@uni.edu (S.H. Matthews), breevaart@essb.eur.nl (K. Breevaart).

¹ Co-first author.

First, our review extends the work by McClean et al. (in press)² that reviewed the broader research of changing leadership. While McClean et al. (in press) included a wider range of changing leadership behaviors such as longer-term leader behavioral shifts and leader behavioral growth and decay, we solely focus on daily behaviors. As a consequence, our review is more comprehensive of the daily leadership literature and highlights unique elements and patterns (e.g., methodological practices, theoretical perspectives, types of leader behaviors studied). This allows us to more precisely assess both the strengths and weaknesses in current research. It also allows us to provide more detailed suggestions for future research. Second, our review builds on Ohly and Gochmann's (2017) review of daily leadership, which primarily focused on specifying methodological best practices for daily leadership research. Our review does not provide specific methodological best practices per se, but rather assesses the state of the science in daily leadership to see how it meets current best practices already provided.

Thus, the aim of this manuscript is to review and evaluate previous research examining the daily causes and consequences of leadership behaviors. In doing this, we hope to inform scholars on how previous daily studies of leadership have (and have not) utilized their study designs to theoretically advance leadership knowledge. We believe that by highlighting what has been done in daily leadership studies, we can spark future leadership inquiry by helping scholars look at leadership research through a slightly different lens. In what follows, we first reflect on the value added by studying leadership in a daily fashion. Then, based on our systematic review of the literature, we review the existing empirical research conducted by scholars that has explored leadership on a daily basis. We do this by first summarizing the theories used by articles in our review; second, analyzing the methods used in the articles in our review; and, third reviewing the articles based on the behaviors studied. Finally, in our conclusion, we discuss areas for future research based on our review. We provide suggestions that will push the field forward and establish a road map for further inquiry in daily leadership research.

Importance of examining daily leadership

There are at least three important theoretical and methodological advantages to study daily leadership relations. The first is that scholars are able to examine phenomena and test leadership theories at a within-person level (McCormick, Reeves, Downes, Li, & Ilies, in press). The within-person approach to leadership allows researchers to answer unique research questions that complement the existing nomological network surrounding leadership with novel information on the workings of leadership. Second, understanding daily leadership allows researchers to get an in-depth look at the short term processes of leadership (i.e., the proximal causes and consequences of leadership). It also provides insight into how leadership behaviors unfold over short spans of time (i.e., during the day or from one day to the next). Third, it allows researchers to analyze leadership behaviors in their natural context. Studying daily life of any sort, be it leadership, student life, or parenting, allows researchers to "capture life as it is lived" (Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003). Leadership is a complex process, and thus, studying leadership in a daily fashion is critical to fully understand it as it gives unique insight that cannot be easily captured in other ways. Below, we describe each of these three benefits in more detail.

Within-person approach to leadership

Existing leadership research primarily focuses on leadership at a between-person level, studying differences in general patterns of

²Of the 74 articles in our review, only 17 were reviewed in the McClean et al. (in press) article.

behaviors between different leaders. These studies provide valuable insights to select individuals for a leadership position. For example, previous research has shown that individuals who score highly on agreeableness and honesty-humility scales are less likely to behave abusively towards their followers (Breevaart & de Vries, 2017). But daily studies on leadership provide unique information to scholars by allowing researchers to explore leadership at another level of analysis – the within-person level – on a daily basis. Even personality, a meaningful way to explain differences between individuals, has been shown to be worth studying on a daily basis to understand within-person relationships (e.g., Fleeson, 2001; Fleeson & Nofhle, 2011). And although there are other notable types of within-person studies focusing on leader development over time (e.g., Giambatista, 2004; Kalish & Luria, 2016; Miscenko, Guenter, & Day, 2017) or following interventions or changes (e.g., Day & Sin, 2011; Seifert & Yukl, 2010), daily studies are different with their focus on short-term (i.e., daily) within-person relationships in leadership.

Daily within-person leadership studies both challenge the way we view leadership (Dalal, Bhawe, & Fiset, 2014) and show how leadership relations exist at multiple levels of analysis. Daily within-persons studies of leadership can show how leader relations that are non-existent at the between-person level exist at a within-person level. For example, at the between-person level, leader abusive behaviors and leader behaviors of consideration and structure initiation are likely to be negatively correlated. However, on a within-person, daily level they have been found to positively relate to each other (*Liao, Yam, Johnson, Liu, & Song, 2018). In a related example, Breevaart et al. (2014) showed that leaders can be transformational, rewarding, and controlling all on the same day. Thus, daily within-person leadership research can change and challenge preconceived relations in leadership.

Daily studies also extend leadership research by showing that relations exist at multiple levels of analysis. This extends theories of leadership by showing that both general leadership behaviors and daily leadership behaviors have implications for leader and follower antecedents and outcomes. Within-person studies demonstrate the need for leaders to behave constructively not only in general but also on a daily basis. For example, transformational leadership at the between-person level of analysis has been found to increase employee job engagement (Zhu, Avolio, & Walumbwa, 2009); daily studies have shown that this relationship also exists at a within-person level of analysis (Breevaart et al., 2014; Tims et al., 2011).

Short-term processes of leadership

Another theoretical and methodological advantage of daily studies of leadership is that they allow researchers to study the complexity of leadership processes as they unfold from one day or situation to the next. Scholars can examine what daily situations trigger different types of constructive (e.g., transformational or servant) and destructive (e.g., abusive or tyrannical) leadership behaviors and better explore the proximal consequences of these leader behaviors. This helps give scholars a deeper and more nuanced view of short-term relationships in leadership. Knowledge of these proximal situational triggers of leadership behaviors have theoretical implications and provide important information to optimize the practice of leadership. For example, Barnes, Lucianetti, Bhawe, and Christian (2015) asked leaders when they woke up to indicate how many hours they slept and how well they slept. They found that regardless of the hours of sleep, leaders who reported lower sleep quality in the morning (e.g., waking up throughout the night) also reported having depleted egos, which caused their followers to report they were more abusive that day. Thus, if sleep affects the use of abusive leadership behaviors, organizations could decide to grant their leaders a day off after a night of working overtime, or leaders themselves may decide to work from home the next day.

Daily studies also allow scholars to use more specific variables to test theories and thus uniquely explore the leadership process. Studies

that use precise, specific variables complement more traditional studies of leadership by allowing scholars to measure and examine leadership processes in different ways. For example, Rosen et al. (2019) explored how daily email demands, instead of just general work demands, in the morning influenced leader behaviors during the day. Similarly, Stocker, Jacobshagen, Krings, Pfister, and Semmer (2014) examined how daily leader appreciation, instead of just general leader support, leads to enhanced follower outcomes for the day. Finally, Ford, Wang, Jin, and Eisenberger (2018) explored how daily leader support increased follower daily gratitude – rather than just positive affect – which increased follower daily organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and decreased follower counterproductive work behaviors (CWB). Thus, daily studies allow researchers to get deeper insights into specific aspects of daily life and how they relate to the process of leadership.

Daily studies also provide important information on how time affects short-term leadership processes. Daily studies can examine how long the effects of leadership behaviors last for followers and leaders. They can also show how the timing of leadership behaviors is important. For example, Qin, Huang, Johnson, Hu, and Ju (2018) found that leader daily abusive behaviors increased leader work engagement the next day but that it had a negative effect on leader work engagement after several days. In general, daily studies can incorporate time into leadership research to provide further information into the short-term process of leadership.

Leadership in its natural context

Finally, daily studies of leadership often examine leadership in its natural context rather than in a special environment such as a laboratory setting. Measuring behaviors as they naturally and spontaneously occur is what makes the study of daily behaviors fundamentally different from both laboratory and field studies that use global self-reports (i.e., general experiences or stable trait-like differences between people). Gathering contextualized information is one of the major advantages of daily studies (Reis, 2012). For example, employees are often asked to rate their leader's behavior when they are at work, rather than in a lab or at home. Studying behaviors and feelings in their natural context is important because the context plays an important role in eliciting these behaviors and feelings. Additionally, feelings and emotions are transient in nature (Robinson & Clore, 2002). When your leader's behavior elicits certain feelings, these feelings may have disappeared by the time you got home, or they may have been affected by other experiences. So, the closer the measure is to the actual experience, the better.

In addition, the embeddedness of daily studies in the natural context is also relevant when studying leadership behaviors that cannot be studied in the lab for ethical or practical reasons. Due to ethical concerns, daily studies become of paramount importance for abusive leader behaviors or other types of destructive leadership behaviors. Because it would be unethical to experimentally manipulate destructive leadership behaviors such as publicly ridiculing someone or blaming someone for something (s)he did not do, these behaviors can be studied as they naturally occur during the day. In addition, from an external validity standpoint, leadership can be difficult to authentically create in a laboratory setting, which makes it uniquely important to study leadership in the field. While laboratory studies of leader behaviors can provide important insight into leadership (e.g., Koning & Van Kleef, 2015; Van Kleef et al., 2009; Visser, van Knippenberg, Van Kleef, & Wisse, 2013), an encounter with an actor, a pre-recorded video, or written description of a leader carries ecological validity limitations. For these reasons, leadership derives distinct advantages from being studied in a daily fashion.

Review process

Experience sampling methodology

Our review focuses on leadership studies that utilized experience sampling methodology (ESM) to measure daily leadership behaviors, which we refer to as “daily leadership studies.” ESM is a methodological approach that allows researchers to better capture real-time experiences (Uy, Foo, & Aguinis, 2010). That is, rather than having participants reflect back on experiences and feelings that happened in the past, ESM allows scholars to measure experiences and feelings as they occur (Fisher & To, 2012). There are three types of ESM methods (Reis & Gable, 2000; Uy et al., 2010; Wheeler & Reis, 1991). The first is collecting data at a specified interval (e.g., at the end of a workday) is called interval-contingent sampling. This method is one of the most common ways of employing ESM in leadership studies (see Barnes et al., 2015, Courtright, Gardner, Smith, McCormick, & Colbert, 2016, and Lanaj, Foulk, & Erez, 2019 for examples). It is used to study phenomena at fixed times, for example at 09:00 AM to report about one's sleep that night and at 06:00 PM to report about one's workday. Because this type of sampling introduces some type of memory bias (e.g., reflecting on the entire workday), it is best used to measure experiences and behaviors that are somewhat resistant to memory bias.

The second type of ESM invites participants to input data every time they are notified by the researchers, usually by email or through an electronic notification device (see Bono, Foldes, Vinson, & Muros, 2007 for an example). This type of sampling is called signal-contingent sampling and can be used to measure ongoing experiences that are likely affected by the predictability of measurement and memory bias. Participants are asked to report their current experiences when they receive a signal. This type of sampling is also referred to as experience sampling. The third type of ESM collects data at an event level (see Meier & Gross, 2015, Stocker et al., 2014, and Wijewardena, Härtel, & Samarantunge, 2017 for examples), and is called event-based sampling. In this type of design, participants are asked to respond to a survey every time a particular event or interaction occurs. By having participants respond immediately following the event in question, researchers can minimize recall bias. Event-based sampling is especially useful to capture rare phenomena because participants only report on their experiences when a specified event happens (Uy et al., 2010). Collectively, these three ways of conducting ESM studies give scholars a variety of ways to design their studies depending on their research questions.

Systematic review

We conducted our search for empirical leadership studies by searching in EBSCO and Web of Science. We focused our search on studies that examined leadership behaviors (i.e., transformational, ethical) – either measured by the leader or follower. To identify articles relevant to our review we searched for *leader**, *manager**, or *supervis** as well as one of the following keywords: *daily report*, *experience-sampling*, *event sampling*, *diary stud**, or *daily diary*. In our search process, we confirmed that the articles aligned with the aim of the review by 1) including leadership behaviors, 2) measuring variables at the daily level, and 3) including a dependent variable (i.e., we excluded studies that simply measured the frequency of different types of leader behaviors but did not measure a dependent variable). Through this search process, we found 72 articles. We then added two articles (Lanaj & Jennings, 2019; Liao, Liu, Li, & Song, 2018) of which we were aware, bringing our total to 74 articles. Below, in Table 1, we provide a summary of each article included in our review. We first summarize the theories and models used in the articles, then provide a synthesis of the methodological approaches used, and finally review the articles based on leadership behavior studied.

Table 1
Articles identified for review and summaries.

Authors (year)	Leadership behavior	Theoretical framework	Data source	Data collection frequency & duration	Key findings
Almeida et al. (2016)	Supportive	Work-home resource model	131 followers	Once a day for 8 days	General supportive leadership moderates the relationship between follower work-family conflict to follower negative affect. Daily supportive leadership also moderated the relation between follower work-family conflict to nighttime cortisol levels.
Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta, and Kramer (2004)	Supportive	Componential theory of creativity	139 followers	Once a day during a project lifespan (8–37 weeks)	A leader's daily behaviors affect followers' daily perceptions and feelings, which then affected peer-rated follower creativity.
Bames et al. (2015)	Abusive	Ego depletion theory	99 leaders & 261 followers	Once a day for 10 days	A lack of quality sleep influences leaders to engage in daily abusive supervision behaviors due to ego depletion, which then leads to decreased work unit engagement.
Beattie and Griffin (2014)	Supportive	Job demands-resources theory	130 followers	Eight times over 4 weeks	Supportive leadership minimizes the positive relationship between daily incivility and daily stress.
Bianco-Donoso, Garrosa, Demerouti, and Moreno-Jiménez (2017)	Supportive	Conservation of resources theory	74 followers	Twice a day for 5 days	The authors did not find that daily supervisor support buffered the negative effect daily difficulties to regulate emotions at work had on emotional exhaustion, fatigue, and negative affect.
Bono et al. (2007)	Transformational & exchange	Self-determination theory	54 followers	Four times a day for 10 days	Followers experience fewer positive emotions when interacting with their leader. Further, followers with a leader high in transformational leadership experience more positive emotions during the day. Leader transformational leadership also moderates the daily relation between follower emotion regulation and job satisfaction but not the daily relation between follower emotion regulation and job stress.
Bormann (2017)	Ethical & abusive	Social learning theory	241 followers	Once a day for 5 days	Daily ethical leadership leads to follower engagement which then increased follower helping. Further, the mediated relationship is moderated by the previous day's abusive leadership behaviors.
Breevaart and Bakker (2018)	Transformational	Job demands-resources theory	271 followers	Once a day for 10 days	Daily challenge demands has a positive relationship with work engagement on the days that transformational leadership was high. Daily hindrance demands has a negative relationship with work engagement on days when transformational leadership was low.
Breevaart et al. (2014)	Transformational, contingent reward, & MBE	Transformational leadership theory	61 followers	Once a day for 34 days	Daily transformational leadership and contingent reward positively affects followers' daily sense of work of a favorable work environment and work engagement, while MBE decreases feelings of a favorable work environment.
Butts, Becker, and Boswell (2015)	Abusive	Affective events theory	341 followers	Once a day for 7 days	The relationship between the affective tone of electronic communication and anger is strongest when communication is from a leader and the leader is high in abusive supervision.
Christensen-Salem, Kinicki, Zhang, and Walumbwa (2018)	Supportive	Affective events theory	63 followers	Once a day for 10 days	Leader developmental feedback leads to positive affect via feedback acceptance, which then increases creativity on a within-person basis.
Courtright et al. (2016)	Abusive	Resource drain theory	92 leaders	Once a day for 10 days	Family work conflict leads to increases in abusive supervision the next day, via ego depletion.
Derks, van Duijn, Tims, and Bakker (2015)	Expectations	Boundary theory	100 followers	Once a day for 4 days	When leaders expect followers to be online after work hours, the relationship between daily smartphone use and daily work-home interference is strengthened.
Diebig, Bormann, and Rowold (2017)	Transformational	No explicit model or theory	205 followers	Once a day for 5 days	Leader transformational leadership behaviors increase team cooperation which then decreases follower stress. Type of communication moderates this relationship.

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Authors (year)	Leadership behavior	Theoretical framework	Data source	Data collection frequency & duration	Key findings
Dollard and Idris (2017)	Supportive	Job demands-resources theory	109 followers	Once a day for 5 days	Espoused psychological safety climate leads to daily enacted leader support, which then leads to an increase in work engagement. Espoused psychological safety climate influences the daily fluctuation of enacted leader support. Daily leader support also strengthens the negative relation between espoused psychological safety and emotional exhaustion. Empowering leadership strengthens the relationship between follower state promotion focus and follower creativity. Empowering leadership also strengthens the indirect effect between customer empowering behavior to employee creativity via state promotion focus.
Dong, Liao, Chuang, Zhou, and Campbell (2015)	Empowering	Regulatory focus theory	380 followers	Ten random work events over 4 weeks	Leader member exchange quality increases followers' sense of belonging which then enhances their vigor and decreases their emotional exhaustion. Leader member exchange relationships also affect follower next day emotional exhaustion. Daily leader helping leads to more episodic gratitude towards the organization, which increases the prevalence of OCBs and decreased the prevalence of CWBs. Leader interactional justice leads to a decrease in episodic anger towards the organization, which decreases the prevalence of CWBs. Psychological power leads to leader abusive behaviors which then leads to decreases in need fulfillment and relaxation. The positive relationship between daily home-work conflict and daily CWB is minimized when employees experience high levels of family-support from their leader. High levels of leader support minimize the negative relationship between daily workload and daily work-family conflict.
Ellis, Bauer, Erdogan, and Truxillo (2018)	Exchange	No explicit model or theory	129 followers	Once a day for 5 days	Daily transformational leadership leads to an increase in positive job attitudes through an increase in fulfillment of psychological needs.
Ford et al. (2018)	Helping & justice	Affective events theory	54 followers	Once a day for 10 days	Daily transformational leadership behaviors lead to follower's daily job crafting. Promotion focus moderated this relation. Daily procedural justice behaviors are depleting for leaders and indirectly reduce leader OCB. Daily interactional justice behaviors are not depleting for leaders and indirectly increase leader OCB.
Foulk, Lanaj, Tu, Erez, and Archambeau (2018)	Abusive	Social distance theory of power & Consent-based theory of power	108 leaders	Thrice a day for 10 days	Leaders with a collective identity have higher mean levels of transformational leadership behaviors and lower variance in transformational leadership behaviors. Leaders with an individual identity have higher mean levels of abusive supervision and lower variance in abusive supervision.
Germeyns and De Gieter (2017)	Supportive	Conservation of resources theory	50 followers	Once a day for 10 days	Nurses who received leader support after a negative incident are more likely to have a decrease in positive affect following the negative incident.
Goh, Ilies, and Wilson (2015)	Supportive	Conservation of resources theory	135 followers	Twice a day for 5 days	The authors did not find that daily leader support interacted with negative affect to influence quality of care.
Hetland, Hetland, Bakker, and Demerouti (2018)	Transformational	Transformational leadership theory	65 followers	Once a day for 5 days	On days that followers perceive their leader displayed higher levels of interpersonal justice, followers feel more job satisfaction and less state hostility
Hetland et al. (2018)	Transformational	Job demands-resources theory	107 followers	Once a day for 5 days	Positive leadership and transformational leadership increase followers' daily positive affect.
Johnson, Lanaj, and Bames (2014)	Justice	Ego depletion theory	79 leaders	Twice a day for 10 days	
Johnson, Venus, Lanaj, Mao, and Chang (2012)	Transformational, consideration & abusive	Social identity theory	53 leaders & 86 co-workers or followers	Once a day for 15 days	
Jones and Johnston (2012)	Supportive	No explicit model or theory	171 followers	Once a shift for 3 shifts	
Jones and Johnston (2013)	Supportive	No explicit model or theory	171 followers	Once a shift for 3 shifts	
Judge, Scott, and Ilies (2006)	Justice	Affective events theory	64 followers	Once a day for 15 days	
Kelloway, Weigand, McKee, and Das (2013)	Positive & transformational	Broaden & build theory	26 followers	Six times over a three-week period	

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Authors (year)	Leadership behavior	Theoretical framework	Data source	Data collection frequency & duration	Key findings
Kudesia and Reina (2019)	Leader trustworthiness	No explicit model or theory	201 followers	Thrice a day for 8 days	Specific instances of interactions with trustworthy leaders were not significantly associated with within-person changes in mindfulness.
Kuonath, Specht, Kühnel, Pachler, and Frey (2017)	Transformational	Affective events theory	97 followers	Once a day for 5 days	Daily transformational leadership leads to an increase in followers' personal initiative.
Lam, Lee, and Sui (2019)	Voice reception	Social judgement theory	53 followers & 33 leaders	Every time an employee used voice towards his/her manager for 4 weeks	Voice directness was positively related to leader endorsement, but only for individuals who had high voice credibility.
Lanaj and Jennings (2019)	Helping	Affective events theory	43 leaders & their followers	Twice a day for 15 days for leaders; once a day for 15 days for followers	Leaders experienced more negative affect on days that they helped followers with personal problems. Also, followers rated their leaders as less engaged on days that they had helped them with personal problems.
Lanaj et al. (2019)	Self-reflection	Cognitive energetic theory & leader identity theory	65 leaders	Thrice a day for 10 days	Leader self-reflection behaviors decreased leader depletion which increased leader engagement. This then leads to both leader prosocial impact and clout.
Lanaj, Johnson, and Lee (2016)	Transformational, transactional	Affective events theory & self-determination theory	50 leaders (Study 1) & 47 leaders (Study 2)	Twice a day for 15 days (both studies)	Daily engagement of transformational leadership increases leader positive affect and decreases negative affect.
Lavy, Litman-Ovadia, and Boiman-Meshita (2017)	Supportive	No explicit model or theory	120 followers	Once a day for 10 days	Daily supervisor support significantly influenced the amount employees used their strengths on the following day. Daily colleague support did not significantly predict following-day use of strengths.
Li, Barnes, Yam, Guarana, and Wang (in press)	Voice reception	Ego depletion theory	62 leaders	Once a day for 10 days	Leaders are less likely to accept employee voice when they are more depleted.
Liao et al. (2018)	Abusive	Moral licensing/ cleansing theory	31 leaders and 72 followers (Study 1) & 68 leader-follower dyads (Study 2)	Twice a day for 10 days (both studies)	Daily abusive supervision leads to guilt and perceived loss of moral credits, which leads to constructive leader behavior.
*Liao et al., 2018	Exchange	Social exchange theory	73 followers	Event-based sampling over two weeks	Resource contribution surplus in an exchange episode increases state work engagement and leads to an increase in member resource contribution in the next exchange episode. High LMX relationships attenuate this effect.
Liu et al. (2015)	Supportive	Self-regulation theory	125 followers	Four times a day for 15 days	Perceived leader family support minimizes the effect of daily family-to-work conflict on displaced aggression towards leaders, coworkers, and family members.
Matta, Erol-Korkmaz, Johnson, and Biçaksız (2014)	Exchange	Affective events theory	50 followers	Once a day for 10 days	Negative daily work events are associated with followers' negative emotional reactions and subsequent CWB. Of the negative daily work events, negative interactions with supervisors generally lead to the strongest negative emotional reactions.
Matta, Scott, Colquitt, Koopman, and Passantino (2017)	Justice displays	Uncertainty management theory	97 leader-follower dyads	Once a day for 15 days	Justice variability displayed by leaders leads to more stress for followers. Justice variability also exacerbates the relationship between workplace uncertainty and stress. Leaders with more self-control show less justice variability.
Meier and Gross (2015)	Incivility	Self-control strength model	116 followers	Every time an event occurred over two weeks	Followers exhibit incivility towards their supervisor in response to incivility, but only when the incivility of the leader recently occurred that day.
Myrden and Kelloway (2015)	Transformational	Service-profit chain model	29 followers, 592 customers	Once a day for 5 days	Daily transformational leadership increases employee job satisfaction and engagement. Increases in job satisfaction and engagement subsequently positively impact customer perceptions of quality, customer satisfaction, and customer loyalty intentions.
Nielsen and Cleal (2010)	Leader daily tasks	Flow theory	58 leaders	Randomly asked to respond about 8 times per day for 10 days	Engaging in planning, problem-solving, and evaluation tasks was positively related to experiencing flow at work.

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Authors (year)	Leadership behavior	Theoretical framework	Data source	Data collection frequency & duration	Key findings
Nielsen and Cleal (2011)	Transformational	No explicit model or theory	58 leaders	Randomly asked to respond about 8 times per day for 10 days	Information sharing, brainstorming, planning, problem-solving, discussion, and evaluation are situations that predict transformational leadership behavior.
Pluut, Iliés, Cursseu, and Liu (2018)	Supportive	Work-home resources model	112 followers	Twice a day for 9 days	Leader support weakens the positive effect of workload on emotional exhaustion.
Qin et al. (2018)	Abusive	Conservation of resources theory	72 leaders	Twice a day for 10 days	Daily abusive supervision leads to improved recovery levels. However, these benefits are only short-lived.
Rodríguez-Carvajal, Herrero, van Dierendonck, de Rivas, and Moreno-Jiménez (2019)	Servant	Broaden & build theory	126 followers	Thrice a day for 5 days	Daily servant leadership led to an increase in next-day worker goal attainment through helping employees feel more positive about the meaning of life and by helping increase their vitality the next morning.
Rosen et al. (2019)	Transformational & initiating structure	Self-regulation Theory	48 leaders	Twice a day for 10 days	Leaders' daily email demands negatively affect goal progress. For leaders with low self-control, a decrease in goal progress then leads to a decrease in transformational and structure initiating behaviors.
Schilpzand, Houston III, and Cho (2018)	Empowering	Model of proactive motivation	98 followers	Twice a day for 10 days	Daily empowering leadership leads followers to have enhanced next day proactive behaviors of voice and risk-taking. Follower sleep quality moderates this effect.
Scott, Colquitt, Paddock, and Judge (2010)	Empathy	Appraisal theory of emotions	60 followers	Once a day for 10 days	Groups with managers who expressed empathy experienced lower average levels of somatic complaints, and their daily progress was more positively related to positive affect.
Scott, Garza, Conlon, and Kim (2014)	Justice	Justice theory	90 leaders	Once a day for 15 days	On a day-to-day basis, leaders adhere to justice norms both due to cognitive and affective motives.
Sherf, Venkataramani, and Gajendran (2019)	Justice	Self-regulation theory	107 leaders	Twice a day for 10 days	When leaders face high workloads, they are more likely to prioritize technical responsibilities over acting justly.
Shockley and Allen (2013)	Supportive	Theory of optimal matching	58 followers	Four times a day for 10 days	The positive relationship between family interference with work conflict and blood pressure is minimized by family-supportive leaders.
Stocker et al. (2014)	Supportive	No explicit model or theory	139 followers	Event-based sampling for 5 days	On days that leaders showed appreciation for followers, followers experienced higher levels of serenity.
Tariq and Ding (2018)	Abusive	Self-determination theory	320 followers	Once a day for 10 days	Abusive supervision negatively affects job performance and positively impacts turnover intentions through a decrease in intrinsic motivation. These effects are lessened when family motivation is high.
Tepper et al. (2018)	Transformational	P-E Fit	65 followers (Study 1); 109 followers (Study 2)	Once a day for 15 days (both studies)	The daily fit between transformational needed and received leads to follower positive affect. This increase in positive affect then leads to higher levels of job satisfaction, satisfaction with leader, and OCBs.
To, Fisher, Ashkanasy, and Rowe (2012)	Supportive	Dual-pathway model	30 followers	Thrice a day for 10 days	The relationship between positive mood and creative process engagement is stronger when leader support for creativity is high.
Tims et al. (2011)	Transformational	Job demands-resources theory	42 followers	Once a day for 5 days	Daily transformational leadership increases followers' daily work engagement by increasing their levels of optimism.
Tomprou and Nikolaou (2013)	Extending promises	Psychological contract theory	85 followers	Once a day for 10 days	Promises made by line managers had more of an effect on newcomers' beliefs in employer's promises compared to promises made by HR managers and promises made by top management.
Tsai and Chen (2017)	Supportive	Personal resource depletion theory	67 followers	Every time the employee had an interaction with a customer	The negative relationship between customer negative affective displays and employee positive affective displays was minimized by perceived supervisory support.
Van Dijke, Leunissen, Wildschut, and Sedikides (2019)	Justice	Self memory system model	128 followers (Study 1); 311 followers (Study 2)	Once a day for 10 days (Study 1); Once a day for 5 days (Study 2)	The positive effect between nostalgia and both intrinsic motivation and work effort is strongest in situation of low interactional justice from leaders.

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Authors (year)	Leadership behavior	Theoretical framework	Data source	Data collection frequency & duration	Key findings
Venus, Johnson, Zhang, Wang, and Lanaj (2018)	Vision communication	Construal level theory	44 leaders	Twice a day for 15 days	Leader construal level in the morning positively affected leader vision communication during the day, but only for leaders whose leadership self-identity was high.
Vogel and Mitchell (2017)	Abusive supervision	Self-defense view & self-presentational view	73 followers	Once a day for 15–21 days	Daily abusive supervision leads to a decrease in follower self-esteem, which leads to an increase in follower workplace deviance and self-presentational behaviors. The negative relationship between daily abusive supervision and follower daily self-esteem is stronger when turnover intentions are low.
Volmer (2015)	Exchange	Affective events theory	98 followers	Thrice a day for 5 days	Daily social conflict between followers and leaders leads to increases in negative affect for followers before they go to bed. Between-level effects of both core self-evaluations and procedural justice perceptions moderate this relationship.
Weiss, Razinskas, Backmann, and Hoegl (2018)	Authentic	Ego depletion theory	44 leaders	Once a day for 10 days	Authentic leadership decreases leaders' stress and increases their work engagement and the effects are mediated by leader mental depletion.
Wijewardena et al. (2017)	LMX	Affective events theory & comprehension-elaboration theory	889 followers	Every time an event occurred over 10 days	Followers' perceptions of leader humor behaviors impact followers' emotions. When followers perceive their leaders' humor to be positive, they often experience an increase in positive emotions. When followers perceive their leaders' humor to be negative, they often experience an increase in negative emotions.
Xanthopoulou, Dakker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli (2012)	Coaching	Broaden & build theory	42 followers	Once a day for 5 days	Day-level coaching increases follower positive emotions and personal resources for that day.
Yagil and Medler-Liraz (2014)	Authentic	No explicit model or theory	76 followers	Once a day for 10 days	The relationship between followers' positive emotions and their authentic self-expression is stronger if they have leaders who engage in authentic leadership behaviors.
Yang and Diefendorff (2009)	Justice	Affective events theory	231 followers	Once a day for 25 days	Perceived leader interpersonal justice behaviors increase follower negative emotions and lead to follower counterproductive work behaviors.
Yeung and Shen (2019)	Abusive, consideration, and structure initiating	Affective events theory	103 leaders	Once a day for 10 days	Daily authentic pride leads to more use of initiating structure and consideration. Daily hubristic pride leads to more abusive supervision.
Zacher (2016)	Mentoring	Career construction theory	159 followers	Once a day for 5 days	Daily leader career mentoring was negatively associated with follower daily concern and positively associated with follower daily curiosity.
Zacher and Willden (2014)	Ambidextrous	Ambidexterity Theory	113 followers	Once a day for 5 days	On days that leaders use ambidextrous leadership, followers are more innovative.

Review of theoretical approaches

Key to effective leadership research is using theory to develop arguments. Whereas the leadership field has been criticized for its lack of solid leadership theories (e.g., Van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013), several different theoretical perspectives have been adopted to understand the causes and consequences of daily leadership. Most studies identified in our review utilized an overall model or theoretical framework to build their arguments (66/74 articles - 89%), but there was a portion of articles that failed to use an overarching theoretical framework to guide their arguments (8/74 articles - 11%). We identified three dominant types of theoretical perspectives to explain the daily causes and consequences of leadership, namely stressor/strain theories (e.g., job demands-resource theory, conservation of resources theory, ego depletion theory; 18/66 articles - 27%), affect/emotion theories (e.g., affective events theory, broaden-and-build theory; 16/66 articles - 24%), and motivation theories (e.g., self-determination theory; 12/66 articles - 18%). In total, these three types of theoretical perspectives made up 70% all the studies in our review that relied upon theory and 62% of all the articles in our review. In addition to these three types of theoretical perspectives, seven articles used social theories (e.g., social learning theory), six articles used cognitive theories (e.g., cognitive energetic theory), and three used leadership theories (e.g., leader identity theory). The other articles used a variety of other theoretical perspectives such as justice theory, psychological contracts theory, etc. Table 1 reports the theory or model used by each study, and Table 2 summarizes the theoretical perspectives used in daily leadership research.

Table 2
Theoretical perspectives.

Theory	Number of studies
Affective events theory	12
Job demands-resource theory	5
Conservation of resources theory	4
Ego depletion theory	4
Broaden and build theory	3
Self-determination theory	3
Self-regulation theory	3
Transformational leadership theory	2
Work-home resource model	2
Ambidexterity theory	1
Appraisal theory of emotions	1
Boundary theory	1
Career construction theory	1
Cognitive energetic theory	1
Componential theory of creativity	1
Comprehension-elaboration theory	1
Consent-based theory of power	1
Construal level theory	1
Dual-pathway model	1
Flow theory	1
Justice theory	1
Leader identity theory	1
Model of proactive motivation	1
Moral licensing theory	1
P-E fit theory	1
Personal resource depletion theory	1
Psychological contract theory	1
Regulatory focus theory	1
Resource drain theory	1
Self-control strength model	1
Self-defense and self-preservation view	1
Self-memory system model	1
Service-profit chain model	1
Social distance theory of power	1
Social exchange theory	1
Social identity theory	1
Social judgement theory	1
Social learning theory	1
Theory of optimal matching	1
Uncertainty management theory	1

Importantly, not all leadership research is appropriate for daily study. Studies that look at long term changes in leadership or stable relations are not well suited for daily studies. However, during our review process, we were pleased to observe that the majority of articles did use daily leadership studies to answer questions that could not have been answered as effectively using other methods. Many studies looked at the antecedents or outcomes of short-term factors, which are the types of things best studied for daily ESM studies. Also, many studies used stressor/strain theories or affect/emotion theories as their overall theoretical perspective. The studies of specific stressors, affect, and emotions related to leadership are the types of theoretical questions that are well suited to be examined in a daily fashion because they can be short-lived.

Review of methodological approaches

While prior research has already provided advice on how to conduct general (e.g., Gabriel et al., 2018) and leadership-specific (e.g., Ohly & Gochmann, 2017) ESM studies, we highlight the methodological practices currently employed by researchers who study the daily leadership practice. By summarizing common methodological practices, we hope to show patterns, strengths, and weaknesses in current methodological designs. Because there is diversity in the methodological practices used in existing research, we discuss the articles by data sources, response rates, and study designs. Table 3 gives a summary of the study methods and study designs used by the articles in our review.

Data source

Of the samples included in our review, a majority of them used data only from followers (54 of 78 samples – 69%), some used only leader report data (16 of 78 samples – 21%), and a small number of samples used data from both leaders and followers (8 of 78 samples – 10%). One study used both follower and customer data (Myrden & Kelloway, 2015). Both follower and leader reports used to explore the daily relations of leadership are valid and useful. Yet, it is important to note that a majority of our information about the daily aspects of leadership are from follower perceptions. The studies that did include leaders in their samples typically did not specify the type or level of leader measured. This is unfortunate because a leader's level within the organization has important implications for understanding leadership and

Table 3
Summary of methods and study designs.

	Type of daily ESM study			
	Interval-contingent	Signal-contingent	Event-based	Overall
Total number of samples	67	5	6	78
Times measured per day				
Once a day	44	3	–	47
Twice a day	14	–	–	14
Thrice a day	6	–	–	6
Four or more times	3	2	–	5
Length of study (in workdays)				
3–5 days	19	1	2	22
6–10 days	33	4	3	40
11 or more days	15	–	1	16
Data source				
Follower	47	3	5	54
Leader	14	2	–	16
Both	6	–	1	8

Note: the total number of samples is greater than the total number of articles reviewed because several articles had more than one sample.

should be included in future research. Finally, most studies relied upon a single source for their data collection (i.e., either only leaders or only followers). Of course, collecting multiple measures from multiple participants at multiple points in time can be challenging. But study designs that do collect data from multiple sources overcome issues of common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). This is important because ESM study designs do not overcome the weaknesses of common method bias in and of themselves (Gabriel et al., 2018).

Response rates and inclusion criteria

While response rates varied across studies, most studies got response rates between 70 and 90%. Before analyzing the data, some studies excluded data from participants who completed less than 20% (e.g., Barnes et al., 2015), 50% (e.g., Breevaart & Bakker, 2018), or 80% (e.g., Courtright et al., 2016; Judge et al., 2006) of the surveys. Also, responses were excluded for participants who responded when not at work (e.g., Bono et al., 2007), responded outside of the specified time frame (e.g., Courtright et al., 2016) or when data was not available for both the leader and follower. Finally, some studies had missing data because participants were instructed to report the number of interactions they had with their leader on a day and responses were excluded when participants did not interact with their leader during the day (e.g., Liao et al., 2018; Meier & Gross, 2015). However, even though most articles had to deal with a substantial amount of missing data due to the nature of ESM studies, almost no articles mentioned the use of modern missing data techniques (Enders, 2010; Graham, 2009; Newman, 2014). We hope future daily leadership studies will better utilize these missing data techniques.

Type of daily ESM study

Interval-contingent

Most samples in our review used interval-contingent sampling, with 67 of 78 (86%) using this sampling method. Of these samples, 44 of 67 collected measures once a day, 14 of 69 collected measures twice a day, 6 of 69 collected measures thrice a day, and 3 collected measures four or more times a day. Collecting data once a day for a day-to-day study design, such as exploring how previous day factors affects next day leader behavior (e.g., Courtright et al., 2016), temporally separates independent from dependent variables and reduces common-method bias. Yet, several studies in our review not only used single-source data, but also collected their independent and dependent variables at the same time. Scholars that explore the daily aspects of leadership using an interval-contingent sampling design benefit by having temporal separation between their independent and dependent variables, particularly when they are collecting all their data from a single source. Future research should temporally separate independent and dependent variables where possible. Many interval-contingent samples also fail to capitalize on measuring leadership relationship in their natural context by having participant's complete measure at home, or after work.

The number of days included in interval-contingent samples ranged from three days to over a month. Of the samples in our review, 19 of 67 (28%) measured responses for 3–5 days, 33 of 67 (49%) measured responses for 6–10 days, and 15 of 67 (22%) measured responses for 11 or more days. Prior research on ESM study designs has recommended measuring participants for at least 10 days (Gabriel et al., 2018; Ohly & Gochmann, 2017). Therefore, future leadership researchers should do better at following this best practice or explain why they deviate from this recommendation.

Signal-contingent

Only six samples used a signal-contingent study design. Two studies relied upon leader reports, and three relied upon follower reports. Three studies collected measures once per day, and two studies

collected measures four or more times a day. One study collected data for 3–5 days, and the other four studies collected data for 6–10 days. These studies followed best practice.

Event-based

Six samples used event-based sampling. Five of the samples used follower-reported data and one sample used both leader- and follower-reported data. Two samples lasted 3–5 days, three lasted 6–10 days, and one lasted 11 or more days. The number of times participants responded per day depended upon the number of times the event being measured occurred each day. This study design allows researchers to get as proximal to leader behaviors or follower outcomes as possible because participants respond right after the event being studied occurs. Based on the current state of the science, these relations are less studied. In addition, this type of study design fully captures the benefit of daily studies of capturing “life as it is lived” (Bolger et al., 2003) by measuring leadership relations in their natural context and as close to their occurrence as possible. We hope future research will utilize this study design more often.

Review of leader behaviors

We review the literature on daily leadership research by discussing the findings organized by leadership behavior (e.g., transformational, abusive). The sections on each behavior are organized by 1) a summary of methods and theories used for the leader behavior, 2) a summary of the direct and indirect consequences of the daily leader behavior, 3) a summary of the causes (i.e., antecedents) of the daily leadership behavior, and 4) a summary of the leader behavior as a moderator between daily relations.

Daily transformational leadership behaviors

Methods and theory

We found 16 articles that explored the daily aspects of transformational leader behaviors and the sub-facets of transformational leadership (e.g., vision communication). Out of the 16 articles that we found, 13 used interval contingent sampling and 1 used signal-contingent sampling (Nielsen & Cleal, 2011). In addition, the samples of ten studies consisted of only followers, the samples of three studies only included leaders, two studies included both leaders and followers, and one study included both followers and their customers (Myrden & Kelloway, 2015). Finally, a range of different theories were used to study daily transformational leadership, the most frequently used being job demands-resources theory, transformational leadership theory, and self-determination theory.

Consequences

Eleven out of sixteen articles in our review explored the daily consequences of leader transformational behaviors for followers and the leaders themselves, showing that daily transformational leadership behaviors have positive, proximal consequences for both. First, daily transformational leadership behaviors have been found to increase followers' state job engagement on a daily basis via an increase in followers' optimism (e.g., Tims et al., 2011), autonomy, or social support (e.g., Breevaart et al., 2014). In addition to job engagement, on days that leaders show more transformational leadership, followers engage in more job crafting behaviors (Hetland et al., 2018), experience more positive affect (Kelloway et al., 2013), have an increase in positive job attitudes (Hetland et al., 2015; Myrden & Kelloway, 2015), display more personal initiative (Kuonath et al., 2017), and are more likely to cooperate with their team members (Diebig et al., 2017). Followers also report more daily positive emotions when they rate their leader as transformational (Bono et al., 2007). Work by Tepper et al. (2018) found that daily transformational leader behaviors increase follower state positive affect and job satisfaction, but only when followers feel a

need for transformational leadership. In addition to the daily consequences of transformational leadership for followers, Lanaj et al. (2016) found that daily transformational leader behaviors increased the leaders' own state positive affect and decreased their state negative affect.

Causes

Our review identified four daily studies that highlighted the proximal antecedents of daily transformational leadership behavior. Two of these studies show that daily job demands and characteristics affect leaders' daily use of transformational behavior. Daily email demands were found to reduce leaders' daily transformational behaviors via goal progress (Rosen et al., 2019), while situational factors like planning, problem-solving, and brainstorming were found to lead to increases in day-to-day use of transformational leader behaviors (Nielsen & Cleal, 2011). Both of these articles are great examples of articles measuring specific variables that would be difficult to capture without using ESM.

From a frequency perspective, Johnson et al. (2012) found that individuals with a high collective (as opposed to individual) identity displayed higher mean levels of transformational leadership behaviors and less daily variation in their transformational leadership behaviors. Finally, Venus, Johnson, Zhang, Wang, and Lanaj (2018) explored proximal antecedents to a specific component of transformational leader behavior – vision communication. They found that when a leader's construal level (i.e., the extent to which an individual focuses on the big picture rather than the details) is high in the morning, leaders engage in more vision communication behaviors later in the day. Taken together, the daily demands, tasks, and perspectives of a leader affect when a leader engages in daily transformational leadership behaviors.

Moderators

Breevaart and Bakker (2018) found that daily transformational leadership enhances the positive effects of daily cognitive and workload demands onto followers' daily work engagement and reduces the negative effect between daily role-conflict and followers' work engagement. Thus, daily transformational leader behaviors can enhance the positive effects of followers' daily challenge demands and reduce the negative effects of daily hindrances. Relatedly, Bono et al. (2007) found that the negative daily relation between follower emotion regulation and daily job satisfaction was buffered by transformational leadership.

Daily transactional leadership behaviors and initiating structure

Methods and theory

We found six studies on daily transactional leadership, almost all of which ($k = 5$) used interval contingent sampling. Half of the studies ($k = 3$) included only followers, whereas the other half ($k = 3$) gathered data just from the leaders. In the studies, different theories were used, ranging from boundary theory (Derks et al., 2015) to affective events theory (Yeung & Shen, 2019) to psychological contract theory (Tomprou & Nikolaou, 2013).

Consequences

Two out of six articles explored the proximal consequences of leader transactional and initiating structure behaviors. Like transformational leader behaviors, the daily use of contingent reward behavior was found to be indirectly and positively related to followers' daily work engagement via both autonomy and social support (Breevaart et al., 2014). However, daily active management by exception was found to be negatively related to follower engagement via decreases in daily autonomy (Breevaart et al., 2014). Furthermore, Tomprou and Nikolaou (2013) showed that daily newcomer beliefs in promises made by people within their organization were higher when these promises were made by their line managers compared to HR managers and top management.

Causes

Three studies looked at proximal antecedents to daily transactional and initiating structure behaviors. Yeung and Shen (2019) found leader authentic pride to be associated with more structure initiating and consideration behaviors. Rosen et al. (2019) found that for leaders low in self-control, daily email demands led to decreases in leader structure initiating behaviors through a decrease in goal progress. Finally, Nielsen and Cleal (2010) showed that the more leaders engaged in daily planning, problem-solving, and evaluation of tasks, the more flow they experienced at work.

Moderators

Finally, one study examined a transactional leader behavior as a moderator between follower daily behaviors. Derks et al. (2015) found that when leaders expect followers to be online after work hours, the positive relation between followers' daily smartphone use and daily work-home interference is strengthened.

Daily abusive leadership behaviors

Methods and theory

Overall, we found twelve studies on daily abusive behaviors, including leader incivility. Most used interval contingent sampling ($k = 11$), and one study (Meier & Gross, 2015) used event-contingent sampling. Five studies focused solely on followers, whereas three studies focused on the leaders and three studies focused on both leaders and followers. Most studies built on affect or emotion theories, such as affective events theory (e.g., Butts et al., 2015), or stressor strain theories, such as ego-depletion (e.g., Barnes et al., 2015) and conservations of resources theory (e.g., Qin et al., 2018). Compared to other leader behaviors, daily studies on abusive leader behaviors have tended to draw from similar types of theoretical perspectives.

Consequences

Seven studies looked at the daily consequences of leader abusive behaviors. First, Vogel and Mitchell (2017) showed that daily abusive leadership behaviors lead to an increase in followers' daily workplace deviance due to a daily loss of self-esteem. Daily abusive leader behavior has also been found to decrease followers' daily intrinsic motivation (Tariq & Ding, 2018) and daily work engagement (Barnes et al., 2015) and increase followers' turnover intentions (Tariq & Ding, 2018). In addition, followers often exhibit incivility towards their leaders in response to incivility they experienced that day (Meier & Gross, 2015).

The daily use of abusive leader behaviors also has consequences for the leaders themselves. Interestingly, engaging in abusive leader behaviors in the morning causes leaders to experience guilt and a sense of lost moral credits, and as a result, leaders are more likely to engage in constructive leader behaviors in the afternoon (Liao et al., 2018). Abusive leader behaviors during the day have also been found to result in decreased need fulfillment and relaxation at the end of the day (Foulek et al., 2018). In contrast, research has found that abusive leader behaviors during the day can lead to enhanced recovery at the end of the day due to leader resource conservation and leads to next day leader work engagement (Qin et al., 2018). However, the recovery effects due to abusive leader behaviors seem to be short-lived, and engaging in these abusive behaviors has a negative effect on leaders' work engagement after several days. Taken together, these findings suggest that additional future work is needed to synthesize the conflicting personal consequences of leader abusive behaviors on the leaders themselves.

Causes

Five studies explored the short-term daily antecedents to abusive leader behaviors. Specifically, it has been found that a leader's previous night's sleep quality (Barnes et al., 2015) and previous day's level of family-to-work conflict (Courtright et al., 2016) increase the leader's depletion of ego resources, which leads to more abusive leader

behaviors the next day. Also, Johnson et al. (2012) found that leaders with an individual (vs. collective) identity showed higher daily mean levels of abusive supervision and less variation in their abusive supervision behaviors. Other studies highlight how daily feelings of psychological power can increase daily abusive behaviors (Fouk et al., 2018), and how leader pride can also be a source of daily abusive leader behaviors (Yeung & Shen, 2019). Thus, both pre-work factors, such as sleep quality and family interaction, and a leader's psychological and emotional state are important antecedents of daily abusive behaviors.

Moderators

Finally, two studies explored abusive leader behaviors as a moderator. One study found that followers were more likely to experience daily anger after receiving a negatively toned message when it came from a leader (versus coworker) who was high in abusive behaviors (Butts et al., 2015). Bormann (2017) found that previous day abusive supervision moderates the relation between ethical leadership and follower engagement. The work by Bormann (2017) is an excellent example of a within-person study that challenges how we view leadership by showing that leaders may be abusive one day but ethical another. It is also a good example of showing how two types of leader behaviors interact with each other on a day-to-day basis.

Daily leader justice behaviors

Methods and theory

Eight studies focused on daily justice behaviors of leaders, exploring both the causes and the consequences of daily justice behaviors. Leader justice behaviors include behaving equitably, fairly, and without bias. All of these articles used interval contingent sampling. Affective events theory was used most often (e.g., Ford et al., 2018; Judge et al., 2006; Yang & Diefendorff, 2009). Justice (Scott et al., 2014) and motivation theories (Sherf et al., 2019) were used as well.

Consequences

Five studies explored the daily consequences of leader justice behaviors. When followers perceive that their leaders exhibit low levels of justice on a given day, this leads to increases in follower daily negative emotions, which then increases followers' likelihood to engage in CWBs (Yang & Diefendorff, 2009). Also, followers feel more job satisfaction and less hostility on days that their leader displays more interpersonal justice (Judge et al., 2006). Similarly, followers experience less anger when their leader behaves with interactional justice, which then indirectly reduces follower daily CWB (Ford et al., 2018). And leaders that vary in their justice behaviors from day to day increase followers' daily stress which increases followers' daily job dissatisfaction and daily emotional exhaustion (Matta et al., 2017). With regard to the consequences for leaders themselves, research has found that daily procedural justice behaviors are draining for leaders but that daily interactional justice behaviors are replenishing for leaders; both indirectly affect leader OCB (Johnson et al., 2014).

Causes

Two studies have looked at the causes of daily leader justice behaviors. Leaders' daily cognitive motives of compliance, identity maintenance, and fairness, and their affective motives of positive and negative affect all were found to influence their daily practice of justice behaviors (Scott et al., 2014). Sherf et al. (2019) showed that leaders' daily workload induces leaders to prioritize technical tasks over justice behaviors, which decreases their daily behaviors of justice rule adherence (i.e., the manner in which individuals adhere to rules of justice such as explaining decisions, providing logic for decisions, or seeking input). The study by Sherf et al. (2019) is an excellent example of a daily leadership study exploring the short-term process of leadership using specific variables that would have been difficult to study in another way.

Moderators

Finally, one study explored leader justice behaviors as a moderator. High levels of daily leader displays of interactional justice were found to minimize the positive effects between nostalgia and both daily intrinsic motivation and daily work effort (Van Dijke et al., 2019). Thus, interactional justice can act as a compensatory mechanism for employees that feel low levels of nostalgia. The research on leader daily justice behaviors mirrors several findings identified in the abusive leadership section – work characteristics are important antecedents and follower negative affective reactions are key outcomes. This is not surprising, given that followers of abusive supervisors often feel unjustly treated.

Daily leader-follower interactions

Methods and theory

Daily leadership studies on leader-member exchange and other types of dyadic interactions between leaders and followers highlight how leader-follower interaction at the daily level has short-term consequences for both leaders and followers. We found nine articles that studied daily leader-follower interactions. Seven used only follower measures and one used leader and follower measures. Five of these studies are interval-contingent sampling studies, three studies used event-based sampling, and one study used a signal-contingent method. Almost all studies used affect/emotion theories (e.g., Wijewardena et al., 2017) or social theories (*Liao et al., 2018) as their theoretical framework.

Consequences

Eight studies focused on the consequences of leader-follower interactions. First, there are emotional and affective consequences for followers when they interact with their leader daily. For example, conflict episodes during the day with one's leader have been found to increase followers' daily negative affect (Volmer, 2015). Also, daily interactions with one's leader have been found to lead to fewer positive emotions than daily interactions with one's co-workers (Bono et al., 2007), and negative work events involving one's leader create higher levels of follower negative emotions compared to negative events involving co-workers (Matta et al., 2014). Finally, an event study of leader humor behaviors found that positive leader humor increased positive emotions among followers, while negative leader humor increased negative emotions among followers (Wijewardena et al., 2017). Daily leader-follower interactions have also been found to enhance follower belongingness, which enhances follower vigor and decrease emotional exhaustion (Ellis et al., 2018). And leader-follower interactions studied at the event-level show that resource contribution surplus leads to feelings of reciprocity and subsequent enhanced levels of work engagement (*Liao et al., 2018). However, Kudesia and Reina (2019) did not find daily interactions with trustworthy leaders to be significantly related to within-person changes in follower mindfulness. Finally, Li et al. (in press) found that leaders are less likely to accept employee voice when they are more depleted.

Causes

Only one studied looked at the causes of leader-behavior interaction. Lam et al. (2019) found that for followers, daily voice directness was positively related to leader endorsement behavior, but only for individuals who had high voice credibility.

Daily leader supportive behaviors

Methods and theory

Overall, we found 23 daily studies on supportive supervision, which made it the most studied leader behavior in our review. These studies measured both general leader support as well as specific types of leader support such as coaching, mentoring, helping, family support, support

for creativity, etc. Most used interval-contingent methodology, and two studies used event-sampling methodology. All but two of the studies only collected data from followers, and those studies collected data from both followers and leaders. These studies used a variety of theoretical perspectives such as affective events theory ($k = 3$), conservation of resources theory ($k = 3$), work-home resource perspective ($k = 2$), and job demands-resources theory ($k = 2$). However, five of these studies did not use an overall theoretical perspective.

Consequences

In our review, 12 studies explored the follower and leader consequences of supportive behaviors. Most studies explored follower affective consequences to leader daily support. For example, Amabile et al. (2004) found that daily leader-reported supportive behaviors positively affected followers' daily perceptions of leader support and created a beneficial affective reaction for followers, which then positively affected their day-to-day creativity levels. The daily use of empathy by one's leader was found to decrease followers' daily somatic complaints and strengthen the relation between followers' daily goal progress and their state positive affect (Scott et al., 2010). Research also found that leader developmental feedback leads to follower positive affect, which then increases follower creativity on a within-person basis (Christensen-Salem et al., 2018).

Ford et al. (2018) found that daily leader helping led to more episodic gratitude towards the organization, which increased the prevalence of OCBs and decreased the prevalence of CWBs. Also, day-level coaching has been found to increase positive emotions and personal resources for followers who receive the coaching (Xanthopoulou et al., 2012). And Stocker et al. (2014) found that followers experienced higher levels of serenity on days that leaders showed appreciation for followers. Taken together, these results show that daily leader support tends to enhance follower daily affect.

However, in contrast to this general finding, two studies found that daily leader support hurt or had no effect on follower affect. Jones and Johnston (2012) found that nurses who received managerial support after a negative incident were more likely to have a decrease in positive affect. And daily supervisor support was found to not interact with negative affect to influence perceived quality of care (Jones & Johnston, 2013).

In addition to affective reactions, daily leader support can cause followers to be more effective and creative. For example, daily supervisor support can stimulate followers to use their strengths more on the following day (Lavy et al., 2017). Also, daily supervisory career mentoring was found to be negatively associated with daily concern and positively associated with daily curiosity (Zacher, 2016). Finally, research has found that on days leaders both stimulate follower's exploration of ideas and facilitate the exploitation of ideas (i.e., use ambidextrous leadership), followers display more innovative behavior (Zacher & Wilden, 2014). The general trend across these studies highlights how leaders' daily supportive behaviors tend to increase followers' daily positive affect and followers' daily creativity/innovation.

Leader supportive behaviors also have consequences for the leader. Lanaj and Jennings (2019) found that leaders experienced more negative affect on days that they helped followers with personal problems. They also found that followers rated their leaders as less engaged on days that they had helped them with personal problems. This study by Lanaj and Jennings (2019) explored an interesting within-person relation, showing a potential dark side to leader support. This likely would have been difficult to show at a between-person level of analysis.

Causes

Only one study looked at the antecedents of supportive leader behaviors. Dollard and Idris (2017) found that espoused psychological safety climate by the organization led to an increase in daily enacted leader support.

Moderators

In addition to exploring daily consequences, 11 studies looked at leader support as a moderator for various daily relations. For example, one study found that daily leader social support often weakens the positive relation between follower daily workload and emotional exhaustion (Pluut et al., 2018). Daily supportive leadership also buffers the relation between follower work-family conflict and follower end-of-day cortisol levels (Almeida et al., 2016). Daily leader support also strengthens the negative relation between espoused psychological safety and daily emotional exhaustion (Dollard & Idris, 2017). However, Blanco-Donoso et al. (2017) did not find that daily supervisor support buffers the negative effect that daily difficulties to regulate emotions at work had on emotional exhaustion, fatigue, and negative affect.

Several studies have shown how general supportive supervision moderates several types of daily work and home conflicts. For example, To et al. (2012) found that the daily positive relation between positive mood and creative process engagement is stronger when general leader support for creativity is high. General supportive supervision also minimizes the effects of daily work-to-family conflict to follower negative affect (Almeida et al., 2016); it reduces the positive effect daily family-to-work conflict has on follower daily counterproductive work behavior (Germeys & De Gieter, 2017), aggression towards supervisors and co-workers (Liu et al., 2015), and blood pressure (Shockley & Allen, 2013); and it reduces the effect between follower daily workload and work-family conflict (Goh et al., 2015). Leader supportive behavior also reduces the relation between follower experiences of daily incivility and daily stress (Beattie & Griffin, 2014), as well as the relation between negative customer experiences on employee positive affect (Tsai & Chen, 2017). In aggregate, these studies provide considerable evidence that supportive leader behaviors can reduce the effects of follower daily negative workplace stressors.

Daily moral leader behaviors

Methods and theory

Moral approaches to leadership in this review include the following three types of leadership: servant leadership, authentic leadership, and ethical leadership (Hoch, Bommer, Dulebohn, & Wu, 2018; Lemoine, Hartnell, & Leroy, 2019). Each of these leadership theories taps into moral motifs of leader actions. We identified four studies that explored the daily occurrence and consequences of moral leadership behaviors. All but one focused on follower perceptions, and all used interval-contingent sampling methodology.

Consequences

Three studies explored the consequences of leader moral behaviors. Daily ethical leadership was found to enhance follower daily engagement and subsequent helping behavior later in the day (Bormann, 2017). However, the positive effects of daily ethical leadership behaviors onto followers' work engagement are attenuated by the leader's previous day abusive behavior (Bormann, 2017). Daily servant leadership has been found to lead to an increase in next-day follower goal attainment (Rodríguez-Carvajal et al., 2019). Moral leader behaviors also have consequences of the leader. One study found that daily authentic leadership behaviors do not deplete leaders' ego resources but enhance leaders' work engagement and decrease leaders' stress levels (Weiss et al., 2018). Thus, moral leader behaviors can be energizing for leaders as well.

Moderators

Finally, one study explored moral leadership as a moderator. Yagil and Medler-Liraz (2014) found that the relation between followers' daily positive emotions and their levels of authentic self-expression is stronger when they have a leader who displays more authentic leadership behaviors.

Surprisingly, only one study identified in our review explored daily servant leadership behaviors (Rodríguez-Carvajal et al., 2019). This is unfortunate given that servant leadership, as a general behavior pattern, predicts more variance above and beyond transformational leadership than both ethical and authentic leadership (Hoch et al., 2018).

Daily empowering leadership behaviors

Methods and theory

Empowering leadership is an emerging leadership theory and includes leader behaviors such as involving followers in decisions, delegating responsibilities to followers, and encouraging followers to take initiative (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Only two studies examined how empowering leadership as rated by followers can affect followers' daily outcomes. One study used interval-contingent sampling with two measurement points a day (Schilpzand et al., 2018), and one study used event-sampling study (Dong et al., 2015).

Consequences

First, Schilpzand et al. (2018) showed that daily empowering leadership led followers to engage in more proactive goal setting the next day, which consequently enhanced followers' daily voice and risk-taking behaviors. These relations were strengthened when followers had a good night rest (Schilpzand et al., 2018).

Moderators

The second study found that general empowering leadership was a cross-level moderator that strengthens the relation between follower state promotion focus and creativity; empowering leadership also moderated the indirect effect between customer empowering behavior to creativity via state promotion focus (Dong et al., 2015). Thus, empowering leader behaviors can help facilitate follower daily proactivity and daily creativity.

Leader intervention

Finally, two studies explored a daily leader behavioral intervention. In an experimental ESM study, Lanaj et al. (2019) showed that on days when leaders engaged in a positive self-reflection exercise, they reported less energy depletion, which led to heightened work engagement for the leader and an increased sense of clout (perceptions of self-confidence and authority) and prosocial impact on others. This study suggests that positive self-reflection behaviors can be an important mechanism to assist leaders in their day-to-day leadership. Foulk et al. (2018) also conducted an experimental ESM study and manipulated leader psychological power. Psychological power was found to increase leader abusive behaviors.

Discussion

The number of daily studies that incorporate leadership has seen a rapid increase in the past few years. Recent scholarly work on daily leadership behaviors has not only increased our collective knowledge of leadership but has also opened up opportunities avenues for new research. Based on our discussion of the importance of studying daily leadership and review of the literature, we now provide recommendations for future research. Drawing upon our review we suggest ways scholars can provide more depth and breadth with daily leadership studies. In Table 4, we provide a summary of our recommendations for future research.

Depth

Time

An important avenue for the future is to incorporate time when studying daily leadership. Very few studies in our review explicitly

addressed time in their theorizing. This is unfortunate because time is an important element in leadership that is too often overlooked (Castillo & Trinh, 2018; Shamir, 2011). Further, an important advantage to daily studies is their ability to explain short-term processes in leadership. And time is an important boundary condition for many of the theories used to understand leadership at the daily level such as stress/strain theories, affect/emotion theories, and theories of motivation. Some studies in our review would explore how leadership relationships occurred all in one day (e.g., Barnes et al., 2015; Breevaart & Bakker, 2018; Christensen-Salem et al., 2018) while others explored how leadership relationships existed from one day to the next (e.g., Courtright et al., 2016; Lavy et al., 2017; Schilpzand et al., 2018). For many studies, it was not clear why they focused on relationships only at a day level or at a day-to-day level. Some studies did incorporate time as a part of their study. For example, Qin et al. (2018) found that the leader personal benefit of improved recovery levels from abusive supervision is short-lived for the leader and Meier and Gross (2015) found that followers only retaliate incivility towards leaders' incivility when the follower reacts quickly.

There are several different ways in which time may be included in leadership theories to get a better understanding of the dynamics of leadership behaviors. First, time (e.g., the day of the week, the time during the day) may be an explicit predictor of leadership behaviors. For example, could leaders be less likely to engage in transformational behaviors towards the end of the day, and perhaps engage in more abusive behaviors towards the end of the day due to fatigue or resource drain? Or, what might be the consequence of daily leadership behaviors when leaders are called to work additional hours after the typical workday? Finally, does the day of the week have implications for what types of behaviors leaders engage in or follower responses to leader behaviors? Exploring daily leader behaviors by including time in different ways opens up opportunities to answer different types of research questions that can enhance our understanding of the dynamics of leadership.

Another important way that future research may seek to incorporate time is to examine the time-lagged effects of daily leadership behaviors. A few studies in our review explored time-lagged effects in their studies (e.g., Qin et al., 2018). Future scholars could explore additional time-lagged effects in daily leadership behaviors, since this is an important way to understand the causes and consequences of short-term leader behaviors. For example, understanding how long leader behaviors last before they are diminished in value will be key for future scholarly work. Specifically, what types of leadership behaviors have more enduring effects and which are more fleeting? For example, because "bad" is often more powerful than "good" (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer, & Vohs, 2001) it would be interesting to understand if destructive leader behaviors have longer-lasting impacts on follower states compared to other constructive leader behaviors. This could also hold true for the antecedents to leadership behaviors – negative antecedents (e.g., traffic coming to work), may have a longer-lasting effect than positive antecedents (e.g., feeling well-rested) on leader behavior.

Measure multiple leader behaviors

Leaders may exhibit many different types of leader behaviors and daily studies are particularly well equipped to capture how different leader behaviors relate and coexist. General measures of leadership are often not precise enough and do not capture the transient nature of leader behaviors. Daily studies that use a within-person design can challenge and change how we view the relations between leader behaviors. For example, Breevaart et al. (2014) showed that leaders can be transformational, rewarding, and controlling all on the same day. In addition, Lin et al. (2016) found that leaders who behave ethically on one day, are more likely to behave abusively the next day, as explained by moral licensing and ego depletion. However, in the studies in our review, few studies included multiple leader behaviors (6/74 articles 8%), and even less had more than two leader behaviors (3/74 articles

Table 4
Recommendations for future research.

Weakness	Directions for future research	Examples
	Depth	
Few studies incorporated time into their hypothesizing and models.	Future research could explicitly consider time into their theorizing and study design.	Research could explore how time of day affects leader behavior and seek to understand how long destructive and constructive leader behaviors affect followers at the daily level of analysis.
A majority of studies focused on only one type of leader behavior, but daily studies can provide theoretical insight into how leader behaviors relate and coexist.	More future research could examine multiple leader behaviors in a single study	Research could explore how stable leadership behaviors interact with daily leadership behaviors to affect both leader and follower daily outcomes.
Many studies tested theories using general measures of theoretical constructs.	Future scholars should be more precise in their daily measures to test theory in unique ways.	Research could examine specific emotions when testing affective events theory or specific demands when testing job demands-resources theory.
Some of the studies in our review looked at leader behaviors that were very broad (e.g., supportive leadership, transformational leadership)	Future research could do a better job of looking at more specific leadership behaviors.	Instead of studying supportive leadership, scholars could examine which types of supportive behaviors are most important.
	Breadth	
Few studies used leader interventions.	Researchers could utilize leader interventions in their daily study designs.	Scholars could seek to understand the short-term/daily consequences of leadership interventions, such as gratitude or strengths-based training
Few studies used objective measures in their design.	Future research could better incorporate objective measures (especially objective dependent variables) into study designs.	Instead of relying on self-report or other-report data, scholars may incorporate objective measures such as daily exercise measured by a heart rate monitor on a fit-bit, to understand how daily physical exercise might affect leader behavior.
Some leadership behaviors have been understudied at a daily level.	Future research could specifically examine these understudied areas.	Research could explore daily servant, humble, and laze-faire leadership behaviors more extensively
No studies have specifically looked at how daily followership could affect leaders' emotions, attitudes, and behaviors.	Followers play an important role in crafting leadership, and research could explore how daily followership affects leaders.	Future research could explore how followership occurs on a daily basis.
Studies in our review primarily relied upon MEMs to test their hypotheses.	Researchers should be aware of the different ways to model clustered data and assure that they are correctly modeling their data.	Future research could be more explicit about how they model their data and make sure that they explain how they meet the necessary assumptions for the model that they use.

4%). More daily studies of leadership should include multiple types of leader behaviors because it can extend understanding of leader behaviors that may be difficult to capture at a general level of analysis and can challenge how we understand leadership.

Relatedly, no study explored both daily and general leadership behaviors together in one study. It would be interesting to see more studies taking a multilevel approach to leadership – to see how daily processes affect general behaviors (and vice versa) and to understand how the two interact. For example, do followers whose leader is generally inspiring and supportive react differently when their leader is laissez-faire or abusive on a specific day compared to followers whose leader is generally uninspiring and unsupportive? One could argue that for the former group of followers, a daily deviation from the leader's general behavioral patterns is seen as a breach of trust, yet one could also argue that for this group of followers, leaders have some credits to temporarily deviate from their usual behavior.

Use discrete and precise measures

When building leadership theory through daily studies, using more precise and discrete measures of theoretical constructs can add rich detail to the process of leadership. When using more general measures of constructs (e.g., general affect, task demands, OCB), daily studies often fail to capitalize on their opportunity to explore unique and novel relationships. Further, more general measures of theoretical constructs can often be effectively measured at a more general level of analysis. For example, when exploring affective events theory, rather than exploring how daily constructive leader behaviors can cause follower daily positive affect scholars can be more precise. Future scholars could explore how specific daily constructive leader behaviors (e.g., vision communication, servant, humble, supportive) are linked with specific follower emotions. For example, is daily humble leadership more strongly related to follower feelings of gratitude whereas daily empowering leadership is more strongly related to follower feelings of excitement? Do different types of follower positive (or negative) emotions from their leaders' daily behaviors yield different follower

outcomes? Or, do most follower positive (or negative) emotions caused by leaders generally lead to similar outcomes?

Task demands (when testing job demands-resources theory) is another example where future researchers can be more precise and measure discrete, daily task demands and how they relate to daily leadership. For example, how do daily meeting demands affect daily leadership behavior? Or, how do follower specific demands relate to leader daily behaviors? Rather than just exploring general daily demands, scholars have an opportunity to be more exact in their measurement. Not only will this help build theory by exploring novel relationships but can also answer interesting questions and provide insights into leadership that have traditionally been overlooked.

Specificity of leader behaviors

We encourage future researchers to be more specific about the leader behavior studied. For example, instead of simply studying supportive leadership, future research should be more specific about how leaders are supportive of their followers on a daily basis. A number of studies in our review were specific about different types of leader supportive behavior measured (e.g., Christensen-Salem et al., 2018; Germeys & De Gieter, 2017; Liu et al., 2015; Shockley & Allen, 2013) and this should continue in the future. Also, transformational leadership has recently come into criticism for being too broad (Van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013). However, transformational leadership was one of the most studied constructs in our review. We echo the recommendation put forward by Van Knippenberg and Sitkin (2013) to study the dimensions of transformational leadership, and encourage future daily leadership research to study the dimensions of transformational leadership. Finally, future research could also drill down and find out which type of abusive supervision behaviors, when enacted on at the daily level, are most detrimental for followers.

Breadth

Types of leader behaviors

Overall, previous leadership research has looked at a wide array of leader behaviors. However, there are still some behaviors that have been understudied by daily leadership scholars. Based on our review of the literature, we encourage scholars to broaden the spectrum of leadership behaviors studied in a daily fashion. For example, humble leadership has been gaining popularity in recent years (Owens, Yam, Bednar, Mao, & Hart, 2019), but no previous study has focused on daily humble leadership.

Furthermore, we did not find any daily study on laissez-faire leadership. Laissez-faire leadership occurs when leaders do not interfere with their followers, but rather withdraw themselves from the workplace. Whereas some scholars consider laissez-faire a type of non-leadership, others see laissez-faire as a form of destructive leadership (for a discussion on laissez-faire leadership, see Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007 and Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Future work could study laissez-faire leadership on a daily level of analysis. This research could give some insights into the discussion of laissez-faire leadership, taking into account the reasons why leaders withdraw themselves from the workplace. For example, could it be an effective strategy to withdraw oneself from the workplace when facing high work demands, rather than engaging with followers with the risk of having a fallout? And does it make a difference whether leaders are generally engaging (or not) and how many days leaders withdraw themselves from the workplace? Future research is needed to answer these, and other, interesting questions regarding different daily leadership behaviors.

Followership and followers

Daily studies could also help scholars study followership and how it alters leader behavior on a daily basis. No studies in our review explored daily followership but followership likely plays an important role in a leader's daily behavior. For example, scholars may explore how followers' leader-directed citizenship behavior or proactive behavior may elicit positive types of leader behaviors, such as transformational leader behaviors. Scholars may also explore, from a moral licensing perspective, how follower positive behavior could create moral credits for a leader that might increase future negative leader behaviors.

Relatedly, prior research has highlighted the benefits of leaders adjusting their leadership behaviors to the needs of their followers (e.g., De Vries, Roe, & Taillieu, 2002; Lambert, Tepper, Carr, Holt, & Barelka, 2012). Indeed, one of the articles in our review examined how the daily fit between transformational leadership needed and received leads to follower positive affect and subsequent job satisfaction (Tepper et al., 2018). However, each follower may have different needs, and frequently adjusting behavior may be cognitively and emotionally draining for leaders. Future daily leadership studies could look at both the benefits and the downsides to leaders frequently changing their types of behaviors throughout the day when interacting with different followers.

Leader interventions

The study of daily leadership behaviors also lends itself to understand the implications leadership interventions and training have for leaders in the short-term. For example, Lanaj et al. (2019) examined how leader reflection could positively influence the leader's daily behaviors. Organizations spend millions of dollars each year on leadership development. Understanding effective leader interventions that improve daily leadership behaviors has important implications for practitioners. Further, understanding the means by which a leader can alter their leader behaviors will have important implications for both followers and organizations alike. For example, scholars might explore how a leader gratitude intervention or strengths-based training can impact a leader's daily leadership behavior. Research that can highlight practical interventions, trainings, or resources that improve daily leader

behaviors will be an important way in which daily studies of leadership can make academic leadership studies more applicable to organizations.

When measuring the effect interventions have on leader behaviors, scholars could also use a daily ESM before the intervention and then several months after the intervention (see Camburn, Spillane, & Sebastian, 2010 and Nielsen & Daniels, 2012 for examples). This type of study design would allow scholars to utilize the benefits of ESM studies, but would also better measure the longer-term effectiveness of the intervention. In a similar vein, multiple ESM studies could be used over a longer period of time in order to get a more detailed understanding of how leadership processes and leadership development evolve over time.

Objective measures

Although objective data is sometimes used in daily leadership studies, most of the studies still use self-reports to gather information on private feelings that are difficult for others to assess. Daily ESM studies do not resolve the methodological disadvantages of self-reports, but they do minimize many of the concerns. Global self-reports are more strongly influenced by memory bias because when followers are asked to think back over the last months or report general feelings about an event, their answers often reflect general beliefs or attitudes (Schwartz, 2012; Sonnentag, Dormann, & Demerouti, 2010). Because of its proximity to the events, ESM helps reduce memory and estimation problems. However, also due to its proximity, ESM can increase affective bias. Therefore, future research on daily leadership behaviors could benefit from the inclusion of more objective measures in combination with subjective measures.

Barnes et al. (2015), Almeida et al. (2016), and Shockley and Allen (2013) are all examples of articles that used both objective and subjective measures in their studies. Barnes et al. (2015) included a measure of sleep duration. However, new methodologies such as sleep tracking devices and location trackers (e.g., measuring whether you are at home, at work, or in nature) now allow for even more objective context measures (e.g., receiving a notification when you wake up). Almeida et al. (2016) used daily saliva samples to measure cortisol levels. Shockley and Allen (2013) used wristwatches to measure heart rate and blood pressure throughout the day. Pairing subjective measures with daily objective measures whenever possible and suitable, would enhance the quality of daily leadership studies and the quality of leadership research in general. For example, future studies could use car tracking devices to track how leader-induced follower aggression affects subordinates' driving behavior on their commute home. Or future work may explore how physical exercise may be an important antecedent to constructive leader behaviors. With sleep, while prior research has examined how lack of sleep leads to abusive supervision (Barnes et al., 2015), future studies could look at whether abusive supervision increases difficulties for followers to fall asleep due to rumination. Finally, while it would be difficult to get objective measures of daily job performance in many jobs, there are some jobs that have objective, daily job-performance measures (e.g., call centers, sales companies, restaurants) that could be used in conjunction with daily studies of leadership.

Modeling of data

Studying daily life (i.e., gathering information about the same person at multiple days) inherently results in hierarchical, or clustered, data (i.e., days nested within persons). Recently, McNeish and Kelley (2019) as well as Antonakis, Bastardo, and Rönkkö (in press) showed that the ways in which clustered data are modeled is highly dependent on the discipline in which the study is conducted. Specifically, researchers in the field of economics primarily use fixed-effects models (FEM), and some scholars have suggested that this is the "gold standard" for modeling clustered data (Schurer & Yong, 2012); whereas mixed-effects models (MEM; also known as random effects models;

McNeish & Kelley, 2019) are more commonly used in the fields of psychology and management. As these authors rightfully note, rather than co-existing, it is important that both fields learn from one another to advance scientific practice.

One major benefit of MEMs is that they can incorporate both level-1 and level-2 effects (or more), whereas FEMs can only incorporate level-1 effects and account for the clustered nature of the data using dummy codes. Yet, MEMs require that the random effects assumption (also called exogeneity assumption) is met, meaning that the predictor variables do not covary with the random effects. If this assumption is violated, it means that estimates may be biased due to unmodeled variables at the second level (e.g., a person's personality or intelligence may affect a person's daily behavior). Antonakis et al. (in press) provide an overview of the possibilities to test the random effects assumption (i.e., Hausman test, Likelihood ratio test and Wald test).

One way to bridge the gap between MEMs and FEMs – to avoid endogeneity and at the same time model Level 2 effects – is to use a within-between specification of a mixed-effects model (WB-MEM, also called correlated random effects models; Antonakis et al., in press; Mundlak, 1978). These models include the cluster means of group-mean-centered Level 1 predictors as Level 2 predictors and as such separate the estimation of within- and between-cluster effects. We encourage future leadership scholars, particularly those who conduct daily studies of leadership, to consider the (dis)advantages of all the above-mentioned models and make a conscious decision about how to best analyze their data. Antonakis et al. (in press) provide a very useful decision chart that may help researchers to decide what type of model is appropriate to test their multilevel models depending on the type of effects that are of interest as well as the random effects assumption.

Conclusion

This review has highlighted previous research that has examined the daily causes and consequences of leadership behaviors. By reviewing the theoretical, behavioral, and methodological trends in daily leadership research we hope that our review will provide a basis for best practices that can be utilized as a reference for those wishing to examine daily leadership behaviors. While prior leadership research at the daily level has begun to uncover and expand our understanding of leadership, we have highlighted a number of areas for future scholarly work. In so doing, we hope that future studies of daily leadership behaviors can extend our breadth and expound our depth of our understanding of daily leadership.

References³

*Almeida, D. M., Davis, K. D., Lee, S., Lawson, K. M., Walter, K. N., & Moen, P. (2016). Supervisor support buffers daily psychological and physiological reactivity to work-to-family conflict. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 78(1), 165–179.

*Amabile, T. M., Schatzel, E. A., Moneta, G. B., & Kramer, S. J. (2004). Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 5–32.

Antonakis, J., Bastardo, N., & Rönkkö, M. (in press). On ignoring the random effects assumption in multilevel models: Review, critique, and recommendations. *Organizational Research Methods*.

*Barnes, C. M., Lucianetti, L., Bhawe, 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. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88, 207.

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of general psychology*, 5(4), 323–370.

*Beattie, L., & Griffin, B. (2014). Day-level fluctuations in stress and engagement in response to workplace incivility: A diary study. *Work & Stress*, 28(2), 124–142.

*Blanco-Donoso, L. M., Garrosa, E., Demerouti, E., & Moreno-Jiménez, B. (2017). Job resources and recovery experiences to face difficulties in emotion regulation at work: A diary study among nurses. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 24(2), 107.

Bolger, N., Davis, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary methods: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54(1), 579–616.

*Bono, J. E., Folds, H. J., Vinson, G., & Muros, J. P. (2007). Workplace emotions: The role of supervision and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1357–1367.

*Bormann, K. C. (2017). Linking daily ethical leadership to followers' daily behaviour: The roles of daily work engagement and previous abusive supervision. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(4), 590–600.

*Breevaart, K., Bakker, A., Hetland, J., Demerouti, E., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2014). Daily transactional and transformational leadership and daily employee engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87, 138–157.

*Breevaart, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2018). Daily job demands and employee work engagement: The role of daily transformational leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23, 338–349.

Breevaart, K., & de Vries, R. E. (2017). Supervisor's HEXACO personality traits and subordinate perceptions of abusive supervision. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(5), 691–700.

*Butts, M. M., Becker, W. J., & Boswell, W. R. (2015). Hot buttons and time sinks: The effects of electronic communication during nonwork time on emotions and work-nonwork conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(3), 763–788.

Camburn, E. M., Spillane, J. P., & Sebastian, J. (2010). Assessing the utility of a daily log for measuring principal leadership practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(5), 707–737.

Castillo, E. A., & Trinh, M. P. (2018). In search of missing time: A review of the study of time in leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 165–178.

*Christensen-Salem, A., Kinicki, A., Zhang, Z., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2018). Responses to feedback: The role of acceptance, affect, and creative behavior. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 25(4), 416–429.

*Courtright, S. H., Gardner, R. G., Smith, T. A., McCormick, B. W., & Colbert, A. E. (2016). My family made me do it: A cross-domain, self-regulatory perspective on antecedents to abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59, 1630–1652.

Dalal, R. S., Bhawe, D. P., & Fiset, J. (2014). Within-person variability in job performance: A theoretical review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 40, 1396–1436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314532691>.

Day, D. V., & Sin, H. P. (2011). Longitudinal tests of an integrative model of leader development: Charting and understanding developmental trajectories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(3), 545–560.

De Vries, R. E., Roe, R. A., & Taillieu, T. C. (2002). Need for leadership as a moderator of the relationships between leadership and individual outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 121–137.

*Derks, D., van Duin, D., Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2015). Smartphone use and work-home interference: The moderating role of social norms and employee work engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88, 155–177.

*Diebig, M., Bormann, K. C., & Rowold, J. (2017). Day-level transformational leadership and followers' daily level of stress: A moderated mediation model of team cooperation, role conflict, and type of communication. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26, 234–249.

*Dollard, M. F., & Idris, M. A. (2017). Climate congruence: How espoused psychosocial safety climate and enacted managerial support affect emotional exhaustion and work engagement. *Safety Science*, 96, 132–142.

*Dong, Y., Liao, H., Chuang, A., Zhou, J., & Campbell, E. M. (2015). Fostering employee service creativity: Joint effects of customer empowering behaviors and supervisory empowering leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 1364–1380.

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 207–216.

*Ellis, A. M., Bauer, T. N., Erdogan, B., & Truxillo, D. M. (2018). Daily perceptions of relationship quality with leaders: Implications for follower well-being. *Work & Stress*, 1–18.

Enders, C. K. (2010). *Applied missing data analysis*. New York: Guilford Publications.

Fisher, C. D., & To, M. L. (2012). Using experience sampling methodology in organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 865–877.

Fleeson, W. (2001). Toward a structure-and process-integrated view of personality: Traits as density distributions of states. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(6), 1011–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.80.6.1011>.

Fleeson, W., & Nofle, E. E. (2011). Personality research. In M. R. Mehl, & T. S. Conner (Eds.). *Handbook of research methods for studying daily life* (pp. 525–538). New York: Guilford Press.

*Ford, M. T., Wang, Y., Jin, J., & Eisenberger, R. (2018). Chronic and episodic anger and gratitude toward the organization: Relationships with organizational and supervisor supportiveness and extrarole behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(2), 175.

*Foulik, T. A., Lanaj, K., Tu, M. H., Erez, A., & Archambeau, L. (2018). Heavy is the head that wears the crown: An actor-centric approach to daily psychological power, abusive leader behavior, and perceived incivility. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61, 661–684.

Gabriel, A. S., Podsakoff, N. P., Beal, D. J., Scott, B. A., Sonnentag, S., Trougakos, J. P., & Butts, M. M. (2018). Experience sampling methods: A discussion of critical trends and considerations for scholarly advancement. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1094428118802626.

*Germeyns, L., & De Gieter, S. (2017). Clarifying the dynamic interrelation of conflicts between the work and home domain and counterproductive work behavior. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(3), 457–467.

Giambatista, R. C. (2004). Jumping through hoops: A longitudinal study of leader life cycles in the NBA. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(5), 607–624.

*Goh, Z., Ilies, R., & Wilson, K. S. (2015). Supportive supervisors improve employees' daily lives: The role supervisors play in the impact of daily workload on life satisfaction via work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 89, 65–73.

³ * indicates reviewed article

- Graham, J. W. (2009). Missing data analysis: Making it work in the real world. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60(1), 549–576.
- *Hetland, J., Hetland, H., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2018). Daily transformational leadership and employee job crafting: The role of promotion focus. *European Management Journal*, 36, 746–756.
- *Hetland, J., Hetland, H., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., Andreassen, C. S., & Pallesen, S. (2015). Psychological need fulfillment as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and positive job attitudes. *Career Development International*, 20(5), 464–481.
- Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 501–529.
- Hopton, C. (2016). It does not add up: Comparing episodic and general leadership ratings. *Leadership*, 12(4), 491–503.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(6), 891.
- *Johnson, R. E., Lanaj, K., & Barnes, C. M. (2014). The good and bad of being fair: Effects of procedural and interpersonal justice behaviors on regulatory resources. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 635.
- *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.
- *Jones, M. C., & Johnston, D. (2013). Do mood and the receipt of work-based support influence nurse perceived quality of care delivery? A behavioural diary study. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 22(5–6), 890–901.
- *Jones, M. C., & Johnston, D. W. (2012). Does clinical incident seriousness and receipt of work-based support influence mood experienced by nurses at work? A behavioural diary study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 49(8), 978–987.
- *Judge, T. A., Scott, B. A., & Ilies, R. (2006). Hostility, job attitudes, and workplace deviance: test of a multilevel model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 126–138.
- Kalish, Y., & Luria, G. (2016). Leadership emergence over time in short-lived groups: Integrating expectations states theory with temporal person-perception and self-serving bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(10), 1474.
- *Kelloway, E. K., Weigand, H., McKee, M. C., & Das, H. (2013). Positive leadership and employee well-being. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20, 107–117.
- Koning, L. F., & Van Kleef, G. A. (2015). How leaders' emotional displays shape followers' organizational citizenship behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26, 489–501.
- *Kudesia, R. S., & Reina, C. S. (2019). Does interacting with trustworthy people enhance mindfulness? An experience sampling study of mindfulness in everyday situations. *PLoS one*, 14(4), e0215810.
- *Kuonath, A., Specht, J., Kühnel, J., Pachler, D., & Frey, D. (2017). Keeping up day-specific effects of transformational leadership: the role of followers' emotion regulation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(6), 828–843.
- *Lam, C. F., Lee, C., & Sui, Y. (2019). Say it as it is: Consequences of voice directness, voice politeness, and voicer credibility on voice endorsement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(5), 642–658.
- Lambert, L. S., Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Holt, D. T., & Barelka, A. J. (2012). Forgotten but not gone: an examination of fit between leader consideration and initiating structure needed and received. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 913–930.
- *Lanaj, K., Foulk, T. A., & Erez, A. (2019). Energizing leaders via self-reflection: A within-person field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104, 1–18.
- *Lanaj, K., & Jennings, R. E. (2019). Putting leaders in a bad mood: The affective costs of helping followers with personal problems. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. (in press).
- *Lanaj, K., Johnson, R. E., & Lee, S. M. (2016). Benefits of transformational behaviors for leaders: A daily investigation of leader behaviors and need fulfillment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101, 237.
- *Lavy, S., Littman-Ovadia, H., & Boiman-Meshita, M. (2017). The wind beneath my wings: Effects of social support on daily use of character strengths at work. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 25(4), 703–714.
- Lemoine, G. J., Hartnell, C. A., & Leroy, H. (2019). Taking stock of moral approaches to leadership: An integrative review of ethical, authentic, and servant leadership. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(1), 148–187.
- *Li, J., Barnes, C. M., Yam, K. C., Guarana, C. L., & Wang, L. (in press). Do not like it when you need it the most: Examining the effect of manager ego depletion on managerial voice endorsement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
- *Liao, Z., Liu, W., Li, X., & Song, Z. (2018). Give and take: An episodic perspective on leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104, 34.
- *Liao, Z., Yam, K. C., Johnson, R. E., Liu, W., & Song, Z. (2018). Cleansing my abuse: A reparative response model of perpetrating abusive supervisor behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(9), 1039–1056.
- Lin, S. H. J., Ma, J., & Johnson, R. E. (2016). When ethical leader behavior breaks bad: How ethical leader behavior can turn abusive via ego depletion and moral licensing. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101, 815–830.
- *Liu, Y., Wang, M., Chang, C. H., Shi, J., Zhou, L., & Shao, R. (2015). Work-family conflict, emotional exhaustion, and displaced aggression toward others: The moderating roles of workplace interpersonal conflict and perceived managerial family support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 793–808.
- *Matta, F. K., Erol-Korkmaz, H. T., Johnson, R. E., & Biçaksiz, P. (2014). Significant work events and counterproductive work behavior: The role of fairness, emotions, and emotion regulation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35, 920–944.
- *Matta, F. K., Scott, B. A., Colquitt, J. A., Koopman, J., & Passantino, L. G. (2017). Is consistently unfair better than sporadically fair? An investigation of justice variability and stress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60, 743–770.
- McClellan, S. T., Barnes, C. M., Courtright, S. H., & Johnson, R. E. (in press). Resetting the clock on dynamic leader behaviors: A conceptual integration and agenda for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*.
- McCormick, B. W., Reeves, C. J., Downes, P. E., Li, N., & Ilies, R. (in press). Scientific Contributions of Within-Person Research in Management: Making the Juice Worth the Squeeze. *Journal of Management*.
- McNeish, D., & Kelley, K. (2019). Fixed effects models versus mixed effects models for clustered data: Reviewing the approaches, disentangling the differences, and making recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, 24(1), 20.
- *Meier, L. L., & Gross, S. (2015). Episodes of incivility between subordinates and supervisors: Examining the role of self-control and time with an interaction-record diary study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36, 1096–1113.
- Miscenko, D., Guenter, H., & Day, D. V. (2017). Am I a leader? Examining leader identity development over time. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(5), 605–620.
- Mundlak, Y. (1978). On the pooling of time series and cross section data. *Econometrica*, 46, 69–85.
- *Myrden, S. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2015). Leading to customer loyalty: A daily test of the service-profit chain. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 29(7), 585–598.
- Newman, D. A. (2014). Missing data five practical guidelines. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17(4), 372–411.
- *Nielsen, K., & Cleal, B. (2010). Predicting flow at work: Investigating the activities and job characteristics that predict flow states at work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(2), 180.
- *Nielsen, K., & Cleal, B. (2011). Under which conditions do middle managers exhibit transformational leadership behaviors? – An experience sampling method study on the predictors of transformational leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 344–352.
- Nielsen, K., & Daniels, K. (2012). Enhancing team leaders' well-being states and challenge experiences during organizational change: A randomized, controlled study. *Human Relations*, 65(9), 1207–1231.
- Ohly, S., & Gochmann, V. (2017). 12. Diary studies in leadership. *Handbook of methods in leadership research*, 296.
- Owens, B. P., Yam, K. C., Bednar, J. S., Mao, J., & Hart, D. W. (2019). The impact of leader moral humility on follower moral self-efficacy and behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104, 146–163.
- *Pluut, H., Ilies, R., Curşeu, P. L., & Liu, Y. (2018). Social support at work and at home: Dual-buffering effects in the work-family conflict process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 146, 1–13.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903.
- *Qin, X., Huang, M., Johnson, R. E., Hu, Q., & Ju, D. (2018). The short-lived benefits of abusive supervisory behavior for actors: An investigation of recovery and work engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61, 1951–1975.
- Reis, H. T. (2012). Why researchers should think “real-world”: A conceptual rationale. In M. R. Mehl, & T. Connor (Eds.). *Handbook of research methods for studying daily life* (pp. 3–21). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Reis, H. T., & Gable, S. L. (2000). Event-sampling and other methods for studying everyday experience. In H. T. Reis, & C. M. Judd (Eds.). *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (pp. 190–222). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, M. D., & Clore, G. L. (2002). Belief and feeling: evidence for an accessibility model of emotional self-report. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(6), 934–960. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.6.934>.
- *Rodríguez-Carvajal, R., Herrero, M., van Dierendonck, D., de Rivas, S., & Moreno-Jiménez, B. (2019). Servant leadership and goal attainment through meaningful life and vitality: a diary study. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 20(2), 499–521.
- Rosen, C. C., Simon, L. S., Gajendran, R. S., Johnson, R. E., Lee, H. W., & Lin, S. H. J. (2019). Boxed in by your inbox: Implications of daily e-mail demands for managers' leadership behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(1), 19–33.
- *Schilpzand, P., Houston, L., III, & Cho, J. (2018). Not too tired to be proactive: Daily empowering leadership spurs next-morning employee proactivity as moderated by nightly sleep quality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61, 2367–2387.
- Schurer, S., & Yong, J. (2012). *Personality, well-being and the marginal utility of income: What can we learn from random coefficient models?* Health, Econometrics and Data Group (HEDG) Working Papers. Department of Economics: University of York, York, United Kingdom.
- Schwartz, N. (2012). Why researchers should think “real-time”: A cognitive rationale. In M. R. Mehl, & T. Connor (Eds.). *Handbook of research methods for studying daily life* (pp. 22–42). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 138–158.
- *Scott, B. A., Colquitt, J. A., Paddock, E. L., & Judge, T. A. (2010). A daily investigation of the role of manager empathy on employee well-being. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 113, 127–140.
- *Scott, B. A., Garza, A. S., Conlon, D. E., & Kim, Y. J. (2014). Why do managers act fairly in the first place? A daily investigation of “hot” and “cold” motives and discretion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57, 1571–1591.
- Seifert, C. F., & Yukl, G. (2010). Effects of repeated multi-source feedback on the influence behavior and effectiveness of managers: A field experiment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(5), 856–866.
- Shamir, B. (2011). Leadership takes time: Some implications of (not) taking time seriously in leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(2), 307–315.
- *Sherf, E. N., Venkataramani, V., & Gajendran, R. S. (2019). *Too busy to be fair?* Academy of Management Journal: The effect of workload and rewards on managers' justice rule adherence.
- *Shockley, K. M., & Allen, T. D. (2013). Episodic work-family conflict, cardiovascular indicators, and social support: An experience sampling approach. *Journal of*

- Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(3), 262.
- Sonnentag, S., Dormann, C., & Demerouti, E. (2010). Not all days are created equal: The concept of state work engagement. In A. B. Bakker, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.). *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 25–38). New York: Psychology Press.
- *Stocker, D., Jacobshagen, N., Krings, R., Pfister, I. B., & Semmer, N. K. (2014). Appreciative leadership and employee well-being in everyday working life. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28, 73–95.
- *Tariq, H., & Ding, D. (2018). Why am I still doing this job? The examination of family motivation on employees' work behaviors under abusive supervision. *Personnel Review*, 47(2), 378–402.
- *Tepper, B. J., Dimotakis, N., Lambert, L. S., Koopman, J., Matta, F. K., Man Park, H., & Goo, W. (2018). Examining follower responses to transformational leadership from a dynamic, person–environment fit perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61, 1343–1368.
- Tepper, B. J., Simon, L., & Park, H. M. (2017). Abusive supervision. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 123–152.
- *Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2011). Do transformational leaders enhance their followers' daily work engagement? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 121–131.
- *To, M. L., Fisher, C. D., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Rowe, P. A. (2012). Within-person relationships between mood and creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 599.
- *Tomprou, M., & Nikolaou, I. (2013). Exploring the role of social influence in promise beliefs and information acquisition among newcomers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22(4), 408–422.
- *Tsai, W. C., & Chen, H. Y. (2017). A multilevel investigation of antecedents of employee positive affective displays: The roles of customer negative affective displays and employee perceived supervisory support. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(3), 385–398.
- Uy, M. A., Foo, M. D., & Aguinis, H. (2010). Using experience sampling methodology to advance entrepreneurship theory and research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13, 31–54.
- *Van Dijke, M., Leunissen, J. M., Wildschut, T., & Sedikides, C. (2019). Nostalgia promotes intrinsic motivation and effort in the presence of low interactional justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 150, 46–61.
- Van Kleef, G. A., Homan, A. C., Beersma, B., Van Knippenberg, D., Van Knippenberg, B., & Damen, F. (2009). Searing sentiment or cold calculation? The effects of leader emotional displays on team performance depend on follower epistemic motivation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 562–580.
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic—transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board? *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 1–60.
- Venus, M., Johnson, R. E., Zhang, S., Wang, X. H., & Lanaj, K. (2018). Seeing the big picture: A within-person examination of leader construal level and vision communication. *Journal of Management*, 45(7), 2666–2684.
- Visser, V. A., van Knippenberg, D., Van Kleef, G. A., & Wisse, B. (2013). How leader displays of happiness and sadness influence follower performance: Emotional contagion and creative versus analytical performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 172–188.
- *Vogel, R. M., & Mitchell, M. S. (2017). The motivational effects of diminished self-esteem for employees who experience abusive supervision. *Journal of Management*, 43, 2218–2251.
- *Volmer, J. (2015). Followers' daily reactions to social conflicts with supervisors: The moderating role of core self-evaluations and procedural justice perceptions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26, 719–731.
- *Weiss, M., Razinkas, S., Backmann, J., & Hoegl, M. (2018). Authentic leadership and leaders' mental well-being: An experience sampling study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29, 309–321.
- Wheeler, L., & Reis, H. T. (1991). Self-recording of everyday life events: Origins, types, and uses. *Journal of Personality*, 59, 339–354.
- *Wijewardena, N., Härtel, C. E., & Samararatunge, R. (2017). Using humor and boosting emotions: An affect-based study of managerial humor, employees' emotions and psychological capital. *Human Relations*, 70, 1316–1341.
- *Xanthopoulou, D., Dakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). A diary study on the happy worker: How job resources relate to positive emotions and personal resources. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 21(4), 489–517.
- *Yagil, D., & Medler-Liraz, H. (2014). Feel free, be yourself: Authentic leadership, emotional expression, and employee authenticity. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 21, 59–70.
- *Yang, J., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2009). The relations of daily counterproductive workplace behavior with emotions, situational antecedents, and personality moderators: A diary study in Hong Kong. *Personnel Psychology*, 62, 259–295.
- *Yeung, E., & Shen, W. (2019). *Can pride be a vice and virtue at work?* Journal of Organizational Behavior: Associations between authentic and hubristic pride and leadership behaviors.
- *Zacher, H. (2016). Within-person relationships between daily individual and job characteristics and daily manifestations of career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 92, 105–115.
- *Zacher, H., & Wilden, R. G. (2014). A daily diary study on ambidextrous leadership and self-reported employee innovation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87, 813–820.
- Zhang, X., & Bartol, K. M. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(1), 107–128.
- Zhu, W., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2009). Moderating role of follower characteristics with transformational leadership and follower work engagement. *Group & Organization Management*, 34(5), 590–619.