6-12-2007

Personality, Lifestyle, and Transformational Leadership from a Humanistic Perspective

Michele R. Frey

ACCEPTANCE

This dissertation, PERSONALITY, LIFESTYLE, AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP FROM A HUMANISTIC PERSPECTIVE, by MICHELE R.FREY, was prepared under the direction of the candidate's Dissertation Advisory Committee. It is accepted by the committee members in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the College of Education, Georgia State University.

The Dissertation Advisory Committee and the student's Department Chair, as representatives of the faculty, certify that this dissertation has met all standards of excellence and scholarship as determined by the faculty. The Dean of the College of Education concurs.

_____
Roger O. Weed, Ph.D.
Committee Chair

_____
Roy M. Kern, Ed.D.
Committee Member

_____
William L. Curlette, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Jason N. Snow, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Gregory L. Brack, Ph. D.
Committee Member

_____
Date

_____
JoAnna F. White, Ed.D.
Chair, Department of Counseling and Psychological Services

_____
Ronald P. Colarusso, Ed.D.
Dean, College of Education

AUTHOR'S STATEMENT

By presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the advanced degree from Georgia State University, I agree that the library of Georgia State University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to quote, to copy from, or to publish this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written, by the College of Education's director of graduate studies and research, or by me. Such quoting, copying or publishing must be solely for scholarly purposes and will not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from or publication of this dissertation, which involves potential financial gain, will not be allowed without my written permission.

_____

Michele R. Frey

NOTICE TO BORROWERS

All dissertations deposited in the Georgia State University library must be used in accordance with the stipulations prescribed by the author in the preceding statement. The author of this dissertation is:

Michele R. Frey
237 L M Wigley Rd.
Dallas, GA 30132

The director of this dissertation is:

Dr. Roger Weed
Department of Counseling and Psychological Services
College of Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30303

VITA

Michele R. Frey

ADDRESS: 237 L M Wigley Rd.
Dallas, GA 30132

EDUCATION:

Ph.D.	2007	Georgia State University Counseling Education and Practice
Ed. S.	2001	Georgia State University Counseling
M.S.	1999	Georgia State University Professional Counseling
B.S.	1997	Mercer University Business Administration

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

2007 - present	Adjunct Faculty, College of Continuing and Professional Studies, Mercer University, Macon, Georgia
2004 - present	Licensed Professional Counselor, Private Practice, Dallas, GA
	Clinical Supervisor, Home Ministries, Inc., Acworth, GA
2002 - 2004	Adolescent Unit Director, Laurel Heights Behavioral Hospital for Children, Atlanta, GA
	Counselor and Parent Educator, Associated Counseling and Evaluative Services, Jonesboro, GA
1999 - 2002	Mental Health Counselor, Paulding County Regional Youth Detention Center, Dallas, GA
1998 - 2002	Editorial Staff, *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, Georgia State University, Atlanta

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE

Licensed Professional Counselor, GA #003697
National Certified Counselor, #54016

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES AND ORGANIZATIONS:

American Counseling Association
Licensed Professional Counselors Association
North American Society for Adlerian Psychology

South Carolina Adlerian Society
Florida Adlerian Society

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS:

Frey, M. (2006, February). *A comprehensive assessment of families in foster care.* Paulding County Department of Human Resources: Dallas, GA.

Frey, M. (2006, January). *A new paradigm of organizational leadership using personality and lifestyle constructs*. Georgia State University Professional MBA class: Alpharetta, GA.

Frey, M. (2005, November). *Working with families in crisis through parent education.* Home Ministries Annual Seminar: Cedartown, GA.

Curlette, W., & **Frey, M**. (2005, October). *BASIS-A on line: A new administration for lifestyle assessment.* South Carolina Conference for Adlerian Psychology: Myrtle Beach, SC.

Frey, M. (2005, September). *Respect must be mutual.* Interactive workshop presented to teenagers and parents at St. John Vianney Church, Lithia Springs, GA.

Frey, M., & Snow, J. (2005)**.** The personality construct of entitlement: An intervention used for decreasing attrition in parent education groups. *Journal of Individual Psychology, 6*(2), 151-159.

Gilman, R., Easterwood, S., & **Frey, M.** (2004). A preliminary study of multidimensional life satisfaction reports among deaf/hard of hearing youths across environmental settings. *Social Research Indicators, 66*(1-2), 123-141.

Frey, M. (2001, November). *Tips for understanding and working with youth.* Paulding County Youth Detention Center: Dallas, GA.

Frey, M. (2001, September). *Understanding suicide.* Paulding County Youth Detention Center: Dallas, GA.

Kern, R., & **Frey, M.** (2001, June). *Is your relationship a good fit? Assessment in couples counseling.* North American Society of Adlerian Psychology national convention: Tucson, AZ.

Kern, R., Jones, K., & **McDougal (Frey), M.** (2001, February). *Use of Assessment Tools to counsel couples.* Florida Adlerian Society Annual Conference: Tampa, FL.

Snow, J, **Frey, M.,** & Kern, R. (2001). Attrition, financial incentives, and parent education. *Family Journal-Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 10*(4) 373-378.

Curlette, W., **McDougal (Frey),** M., & Talley, J. (2000, October). *A new lifestyle assessment instrument for children and adolescents.* South Carolina Conference of Adlerian Psychology: Myrtle Beach, SC.

Gilman, R., Proctor, B., & **McDougal (Frey), M**. (2000, March). *Neglected children: A neglect domain in the assessment and treatment by school-aged children.* Paper

presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists: New Orleans.

Gfroerer, C., Gfroerer, K., & **McDougal (Frey), M**. (2000, May). *Exploring the relationship between lifestyle and career interests.* Paper presented at the North American Society of Adlerian Psychology national conference: St. Paul, MN.

ABSTRACT

LIFESTYLE, PERSONALITY, AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP FROM A HUMANISTIC PERSPECTIVE

by

Michele R. Frey

This study examined the interrelatedness of personality attributes related to lifestyle constructs as defined by Adler (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956), personality constructs for career success as defined by Hogan (1983), and transformational leadership style as defined by the Full Range of Leadership model (FRL) (Bass, 1990). Recent studies have suggested that certain personality attributes may be consistent with successful leadership ability (Bass, 1990; Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). There is, however, a lack of research looking at personality attributes as determinants of leadership style (Lim & Ployhart, 2004). Adler (Ansbacher & Ansbacher), Hogan (1983), and Bass (1990) posited that all human movement is purposeful and that an individual moves through this world toward and with others and in a concerted effort to overcome adversity. It is hoped that by using models with common theoretical themes that at least one confounding variable will be eliminated and thereby move researchers closer to an understanding of leadership. This study consisted of 240 participants in varying levels of management. Participants were recruited from Masters in Business Administration (MBA) programs and Executive Masters in Business Administration (EMBA) programs as well as a Professional Masters in Business Administration (PMBA) program and a Global Masters in Business Administration program (GMBA) in several local universities and colleges

located in and near a major metropolitan area of the southeastern region of the United States. Measurements include the Basic Adlerian Scales for Interpersonal Success – Adult Form (BASIS-A), the Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI), and the Multi-Leader Questionnaire-Short Form (MLQ-5X) as well as a demographic questionnaire. A discriminant analysis identified the Softness scale from the BASIS-A as a classifying discriminator between those participants who self-reported a transformational style of leadership and those who did not. Several stepwise multiple regression analyses resulted in findings suggesting that the Striving for Perfection and Wanting Recognition scales from the BASIS-A as well as the Ambition scale from the HPI were predictive of those who scored as exhibiting a transformational leadership style. The findings in this study suggest the importance of identifying personality traits and their dynamic interactions in relation to leadership style for future recruiting, hiring, selection, and training of organizational leaders as well as the development of educational programs with a focus on personality traits. The consistent and significant relationships between the BASIS-A scales and the Ambition scale of the HPI with the transformational leadership scales suggest that consideration of personality traits as an indicator and predictor of leadership style should continue to be stressed and explored.

PERSONALITY, LIFESTYLE, AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP FROM A HUMANISTIC PERSPECTIVE

by
Michele R. Frey

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the
Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Counselor Education and Practice
in
the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services
in
the College of Education
Georgia State University

Atlanta, Georgia
2007

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

"We must learn to have faith in ourselves before we can have faith in equals." (Dreikurs, 1953). I am eternally grateful to the many people who have helped me in uncountable ways with their unwavering encouragement to have faith in my own abilities.

First and foremost, this dissertation is dedicated in loving memory to my parents, Joyce and David Rauth, who by simply doing the best they knew to do in a difficult world infused in me a belief in my own potential and the courage to pursue it. Above all, I am thankful to my parents for the gift of family.

My Dissertation Chair, Dr. Roger Weed, has been my cheerleader throughout this process and always, always encouraging. Dr. William Curlette has challenged me to realize my own abilities. Dr. Gregory Brack was gracious enough to step in at the last minute and offer his support. Dr. Roy Kern has been my mentor, friend, and encourager. He provided me with so many opportunities to test my abilities, perseverance, and courage. Last but certainly not least, Dr. Jason Snow has been my closest ally, dearest friend, and staunchest supporter. Above all, he has given me humor and perspective along the way. Thank you all!

My husband, Jimmy Frey, has been beside me the entire journey. I cannot express to him how fortunate I feel to have had him with me through the many trials and tribulations that come with this journey. He has been a steady, faithful, and encouraging partner in a time that was often stressful and unpredictable.

In my two daughters, Kerri Henson and Kelly Whitmire, I see the fruits of those who came before them and the seeds of those who will come after. They were my inspiration and are my pride and joy.

I am eternally grateful to the many, many colleagues and friends who have over the years supported me, encouraged me, laughed with me, cried with me, challenged me, and simply listened to me. You will remain forever in my heart and are true testimonies to the spirit of social interest.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

AD	Adjustment (HPI scale)
AM	Ambition (HPI scale)
BC	Being Cautious (BASIS-A scale)
BSI	Belonging/Social Interest (BASIS-A scale)
E	Entitlement (BASIS-A scale)
EMBA	Executive Master of Business Administration (degree)
FRL	Full Range of Leadership
GA	Going Along (BASIS-A scale)
GMBA	Global Master of Business Administration (degree)
H	Harshness (BASIS-A scale)
HPI	Hogan Personality Inventory (Hogan & Hogan, 1992)
HTL	High Transformational Leadership (subsample)
IC	Individualized Consideration (MLQ scale)
IIA	Idealized Influence Attributed (MLQ scale)
IIB	Idealized Influence Behavior (MLQ scale)
IM	Inspirational Motivation (MLQ scale)
IQ	Inquisitiveness (HPI scale)
IS	Intellectual Stimulation (MLQ scale)
ITS	Interpersonal Sensitivity (HPI scale)
L	Liked by All (BASIS-A scale)
LA	Learning Approach
LTL	Low Transformational Leadership (subsample)
MLQ	Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Short Form; Bass & Avolio, 1990)
MBA	Master of Business Administration (degree)
P	Striving for Perfection (BASIS-A scale)
PMBA	Professional Master of Business Administration (degree)
PR	Prudence (HPI scale)
S	Softness (BASIS-A scale)

SO	Sociability (HPI scale)
TC	Taking Charge (BASIS-A scale)
WR	Wanting Recognition (BASIS-A scale)

CHAPTER 1

PERSONALITY ATTRIBUTES AND LEADERSHIP STYLES: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Over the past 15 years, there have been enormous and rapid changes in legal, political, and social realities that affect the ability of organizations to function efficiently (Storey, 2004; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). Business corporations (Bennis, Spreitzer, & Cummings, 2001; Haveman, Russo, & Meyer, 2001; Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2001), educational institutions of all types (Eddy et al., 1998; Hollinger, 2003; Louis, 2003; Rong & Brown, 2002), health care agencies (Reinhardt, 2004; Skelton-Green, 1997), international initiatives (Hunt, 1997), and governmental entities on all levels (Goski, Blackstone, & Lang, 2002; Heath, 2002; Schiffer, 2000) are but a few of the organizations struggling in this unprecedented era of rapid change. The future success of these and other types of organizations may well depend on their ability to select and train employees flexible and adaptive enough to lead them through the challenges of the modern world.

The realities now facing these organizations include consumer demand for higher quality at lower costs coupled with the large number of nations with skilled workers willing to work for low wages (Storey, 2004); hundreds of thousands of small, entrepreneurial firms resulting from the deregulation of services as well as the rapid technological advances constantly in flux (Hersey et al., 2001; Storey), global

competition, and larger spans of control for managers with flatter organizational hierarchies as a result of cost-cutting measures (Schuler, 1995). Changing societal values and structure such as the increase in single-parent and two-parent working families, the mobilization of U.S. society (Schuler; Storey; Zemke et al., 2000, and the higher educational levels of workers have also contributed to the changing face of organizational behavior (Schuler; Zemke et al.). No less important in considering the atmosphere of organizational progress is the unprecedented diversity in race, ethnicity, and age of those making up the world of work today. The workplace is, in fact, overwhelmed with conflicting voices in the most age and value diverse workplace ever known (Zemke et al.). These differences can be a source of much needed creative strength and increased opportunity, or they can create stifling stress and unrelenting conflict (Bennis et al., 2001). Life long employment with one organization is no longer a given or even an expectation. Employees understand that no job is safe in a world of work where the pace of organizational acquisition, consolidation, and rapid directional change has been as prolific and constant as it has been in recent years (Zemke et al.). The new environments have necessitated a refocusing of leadership approaches to meet the dynamic and ever-changing needs of the modern world (Bennis et al.; Schuler). Organizations are faced with a choice of either adjusting or facing serious negative consequences (Haveman et al., 2001).

A number of researchers argue that the variable of leadership is one of the most important factors in motivating others to handle change effectively (Hersey et al., 2001; Kahai, Sosik, & Avolio, 1997; Kuo, 2004; Parker, 1990; Schminke & Willis, 1999) and that dynamic leadership is most important during times of great change (Clark & Clark,

1990; Kuo). Researchers have also argued that personality attributes are closely linked to leadership ability and specific leadership styles (Bass, 1990; Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). However, there is very little research that attempts to identify those personality attributes or personality profiles as predictive of a specific leadership style. Given the current state and pace of change in organizational behavior, this lack of attention to leadership ability and style can leave organizations struggling to meet their organizational goals.

Leadership Defined

Bass (1990) describes the word "leadership" as a sophisticated, modern concept. He argues that in previous times, words meaning head of state, chief, or king were commonly used to differentiate the ruler from the general population and that the word leadership did not appear until the 19th century in English writings. It has only been in the middle part of the 20th century that the word leadership has been incorporated in other modern languages. In this short period of time, however, many definitions of leadership have been developed to address the many different aspects of life and situations in life to which it may pertain (Bass, 1990; Bennis et al., 2001; Chemers, 2000; Clark & Clark, 1990; Davis, Skube, Hellervik, Gebelein, & Sheard, 1992; Den Hartog, VanMuijen, & Koopman, 1997). Leadership has been described as a focus of group processes, a matter of personality, an exercise of influence over others, an instrument to achieve goals, a method of motivation for the achievement of goals, a form of persuasion, and many combinations of each of these (Clark & Clark). Clark and Clark go a step further and describe effective leadership as a process in which there is reciprocity and potential for two-way influence and power sharing. They assert that real leadership relies on mutual

responsiveness and dependency. Hogan et al. (1994) argued that true leadership is persuasion not domination. Graham and Robinson (2002) concluded that there are about as many definitions of leadership as there are theories of leadership and that can create serious problems in the discussion of the topic.

A common misperception in defining leadership is the belief that the concepts of management and leadership are the same. Quite often they are used interchangeably (Hersey et al., 2001). Hersey et al. argue that there is, in fact, a discernible difference in the two. They suggest that leadership is a much broader concept than management. Bennis (as cited in Hersey et al.) differentiates the extremes of management and leadership with the following text:

> The manager administrates; the leader innovates. The manager is a copy; the leader is an original. The manager maintains; the leader develops. The manager focuses on systems and structure; the leader focuses on people. The manager relies on control; the leader inspires trust. The manager has short-range view; the leader has a long-range perspective. The manager asks how and when; the leader asks what and why. The manager has an eye on the bottom line; the leader has an eye on the horizon. The manager imitates; the leader originates. The manager accepts the status quo; the leader challenges it. . . . (p. 9)

Clearly, Bennis places the application of leadership in problem-solving and motivating subordinates on a higher level than that of managing the same. His definition of leadership suggests a greater movement beyond simply meeting acceptable indices and goals. Because leaders must also manage, one way to conceptualize the relationship between managing and leading is to view management along a continuum that ends with the highest level of leadership.

While there are many definitions of leadership, there are sufficient similarities in the definitions to create a rough classification (Bass, 1990). For the purpose of this conceptual paper, leadership will be defined in accordance with a unifying theme within

other descriptions of leadership (Bass, 1990; Chemers, 2000; Clark, Clark, & Campbell, 1992; Gardner, 1990) and the definition offered by Hogan et al. (1994): ". . . leadership involves persuading other people to set aside for a period of time their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the responsibilities and welfare of a group" (p. 493). Additionally, in this paper, I define leadership within the framework of a value system based on moral and ethical behavior.

Suitcliff (2005) argues that ethics and morality are essential components of true leadership because without them, a leader cannot be trusted. She further argues that if a leader is trusted, followers will go to extraordinary lengths to provide extraordinary performance. Trust is the essential element that enables leaders and followers to work collaboratively towards a common goal.

Impact of Leadership

While the word leadership is a relatively new addition to languages, the concept is one of the world's oldest preoccupations. Egyptian hieroglyphics describe leadership, leaders, and followers. Chinese classics from the sixth century B.C.E. are filled with advice to the country's leaders about their role in relation to the people they governed (Bass, 1990). Bass writes about the admonitions of Confucius to set a moral example and use rewards and punishments for teaching what is right and good. Bass also describes the Tao belief that leaders were to work themselves out of a job by making the people believe that successes were due to the effort of the people.

Later writings from Aristotle (Politics) and Plato (Republic) described requirements for the ideal leader. In his discussion of early leadership concepts, Kellerman (1987) refers to the writings of the Greek philosopher Plutarch which compare

the traits of actual Greek and Roman leaders to support his (Plutarch's) views on prosocial ideals about leadership. The Renaissance scholar, Machiavelli, is widely quoted as offering a guide to effective leadership. He believed the best objectives could be accomplished by gaining the esteem of the people; but if the ruler could not gain that esteem, then treachery, deceit, and violence were required (Kellerman). Latin authors wrote extensively about leadership and administration. Their influence on Thomas Jefferson and James Madison had an impact on the design of the U.S. government in the type and range of authority given to those who would govern, or lead, the new nation (Bass, 1990). A fundamental principle at West Point today comes from Hegel's (as cited in Bass) *Philosophy of Mind*, which argued that a leader could best understand his followers by first serving as a follower. Military writings about leadership are found from the early Chinese classics to the present day (Bass).

History abounds with accounts of great leaders, such as Moses, who convinced thousands of Jews to spend 40 years wandering in the desert while trying to find their promised land, a safe refuge from the slavery of Egypt (Exodus 14, 1:20 King James Version), Susan B. Anthony who encouraged women to demand equal rights and the right to vote (Fredriksen, 2004a), and Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr. (Sargent, 2004), and Nelson Mandela (McDonough, 2002), who inspired millions of people to successfully challenge oppression through nonviolent methods. Napoleon Bonaparte (Bass, 1990), Joan of Arc, George Washington, Ulysses S. Grant (Clark & Clark, 1990), and Colin Powell (Fredriksen, 2004b) are but a few of the many military leaders who have been credited with changing the course of the world through their leadership. The world would be a very different place today without the leadership of political personas

such as Abraham Lincoln, Indira Gandhi, Winston Churchhill (Storey, 2004), and, on the darker side, Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin (Bass). Modern leaders in business include Lee Iacocca, who brought Chrysler from near bankruptcy to a thriving profitable company, Bill Gates, who built a multi-billion dollar business on the use of windows in computers, and John Henry, who through his leadership broke the most fabled curse in sports when his Boston Red Sox won their first World Championship since 1918 (Fredriksen, 2004b). Business Week (The Best Business Managers, 2005) highlighted the careers of successful business leaders such as Anne Mulcahy, who moved Xerox from a dismal performance record and huge losses to respectable performance numbers and Chung Mong Koo, who took the helm of South Korea's largest carmaker, Hyundai Motor Company. Through his leadership, the quality of the cars improved to a level that allowed the company to post record earnings even in the wake of a slump in Korean consumer spending. In recent media reports, many politicians have blamed the inability of coalition forces to withdraw from Iraq on the lack of leadership among the Iraqi people (Clawson, 2004). Clearly, leaders have consistently been viewed throughout history as having important roles in the world.

A number of research studies have associated the importance of leaders' behaviors in relation to subordinates' performance and satisfaction (Bass, 1990; Barker & Barker, 1996; Hogan, et al., 1994). A recent study by Pearce and Sims (2002) investigated team effectiveness using different types of leadership styles. They concluded that effectiveness can be directly and significantly affected in a positive or negative manner by specific leadership behaviors. Lord (1985) noted that when confounding errors are controlled, as much as 45% of the organizational performance is attributable to

executive leadership. Several other authors have concluded that a school principal's leadership is one of the most powerful factors in determining a school's atmosphere and student success (Cawelti, 1999; Licata, Tiddlie, & Greenfield, 1990; Sylvia & Hutchison, 1985). In a nursing environment, studies have linked positive results in job satisfaction and employee performance to effective leadership behaviors (Dunham & Klafehn, 1990; Dunham-Taylor & Klafehn, 1995; Morrison, Jones, & Fuller, 2000). In business, effective leaders have been consistently linked to increased employee satisfaction and extra effort as manifested by increased job performance levels (Bass, 1996; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Kuo, 2004; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramanian, 1996; Posey & Kline, 1990; Sosik, Avolio, & Kahai, 1997). On the negative side, many business leaders believe that the flurry of corporate scandals such as that of Enron is directly related to a lack of moral leadership in business today (Mangham, 2004). In widely publicized data, more than 60% of immediate supervisors are credited with being responsible for high levels of stress in the workplace (Clark et al., 1992).

Some researchers have suggested that the effects of leadership are merely in the eyes of the beholders and are reflective of historical, economic, or social forces (Meindl & Ehrlich, 1987). Others argue that leadership, at best, plays only a minor role in organizational outcomes (Bass, 1990) and that it is a useless concept for understanding social influence (Pandey, 1976). Bass (1990), however, maintains that despite some of the skepticism about the reality and importance of leadership, all social, religious, organizational, and political movements require leaders to begin them, garner support for them, and maintain them.

Theories of Leadership

Early social science literature on leadership dealt mostly with theoretical issues (Bass, 1990). Theorists attempted to account for the emergence of leadership either by looking at the characteristics of the leaders (Bass; Chemers, 2000) or the situational qualities (Bass). For example, Carlyle (1841/1907) developed the Great Man Theory of Leadership. According to this theory, successful leaders exhibited traits of personality and character that set them apart from followers. The characteristics were regarded as largely inborn and applicable across situations (Clark & Clark, 1990). Some early authors theorized that leadership was exhibited by one who possessed the greatest number of desirable traits of personality and character (Bingham, 1998) or that leadership was measured by the degree to which a person was more than ordinarily able to stimulate others to desired responses (Bernard, 1926). Bowdon (1926) equated leadership with the strength of the personality to influence others. These early theories viewed leadership as a one-way effect and did not acknowledge the interactive effects with the followers (Bass).

The idea that specific traits could identify leaders led to countless attempts to identify and measure those traits that would distinguish leaders from followers. The development of intelligence tests spurred further interest in personality traits and enabled research to move from a theoretical perspective to an empirical one (Chemers, 2000). Stogdill (1948) conducted a review of 30 years of studies on the trait models. He concluded that only a very few traits were sometimes associated with differences between leaders and followers. These findings were consistent with those of Bird (1940, as cited in Bass, 1990) and Jenkins (1947, as cited in Bass, 1990), who in over 94 studies found little agreement about which abilities characterized leaders. Notably, intelligence was one

of the more commonly mentioned traits of leaders in these studies, and it was associated about 35% of the time (Stogdill). Based on his findings, Stogdill concluded that while individual differences were important in identifying emerging or effective leaders, the great diversity in situations that might affect a leader made it unfeasible that any one trait might predict leadership ability overall. In addition to a lack of consideration for situations faced by leaders, other failings of the theory included the lack of concern about the response of the followers to the leader and about the quality of leader's performance or effectiveness (Clark & Clark, 1990).

Building on Stogdill's analysis of the problems found with trait theories, Fiedler (1967) took the study of leadership into a dramatic change of direction. Interest developed in what Fiedler called leadership effectiveness traits. These traits emphasized the qualities one needed to perform effectively as a leader rather than those needed to become one. These traits, Fiedler theorized, would depend on the situation facing the leader. The effectiveness of the leader is contingent on the demands of the situation. Leaders are determined to be task-oriented or relations-oriented based on the way they judge the co-workers they least prefer. According to Fiedler's theory, task-oriented leaders will likely be effective in situations of high control and predictability or low control and predictability, and relations-oriented leaders will likely be more effective in situations between the two extremes, those situations that were of moderate control or predictability. The rationale for these findings was that a more directive, task-focused leadership style is better able to give clear directions and structured leader behavior. The more relations-oriented, participative leadership style was better suited when the situation required delicacy to handle a poorly understood task (Chemers, 2000). Fiedler (1967)

emphasized the need to place a person in a situation for which he or she is best suited. A major criticism to this model is the assumption that a leader could not choose to be task- or relations-oriented as the situation demanded (Chemers).

By the 1960s, the dominant paradigm for research on theories of leadership had evolved from studies on traits and situations that affect leadership to a condition of traits and situations involving a transaction between the leader and the subordinates (Hollander, 1986). The transactional model of leadership included for the first time a component that considered the perceptions and expectations that subordinates may have about the leader (Yammarino & Bass, 1990). The transactional model of leadership developed out of the social exchange perspective. It emphasized an implicit social exchange in the relationship between a leader and the subordinates as a component of effectiveness in performance. The leader gives benefits to the subordinates for meeting expectations, and the subordinates reciprocate with increased esteem for and responsiveness to the leader (Hollander, 1978).

Path-goal Theory was one of the transactional theories being promoted at this time (Georgopoulos, Mahoney, & Jones, 1957). According to Path-goal Theory, the leader's main goal is to motivate subordinates by helping them to see how their task-related performance could help them achieve their personal goals. A successful leader shows a follower the rewards that are available to him or her if he or she meets the goals set by the leader. The leader clarifies the goals as well as the path to those goals. Path-goal Theory assumes that the clarification of the goals enhances the psychological state of the followers and they, in turn, increase their levels of performance. Rewards are contingent on the subordinate's performance (Georgopoulos et al.). Research using this

theory attempted to understand how a leader's directiveness (creating structure) or supportiveness (consideration) behaviors would affect subordinate's motivation to perform (Chemers, 2000; House, 1971). Performance measures were found to be contingent on the situation and the individual subordinate's needs. Results regarding structuring behaviors were found to be inconsistent; however, supportive behaviors were generally rated as having positive effects on subordinates in all situations. Other transactional models found that the type of task, the characteristics of the subordinates, and the nature of the subordinate's group affected the leader-follower relationship and ultimately the levels of performance (House; House & Mitchell, 1974). The transactional models placed a new emphasis on meeting organizational goals with the use of persuasion rather than the traditional use of coercion (Clark & Clark, 1990).

Yammarino and Bass (1990) argued that the transactional model, while a big step forward in understanding leader-follower relationships, was only useful to a certain point. They suggested that leaders exhibiting this style may fail because they are unable to provide the rewards commensurate with the subordinate's expectations, ineffective appraisal systems may produce unfair results, time pressures can impede the process, and they may lack the necessary skill to use positive reinforcements effectively. In addition, in order for the leader to be effective, he or she must control the rewards, and the rewards must be valued by the subordinates. Yammarino and Bass suggested that something beyond the transactional models was needed.

Bernard (1926) wrote that personal loyalty to another was more powerful than tangible inducements, and Burns (1978) believed true leadership asked followers to look beyond their own self-interests for the good of the group, to consider their longer-term

needs for their own development rather than the needs of the moment, and to become aware of what is really important (Clark & Clark, 1990). Burns saw leaders as transforming agents whereby followers became leaders. He developed a concept of the transformational leader as one who changes the outlook and behavior of followers. This was especially true in the area of job performance (Burns).

According to Yammarino & Bass (1990), transformational leaders do more with subordinates than just exercise simple exchanges or agreements. Within the framework of this model, superior leadership performance occurs when the leaders seek to elevate and broaden the interests of their subordinates, when they generate an awareness and acceptance among subordinates who go beyond their own self-interests for the good of the group (Burns, 1978), when they motivate others to do more than is expected, and when they raise consciousness about the importance and value of designated outcomes and methods to attain those outcomes (Yammarino & Bass). Burns theorized this style of leadership would increase subordinates' confidence levels and their needs would be expanded and elevated along with their performance levels.

Burns (1978) proposed that leaders were either transformational or transactional. He described the difference in the two styles in terms of what leaders and followers offer each other. Transformational leaders offer a purpose that goes beyond short-term goals and focuses on higher order needs, while transactional leaders focus on the proper exchange of resources. Bass (1985), however, suggested that transformational leadership augments the effects of transactional leadership in predicting subordinate performance and satisfaction. He argues that transformational leadership traits account for some of the unique variance beyond transactional traits. This position was supported by meta-analytic

review conducted by Judge and Piccolo (2004) to test the validity of the factors inherent in both styles of leadership. Their results revealed that transformational and transactional leadership are so tightly related that it is difficult to separate their unique effects.

Building on Burns' (1978) theory, Bass (1985) provided a focus on high-impact leadership (Day, Zaccaro, & Halpin, 2004). Bass's addition to transformational leadership was the attention he gave to the charismatic quality of effective leadership. While Burns discussed charisma as a component of transformational leadership, he saw it as an ambiguous construct that could neither be measured nor developed (Day et al.). Avolio and Bass (1987) demonstrated that not only was charisma observable but that it was observable at all levels. Avolio and Gibbons (1988) then expanded Bass's model by showing how transformational leadership could be developed in life through structured training interventions.

Factor studies from Bass (1985) and Howell and Avolio (1993) identified four components of transformational leadership. Two of these, intellectual stimulation and consideration, are also components of transactional leadership.

Charismatic Leadership or Idealized-Influence

Transformational leaders behave in ways that result in their subordinates' perceiving them as role models. Followers identify with their leaders and want to emulate them. The leader earns credibility with the followers by considering the needs of others over his or her personal needs. He or she can be counted on to do the right thing and avoids using power for personal gain.

Inspirational Motivation

Transformational leaders behave in ways that motivate and inspire others by giving meaning to their work. Team spirit is aroused. The leader gets followers to envision attractive future states. The leader is able to communicate expectations clearly and demonstrate commitment to goals and a shared vision.

Intellectual Stimulation

Transformational leaders encourage their followers' efforts to be innovative and creative. There is no public criticism of mistakes. Followers are included in problem-solving and seeking out new solutions.

Individualized Consideration

Transformational leaders act as mentors or coaches by paying special attention to each individual's need for achievement and continued growth. New learning opportunities are created; individual differences in needs and desires are noted; two-way communication is encouraged; interactions with followers are personalized (that is, previous conversations are remembered, individual concerns are acknowledged, and the individual is seen as a person not just an employee); and tasks are delegated as a way of developing followers. Tasks are monitored only to see if additional help or support is needed.

Bass's (1990) view of transformational leadership is that it exists on a continuum with transactional leadership and that the continuum represents the full range of leadership styles. In 1990, Avolio and Bass introduced the Full Range Leadership model (FRL). Day et al. (2004) described the FRL as a "comprehensive life-span process that involves the accumulation of unstructured and structured experiences and their impact on

the maturation of both leaders and followers" (p. 71). Day et al. also stressed that one major difference in the FRL from other models is a focus on building leaders of higher moral character. The core of the FRL is the concept of developing oneself to develop others. According to this model, as leaders mature and gain moral perspective, they spend more time in promoting the development of others versus concentrating on their own needs. This basic premise is what places transformational leadership at the highest end of the continuum of the FRL (Day et al.). The FRL model moves from the low end characterized by a laissez-faire or no leadership style along a continuum away from passive, avoidant leadership and towards the highest end characterized by the transformational leadership style (Bass).

Transformational theorists argue that the leaders who exhibit a transformational style are more proactive and ultimately more effective than leaders who are transactional, coercive, or avoidant in motivating followers to higher performance (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994, Burns, 1978; Yammarino & Bass, 1990). Empirical research has shown results consistent with the theorists. The Dumdum, Lowe, and Avolio (2002) study found that transformational leaders were better at understanding their environment and then forming goals that garnered the attention and interest of their followers. Avolio (1999) reported that followers of transformational leaders had higher levels of commitment to their organizational mission, greater levels of trust in their leader, and higher levels of cohesion. Meta-analyses by Lowe et al. (1996) and Fuller, Patterson, Coleman, and Hester (1995) confirmed a positive relationship between transformational leadership and job performance. Other researchers found positively correlated relationships with supervisory evaluations of managerial performance (Walderman, Bass, & Einstein,

1987), percentage of financial goals achieved (Howell & Avolio, 1993), and research and development project team innovations (Keller, 1992).

Although studies consistently reflect increased effectiveness and satisfaction for leaders who exhibit a transformational style of leadership (Bass, 1996; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Kuo, 2004; Posey & Kline, 1990), Bass argues that all leaders display to some extent a range of leadership styles along a continuum of transformational to transactional to laissez-faire. The degree to which the leader is seen to be effective is dependent on how frequently he uses each style with transformational being the most effective and laissez-faire the least effective. While the transformational style demonstrates more positive and significant impact in today's environment, studies have shown both transformational and transactional styles can have a positive influence (Kuo). Bass (1996), in fact, argues that the best leaders use the transactional style frequently but use more of the transformational style. This would make sense given that so many studies have validated the argument that they are not distinct styles of leadership but rather that transformational complements and augments transactional (Bass, 1990; Judge & Piccolo, 2004**).**

Determining Leadership Styles

Psychologists have long known that measures of cognitive ability and normal personality predict job effectiveness reasonably well (Hogan & Holland, 2003). Recent studies have suggested that these same measures can predict leadership success as well (Bass, 1990; Conway, 2000) and that certain personality dimensions appear to be consistently correlated with leadership effectiveness (Conway; Hogan et al., 1994). There is, however, a lack of research looking at personality attributes as predictors of leadership

style (Lim & Ployhart, 2004). For instance, only two studies (Judge & Bono, 2000; Ployhart, Lim, & Chan, 2001) and a meta-analysis (Bono & Judge, 2004) have investigated the relationship between transformational leadership style and the personality attributes of the Five Factor Model (FFM). The results of these studies were spotty and limited. The authors found small to moderate relationships linking neuroticism, extroversion, and agreeableness to three of the transformational dimensions. In other studies investigating personality attributes and leadership (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Lord, DeVader, & Aliger, 1986), it has been difficult to separate the attributions about the leaders' effectiveness from the specific behaviors they exhibit. In addition, Bono and Judge concluded that in their meta-analysis that, at least to some extent, survey measures of transformational and transactional leadership confound perceptions, attributions, and implicit theories with behaviors. Consequently, there are still questions about what determines or predicts leadership style and, specifically, transformational leadership style (Lim & Ployhart).

Conway (2000) suggests that an important concept in understanding successful leaders lies in understanding the subjective motives driving their behavior. He argues that when personality measures are given a motivational perspective they reflect why one does things. In addition, Warren Bennis, an established authority on leadership (Storey, 2004), offered a continuing essentialist interpretation of leadership. In a recent study by Bennis and Thomas (2002), the authors argued that the nature of leadership can be discovered within the attributes (traits) of exceptional leaders and that perhaps the best way to identify these attributes is to uncover the ways in which people deal with adversity. They claimed that one of the most reliable indicators and predictors of true

leadership is one's ability to find meaning in negative situations and to learn from difficult and challenging circumstances. The authors term this ability as "an adaptive capacity."

Conway (2000) reported results providing evidence that when criterion constructs and personality constructs are carefully matched, an interpretable pattern of relations emerges. His findings were consistent with those of Hogan (1998) and Hough (as cited in Conway, 2000). It is my belief that determining and predicting leadership are best answered by pairing personality measures based on humanistic theories with criterion measures that include specific leadership behaviors.

Personality Related to Leaders' Behaviors

Humanistic psychology is based on the philosophy of the recognition of and focus on the significant role and function of the subjectivity in individual's living experiences (Corey, 2001; Frankl, 1984; May & Yalom, 2000; Mosak, 2000). People are seen as purposeful and intentional beings that make sense of their experiences in an effort to understand and overcome life's difficulties. They develop their perceptions and reality through the interaction of their phenomenological world and within external and social contexts. The subjective meanings people assign to life experiences provide explanation and guidance for their associated behaviors (Sullivan, 1990). Two promising theoretical frameworks for understanding the subjective motives of successful leaders are Individual Psychology (Adler, 1998) and Socioanalytic Theory (Hogan, 1983).

Individual Psychology developed by Alfred Adler is a phenomenological psychology dealing with how individuals experience life in the context of the social setting and how they subjectively make sense of their experiences (Ferguson, 1984). As a

holistic theory, Individual Psychology assumes an essential cooperative harmony between an individual and society with conflict as an erroneous condition (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956). A major construct in Individual Psychology is the ability to overcome conflicts associated with the natural and societal environments, an adaptive ability.

Adler (1998) wrote that it is the basic need of every human being to belong and to contribute to the welfare of others. Problems arise when life experiences are perceived to interfere or impede with one's ability to meet the need for belonging and contribution (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956). Adler suggested that a person moves through life according to his or her perception of it. He argued that these perceptions, or personal convictions and beliefs, develop early in life based on childhood experiences and family atmosphere. From infancy on, humans form reactions to the world and their experiences in the world. Through the creative responses to these early experiences, humans develop their own interpretations and goals for finding their place in the world. Adler termed these interpretations as one's private logic. These subjective interpretations are consistent throughout the lifetime of the individual (Ferguson, 1984). They become the master plan (life style) by which the individual lives his or her life in effort to overcome perceived adversities. Adler (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1979) called the movement to overcome these problems a "striving for superiority" (p.30) or a "striving for power" (p.34) over adversity. He saw this movement as an endless effort for better adaptation to the environment. This adaptation occurs within the context of the social environment and in relation to the expectations of that setting.

Adler also suggested that a major contributor to direction of the striving is one's willingness or unwillingness to cooperate with others for the general good. He termed

this concept as social interest (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1979). Adler believed that social interest was manifested by a healthy life style, that is, one in which an individual moves in a cooperative, egalitarian way toward others, leading to a feeling of belonging within one's social context. He argued that based on their interpretations of early life experiences, individuals choose to move in either a direction of usefulness, that is, in cooperation with the community or society in which he or she lives for the betterment of that unit (social interest), or a direction of uselessness, that is, in disharmony and against the betterment of the community or society (diminished levels of social interest). Adler stressed the importance of this movement and its expressive forms as exhibits of one's life style. The capacity for cooperation and social interest can be gauged by the way one sees, listens, copes, and acts (Adler, 1998). Adler (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956) posited that every movement in life springs from this life style.

Working in an atmosphere of cooperation, or social interest, has been shown to be a major tenet in meeting set goals and motivating others to increased levels of achievement (Jessup, 1990; Knutson & Miranda, 2000; Robbins, 1998; Shonk, 1992), especially in times of great change. Effective leaders are seen as having qualities that facilitate a sense of connection and belonging with and among followers and that motivate others to contribute beyond set expectations (Bass, 1985). Miranda, Goodman, and Kern (1996) suggested that a theoretical connection exists between transformational leadership and Individual Psychology. The theoretical connection between Individual Psychology and transformational leadership is further validated by Blackburn (2001). Blackburn found statistically significant positive relationships between the Belonging/-Social Interest scale of the BASIS-A Inventory and the transformational leadership

measurement of Individual Consideration on the MLQ. This makes sense in that both stress the importance of social interest and a sense of belonging through encouragement and contribution. A major complement to this relationship is Individual Psychology's focus on adaptation to the environment within the contexts of social interest and belonging. According to Adler, an individual's success in life depends on how well he or she is able to adapt (Adler, 1998). This appears to be true when looking at the leader-follower relationship.

Hogan (1983) developed the Socioanalytic Theory of personality specifically to address issues in organizational behavior. It is intended to explain individual differences in career success based on social behavior (Hogan & Holland, 2003). Socioanalytic Theory assumes that people are motivated from a deep psychological need to engage in social interaction (Hogan & Hogan, 1992). Hogan suggests that people's social behavior is motivated by two unconscious motives: (a) to seek the acceptance and recognition of one's peers while avoiding their criticism and rejection and (b) to seek status and power in relation to one's peers while trying to avoid losing control and status. In addition, Hogan states there are two major dimensions associated with organizational behavior: (a) people work in groups (organizations, departments, teams, etc.) and (b) groups are structured in terms of status hierarchies. Hogan argues that the motives in relation to the work dimensions translate into behavior to get along with others and behavior to get ahead or achieve status among other members of the group (Hogan & Holland).

According to Conway (1999), this dichotomy can present a paradox for leaders if not manifested in useful ways. On the one hand, in order to get along one must cooperate, encourage, and seem friendly, compliant, and positive. If one is successful, he or she will

be seen as a good team player and a good organizational citizen (Moon, 2001). On the other hand, in order to get ahead one must take initiative, actively seek responsibility, and compete with others (Conway). If successful in this task, one will be seen as providing leadership, communicating a vision, and motivating others (Moon). The difficulty often comes in being able to accomplish both goals successfully.

Digman (1997) concluded that the two major dimensions of Socioanalytic Theory closely align with the earlier dichotomy presented by Adler (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1979): striving for superiority (to get ahead) and social interest (to get along) as well as the importance of the adaptive ability associated with these concepts. Both theories argue that this adaptive ability is guided by the meaning the individual has assigned to the direction of the movement.

Future Research

Digman (1997) suggests the pace of change facing organizations today calls for more adaptive, flexible leadership. Given the lack of research on the trait-behavior link with leadership and the weak results from the work that has been done, researchers need to concentrate on a greater understanding of those relationships (Bono & Judge, 2004) in an effort to identify and develop leaders best suited to the challenges of today. In addition, training literature consistently concludes that there is a scarcity of useful research on how to best identify and then train good leaders (Day, 2000; Yuki, 1999). Being able to predict leadership styles can provide a basis for improved employee selection and a clear direction for training and development programs.

In recognizing the role of meaning and purpose in people's lives, Bass's (1985) FRL model appears to share common ground with Alfred Adler's theory of Individual

Psychology (Miranda et al., 1996) and with Hogan's Socioanalytical Theory (Conway, 2000) of career development. Bass, consistent with Adler (Ansbacher & Ansbacher,1979) and Hogan (1983), argues that certain life experiences including family upbringing are accumulated and take the shape of a life script – or a basis for the subjective understanding of life's experiences (Avolio, 1999). The FRL model argues that the best leaders exhibit behaviors that create an atmosphere that increases followers' senses of self-worth and belonging (Bass). Clearly, successful leaders are seen as those who are able to understand and implement Adler's concepts of social interest and the striving for superiority which correspond strongly to Hogan's dimensions of getting along and getting ahead.

Although there has been a steady stream of research in leadership over the years, further work is needed to examine and understand the leadership-follower relationship. Research needs to be directed at a better understanding of the dynamics and formal as well as informal influences in terms of how they affect subordinates, leaders, and organizations (Clark & Clark, 1990). Because both Individual Psychology and Socioanalytic Theory have strong links to the behaviors that characterize individuals who exhibit a transformational leadership style (Miranda et al., 1996; Conway, 2000), perhaps answers to the questions about successful leaders lie not only in their behaviors but also in the relationship between the behaviors and the subjective meaning behind those behaviors. Digman (1997) suggested that behaviors, personality attributes, and subjective motives exist on a hierarchy with subjective motives being manifested through personality and behavior. Future research on leadership should include investigations of possible relationships between these concepts and leadership.

References

Adler, A. (1998). *Alfred Adler: Understanding human nature*. (C. Brett, Trans.). Center City, MN: Hazelton Foundation. (Original work published 1927).

Ansbacher, H. L., & Ansbacher, R. R. (Eds.). (1956). *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler.* New York: Harper & Row.

Ansbacher, H. L., & Ansbacher, R. R., (Eds). (1979). *Superiority and social interest*. New York: Norton.

Avolio, B. (1999). *Full leadership development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B., & Bass, B. M. (1987). Transformational leadership, charisma, and beyond. In J. Hunt & R. Baliga (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 145-172). Lexington, England: Lexington Books.

Avolio, B., & Bass, B. M. (1990). *Developing potential across a full range of leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Avolio, B., & Gibbons, T. (1988). Developing transformational leaders: A life span approach. In J. Conger & Kamungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 87-128). New York: Wiley.

Barker, R., & Barker, S. (1996). An Adlerian approach to managing organizational change. *Journal of Individual Psychology, 52*(2), 181-192.

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

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stodgill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial application*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1996). *A new paradigm of leadership*. Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral Sciences.

Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Free Press.

Bennis, W., Spreitzer, G., & Cummings, T. (Eds.). (2001). *The future of leadership: Today's top leadership thinkers speak to tomorrow's leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W., & Thomas, R. (2002). *Geeks and geezers: How era, values, and defining moments shape leaders.* Boston: Harvard University Press.

Best Business Managers. (2005). *Business Week, 3915.* Business Source Premier.

Bernard, L. L. (1926). *An introduction to social psychology*. New York: Holt.

Bingham, W. (1998). Leadership. In H. C. Metcalf (Ed.), *The psychological foundations of management* (pp. 141-167). New York: Shaw.

Blackburn, D. (2001). *The relationship between personality attributes related to lifestyle and leadership styles.* Unpublished master's thesis, Georgia State University, Atlanta.

Bono, J., & Judge, T. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 901-910.

Bowdon, A. (1926). The study of the personality of student leaders in the United States. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 21*, 149-160.

Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper Row.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R., & Allen, J. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 40*, 468-478.

Carlyle, T. (1907). *Heroes and hero worship*. Boston: Adams. (Original work published 1941)

Cawelti, G. (1999). *Protrait of 6 benchmark schools*. Arlington, VA: Educational Resource Svc.

Chemers, M. (2000). Leadership research and theory: A functional integration. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, & Practice, 4*, 27-43.

Clark, K., & Clark, M. (Eds). (1990). *Measures of leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Clark, K., Clark, M., & Campbell, D. (1992). *Impact of leadership.* Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Clawson, J. (2004). Iraq for Iraqis: How and when? *Middle East Quarterly, 11*(20), 1-8.

Conway, J. M. (1999). Distinguishing contextual performance for managerial jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 3-13.

Conway, J. M. (2000). Managerial performance development constructs and personality correlates. *Human Performance, 13*(1), 23-47.

Corey, G. (2001). *The theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy* (6th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Davis, B., Skube, C., Hellervik, L., Gebelein, S., & Sheard, J. (1992). *Successful manager's handbook: Development suggestions for today's managers.* Minneapolis, MN: Personnel Decisions.

Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly, 11,* 518-613.

Day, D., Zaccaro, S., & Halpin, S. (2004). *Leader development for transforming organizations.* Mahwah, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Den Hartog, D., Van Muijen, J., & Koopman, P. (1997). Transactional versus transformational: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Pscyhology, 70*(1), 19-34.

Digman, J. M. (1997). Higher order factors of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 1246-1256

Dumdum, U. R., Lowe , K. B., and Avolio, B. J. (2002). A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: An update and extension. In: B. J. Avolio and F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead.* (pp. 35-66). Amsterdam, Netherlands: JAI Press

Dunham, J., & Klafehn, K. (1990). Transformational leadership and the nurse executive. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 20*(4), 28-34.

Dunham-Taylor, J. & Klafehn, K. (1995). Identifying the best in nurse executive leadership, Part 2: Interview results. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 25*(7/8), 24-31.

Eddy, J., Spaulding,D., Richards, T., Morris, A., Murphy, D., Maimberg, E., & Brubaker, T. (1998). Retaining quality students and faculty: The need for refined higher education leadership policies and procedures. *College Student Journal, 32*(2), 222-227.

Ferguson, E. (1984). *Adlerian theory: An introduction*. Chicago: Adler School of Professional Psychology.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectivenss*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Frankl, V. (1946/1984). *Man's search for meaning*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Fredriksen, J. (2004a). *Biographical dictionary of modern world leaders: 1900-1991.* New York: Facts on File.

Fredriksen, J. (2004b). *Biographical dictionary of modern world leaders: 1992-Present*. New York: Facts on File.

Fuller, J., Patterson, C., Coleman, E., & Hester, K. (1996). A quantitative review of research of charismatic leadership. *Psychological Reports, 78*, 271-287.

Gardner, J. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Georgopoulos, B., Mahoney, G., & Jones, N. (1957). A path-goal approach to productivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 41*, 155-169.

Goski, J., Blackstone, G., & Lang, J. (2002). A model of leadership development. *Public Personnel Management, 31*(4), 517-522.

Graham, S., & Robinson, D. (2002). Leadership development in organizational consulting. In R. L. Lowman (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational and consulting psychologists* (pp. 370-395). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Haveman, H., Russo, M., & Meyer, A. (2001). Organizational environment in flux: The impact of regulatory punctuations on organizational domains, CEO succession, and performance. *Organization Science, 12*(3), 253-273.

Heath, R. (2002). Community relationship building: Local leaders in the risk communication infrastructure. *Journal of Public Relations, 14*(4), 317-353.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K, & Johnson, D. (2001). *Management of organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hogan, R. (1983). A socioanalytic theory of personality. In M. M. Page (Ed.), *1982 Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 55-89). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Hogan, J. (1998). Introduction: Personality and job performance. *Human Performance, 11,* 125-127.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist, 49*, 493-504.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1992). *The Hogan Personality Inventory manual*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessments System.

Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: A socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(1), 100-112.

Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K.E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343-354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Hollander, E. P. (1964). *Leaders, groups, and influence*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hollander, E. P. (1978). *Leadership dynamics: A practical guide to effective relationships.* New York: Free Press.

Hollander, E. P. (1986). On the central role of leadership processes. *International Review of Applied Psychology, 35*, 39-52.

Hollinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice on instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329-351.

Howell, J., & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 891-992.

House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 16,* 321-338.

House, R., & Mitchell, T. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business, 3*, 81-97.

Hunt, J. G. (1997). Transformational/charismatic leadership's transformation of the field: An historical essay. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*, 129-144.

Jessup, H. R. (1990). New roles in team leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, *44*, 79-83.

Judge, T., & Bono, J. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 751-765.

Judge, T., & Bono, J., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 765-780.

Judge, T., & Piccolo, R. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755-768.

Kahai, S., Sosik, J., & Avolio, B. (1997). Effects of leadership style problem structure on work group process in an electronic meeting system environment. *Personnel Psychology, 50,* 121-146.

Keller, R. T. (1992). Transformational leadership and the performance of research and development project groups. *Journal of Management, 18*, 489-501.

Kellerman, B. (1987). *The politics of leadership in America: Implications for higher education in the late 20th century.* Paper presented at the Invitational Inter-disciplinary Colloquium on Leadership in Higher Education, National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Knutson, K., & Miranda, O. (2000). Leadership characteristics, social interest, and learning organizations. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 56*(2), 205-214.

Kuo, C. (2004). Research on impacts of team leadership on team effectiveness. *The Journal of American Academy of Business, 5*(1/2), 266-277.

Licata, J., Tiddlie, C., & Greenfield, W. (1990). Principal vision, teacher sense of autonomy, and environmental robustness. *Journal of Educational Research, 84*(2), 93-100.

Lim, B., & Ployhart, R. (2004). Transformational leadership: Relations to the five-factor model and team performance in typical and maximum contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 610-621.

Lord, R. G. (1985). An information processing approach to social perceptions, leadership, & behavioral management in organizations. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings

(Eds.), *Research in Educational Behavior, 5*(1), 87-128.. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Lord, R., DeVader, C., & Aliger, G. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3), 402-410.

Louis, K. (2003). School leaders facing real change: Shifting geography, uncertain paths. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 371-383.

Lowe, K., Kroeck, K., & Sivasubramianiam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*, 385-425.

Mangham, I. (2004). Leadership and integrity. In J. Storey (Ed.). *Leadership in organizations: Current issues and key trends* (pp. 41-57). London: Routledge.

May, R., & Yalom, I. (2000). Existential psychotherapy. In R. J. Corsini and D. Wedding (Eds.). *Current psychotherapies* (6th ed., pp. 273-302). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.

McDonough, Z. (2002). *Peaceful protest: The life of Nelson Mandela.* New York: Walker & Co.

Meindl, J., & Erhlich, S. (1987). The romance of leadership and the evaluation of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 30*, 90-109.

Miranda, A., Goodman, E., & Kern. R. (1996). Similarities between social interest and contemporary definitions of corporate leadership. *Journal of Individual Psychology, 52*(3), 1996.

Moon, H. (2001). The two faces of conscientiousness: Duty and achievement striving within evaluation of commitment dilemmas. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 533-540.

Morrison, R., Jones, L., & Fuller, B. (2000). The relation between leadership style and empowerment of job satisfaction of nurses. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 30*(5), 241-250.

Mosak, H. (2000). Adlerian psychotherapy. In R. J. Corsini & D. Wedding (Eds). *Current psychotherapies* (6th ed., pp. 54-98). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.

Pandey, J. (1976). Effects of leadership style, personality characteristics, and methods of leader selection on members' leaders' behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 6,* 476-489.

Parker, G. M. (1990). *Team players and teamwork: The new competitive business strategy.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers

Pearce, C., & Sims, H., Jr. (2002). Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transformational, transactional, and empowering leadership behaviors. *Group Dynamics, 6*(2), 172-197.

Ployhart, R., Lim, B., & Chan, K. (2001). Exploring relations between typical and maximum performance and the five-factor model of personality. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 809-843.

Posey, P., & Kline, J. (1990). *Revitalizing manufacturing: Text and cases*. Irwin, CA: Homewood.

Reinhardt, A. (2004). Discourse of transformational leader meta-narrative on finding the right person for the job. *Advances in Nursing Science, 29*(1), 21-32.

Robbins, S. P. (1998). *Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, and applications* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rong, X., & Brown, F. (2002). Immigration and urban education in the new millennium: the diversity and challenge. *Education Urban Society, 33*(3), 123-133.

Sargent, F. (2004). *Civil rights revolution: Events and leaders*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co.

Schiffer, A. (2000). I'm not that liberal: Explaining conservative democratic identification. *Political Behavior, 22*(4), 293-311.

Schminke, M., & Wells, D. (1999). Group process and performance and their effects on individuals' ethical frameworks. *Journal of Business Ethics, 18*, 367-381.

Schuler, R. S. (1995). *Managing human resources* (5th ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.

Shonk, J. H. (1992). *Working in teams: A practical manual for improving work groups*. New York: Amazon.

Skelton-Green, J. (1997). Leadership crisis in psychiatric services: A change in theory perspective. *Psychiatric Quarterly, 68*(1), 43-66.

Sosik, J., Avolio, B., & Kahai, S. (1997). Effects of leadership style and anonymity on group potency and effectiveness: The role of transformational leadership, anonymity, and task interdependence. *Computers in Human Behavior, 14*, 491-511.

Stodgill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25*, 35-72.

Storey J. (2004). Changing theories of leadership and leadership development. In J. Storey (Ed.), *Leadership in organizations: Current issues and key trends* (pp. 11-37). London: Routledge.

Suitcliff, K. M. (2005). Ethics: The Heart of Leadership. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(4), 869-891.

Sullivan, E. V. (1990). *Critical psychology and pedagogy.* New York, NY: Bergin and Garvey.

Sylvia, D., & Hutchison, T. (1985). What makes Ms. Johnson teach? A study of teacher motivation. *Human Relations, 38,* 841-856.

Walderman, D., Bass, B., & Einstein, W. (1987). Leadership and outcomes of appraisal performance processes. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 60*, 177-186.

Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership and multiple levels of analysis. *Human Relations, 43*, 975-995.

Yuki, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses of transformational leadership and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*, 285-306.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at work*. New York: American Management Association.

CHAPTER 2

PERSONALITY, LIFESTYLE, AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP STYLE FROM A HUMANISTIC PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

Over the past 15 years, there have been enormous and rapid changes in legal, political, and social realities that affect the ability of organizations to function efficiently (Storey, 2004; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). Business corporations (Bennis, Spreitzer, & Cummings, 2001; Haveman, Russo, & Meyer, 2001; Hersey, Blanchard, & Dewey, 2001), educational institutions of all types (Eddy et al., 1998; Hollinger, 2003; Louis, 2003; Rong & Brown, 2002), health care agencies (Reinhardt, 2004; Skelton-Green, 1997), international initiatives (Hunt, 1997), and governmental entities on all levels (Goski, Blackstone, & Lang, 2002; Heath, 2002; Schiffer, 2000) are but a few of the organizations struggling in this unprecedented era of rapid change. These changes can be a source of much needed creative strength and increased opportunity, or they can create stifling stress and unrelenting conflict (Bennis et al.). Organizations are faced with a choice of either adjusting or facing serious negative consequences (Haveman et al.). A number of researchers argue that the variable of leadership is one of the most important factors in motivating others to meet organizational goals (Kahai, Sosik, & Avolio, 1997; Parker, 1990; Schminke & Willis, 1999), especially in times of great change (Clark & Clark, 1990; Kuo, 2004). Recent studies have suggested that certain personality attributes may be consistent with successful leadership ability (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002) and that certain

personality dimensions appear to be consistently correlated with leadership effectiveness (Conway, 2000; Hogan et al.). There is, however, a lack of research looking at personality attributes as determinants of leadership style (Lim & Ployhart, 2004). The paradox is that while studies indicate a strong relationship between personality and leadership (Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1985; Hogan, 1983; Stogdill, 1948), most managers are selected on their ability to perform their jobs or on how well-liked they are by their supervisors not on their ability to interact with or to lead others nor on what their particular leadership style might be (Hogan et al.). The future success of organizations may depend on how well the organizations are able recruit, nurture, and groom potential leaders who possess personality attributes that complement the rapid changes and challenges of the modern world.

Full Range of Leadership Model

Leadership has been defined as "persuading other people to set aside for a period of time their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the responsibilities and welfare of the group" (Hogan et al., 1994, p. 493) and has been a subject of interest since ancient times (Kellerman, 1987). While many theories have been developed over the years to explain and identify successful leaders (Canella & Monroe, 1997; Carlyle, 1841/1907; Hollander, 1964; Feidler, 1967; Stogdill, 1948), a major shift in the research was sparked by a political historian, James Burns (Chemers, 2000). Burns (1978) differentiated transactional leaders from transformational leaders. He argued that while transactional leaders' relationships to followers was based on mutually beneficial transactions, transformational leaders' relationships influenced followers' to transcend personal interests and transform them selves as agents of collective change (Chemers).

Transformational leadership involves motivating others to do more than they originally intended or thought possible, setting more challenging expectations, and typically achieving higher performance levels from employees. Building on Burns's theory, Bass (1985) provided a focus on high-impact leadership (Day, Zaccaro, & Halpin, 2004). Bass's (1990) view of transformational leadership is that it exists on a continuum with transactional leadership and that the continuum represents the full range of leadership styles. In 1990, Avolio and Bass introduced the Full Range Leadership (FRL) model. Day et al. stressed that one major difference in the FRL model is a focus on building leaders of higher moral character. The core of FRL is the concept of developing oneself to develop others. According to this model, as leaders mature and gain moral perspective, they spend more time in promoting the development of others versus concentrating on their own needs. This basic premise is what places transformational leadership at the highest end of the continuum of the FRL model (Day et al.). The FRL model moves from the low end characterized by a laissez-faire, or no leadership style, along a continuum away from passive, avoidant leadership and towards the highest end characterized by the transformational leadership style (Bass, 1990).

Determining Leadership Styles

Psychologists have long known that measures of cognitive ability and normal personality predict job effectiveness reasonably well (Hogan & Holland, 2003). More and more companies are using personality assessments for selection, hiring, mentoring, coaching, and career development (Hogan & Hogan, 1992). The lack of research looking at personality attributes as predictors of leadership style (Lim & Ployhart, 2004), however, leaves a big hole in understanding of what differentiates great leaders from the

general population. For instance, only two studies (Judge & Bono, 2000; Ployhart, Lim, & Chan, 2001) and a meta-analysis (Bono & Judge, 2004) have investigated the relationship between transformational leadership style and the personality attributes of the Five Factor Model. The results of these studies were spotty and limited. The authors found small to moderate relationships linking neuroticism, extroversion, and agreeableness to three of the transformational dimensions. In a 2001 study by Blackburn, some statistically significant correlations were found between the lifestyle scales on the BASIS-A Inventory and leadership styles as measured by the MLQ; however, the study was limited by the small number of participants. In other studies investigating personality attributes and leadership (Judge, et al., 2002; Lord, DeVader, & Aliger, 1986), it has been difficult to separate the attributions about the leaders' effectiveness from the specific behaviors they exhibit. In addition, Bono and Judge concluded in their meta-analysis that, at least to some extent, survey measures of transformational leadership confound perceptions, attributions, and implicit theories with behaviors. Consequently, there are still questions about what determines or predicts leadership style and, specifically, transformational leadership style (Lim & Ployhart).

Understanding Leadership

Bennis and Thomas (2002) and Conway (2000) suggested that an important concept in understanding successful leaders lies in uncovering the subjective motives driving their behavior. They argue that when personality measures are given a motivational perspective they reflect why one does things. People develop their perceptions and reality through the interaction of their phenomenological world and within external and social contexts. The subjective meanings people assign to life

experiences provide explanation and guidance for their associated behaviors. Two promising theoretical frameworks for understanding the subjective motives of successful leaders are Individual Psychology (Adler, 1998) and Socioanalytic Theory (Hogan, 1983).

Both theories work from a major construct that attempts to view the world from an individual's subjective frame of reference (Adler, 1998; Hogan, 1983). Adler and Hogan suggest that a person moves through life according to his or her perception of it. Through the creative responses to these early childhood experiences and family atmosphere, humans develop their own interpretations and goals for finding their place in the world.

In his Individual Psychology, Adler (1998) argued that it is the basic need of every human being to belong and to contribute to the welfare of others. Problems arise when life experiences are perceived to interfere or impede with one's ability to meet the need for belonging and contribution. Adler called the movement to overcome these problems a striving for superiority, or a striving for power, over adversity. He saw this movement as an endless effort for better adaptation to the environment. Adler (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956) also suggested that a major contributor to the direction of the striving is one's willingness or unwillingness to cooperate with others for the general good. He termed this concept, "social interest." Adler believed that social interest was manifested by a healthy life style, that is, one in which an individual moves in a cooperative, egalitarian way toward others, leading to a feeling of belonging within one's social context. Adler stresses the importance of this movement and its expressive forms as exhibited in one's life style. The capacity for cooperation and social interest can be

gauged by the way one sees, listens, copes, and acts (Ansbacher & Ansbacher). Adler (1998) posited that every movement in life springs from this life style based on one's subjective interpretation.

Hogan (1983) developed the Socioanalytic Theory of personality specifically to address issues in organizational behavior. It is intended to explain individual differences in career success based on social behavior (Hogan & Holland, 2003). Hogan suggests that people's social behavior is motivated by two unconscious motives based on an individual's unique perception of the world. They are (a) to seek the acceptance and recognition of one's peers while avoiding their criticism and rejection and (b) to seek status and power in relation to one's peers while trying to avoid losing control and status. In addition, Hogan states there are two major dimensions associated with organizational behavior: (a) people work in groups (organizations, departments, teams, etc.), and (b) groups are structured in terms of status hierarchies. Hogan argues that the motives in relation to the work dimensions translate into behavior to get along with others and behavior to get ahead or achieve status among other members of the group (Hogan & Holland).

Digman (1997) concluded that the two major dimensions of Socioanalytic Theory closely align with the earlier dichotomy presented by Adler (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1979): striving for superiority (to get ahead) and social interest (to get along) as well as the importance of the adaptive ability associated with these concepts. Both theories argue that this adaptive ability is guided by the meaning the individual has assigned to the direction of the movement.

In recognizing the role of meaning and purpose in people's lives, Bass's (1990) FRL model appears to share common ground with Alfred Adler's theory of Individual Psychology (Miranda et al., 1996) and with Hogan's Socioanalytical Theory (Conway, 2000) of career development. Bass, consistent with Adler (Ansbacher & Ansbacher,1956) and Hogan (1983), argues that certain life experiences, including family upbringing, are accumulated and take the shape of a life script – or a basis for the subjective understanding of life's experiences (Avolio, 1999). The FRL model argues that the best leaders exhibit behaviors that create an atmosphere that increases followers' senses of self-worth and belonging (Bass, 1985). Clearly, successful leaders are seen by Bass as those who are able to implement Adler's concepts of social interest and the striving for superiority which correspond strongly to Hogan's dimensions of getting along and getting ahead.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the interrelatedness of the lifestyle constructs (also referred to as personality attributes) presented by Adler (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956), the personality attributes for career success defined by Hogan (1983), and leadership styles as defined by FRL (Bass, 1990) in a effort to further the understanding of characteristics most likely related to the transformational leadership style in students enrolled in graduate level business classes. I hope that results from this study will aid employers, managers, counselors, coaches, and instructors in developing educational programs and strategies for identifying, encouraging, and developing transformational leadership characteristics. Given the previous problems related to identifying the link between personality attributes and exhibited behaviors, this study is

using models with common theoretical themes in an attempt to eliminate at least one confounding variable and move researchers closer to an understanding of the complex construct of the transformational leadership style.

Several questions will be presented in this study looking at the transformational leadership style in graduate level business students. The purpose of the questions will be to add to the body of literature that seeks to understand the relationship between personality and the transformational leadership style. The questions are as follows:

1. Given that the instruments used in this study are linked by common humanistic themes, are there any statistically significant relationships between (a) the scales of the BASIS-A Inventory and the HPI; (b) between the BASIS-A Inventory and MLQ; and (c) between the HPI and the MLQ?
2. Are there personality attributes and/or lifestyle constructs that accurately discriminate between individuals exhibiting a transformational leadership style and those who do not?
3. Are there any personality attributes and/or lifestyle constructs that better predict a transformational leadership style than other attributes or constructs predict it?

Methodology

Participants

This study consisted of 240 participants in varying levels of management and who were enrolled in several different Master's of Business Administration (MBA) programs. Participants were recruited from MBA programs, Professional MBA (PMBA) programs,

Global MBA (GMBA) programs, and Executive MBA (EMBA) programs in several universities and colleges located in the southeast region of the United States.

Procedure

I met with the necessary personnel, including class instructors, to acquire permission for the study and to establish the best times and locations for conducting the study. All participation was voluntary, and participants were required to sign a consent form before proceeding with the study. Participants were informed that all data would be reported in group form with no individually identifying information.

Participants were asked to complete three instruments: the BASIS-A Inventory (Wheeler, Kern, Curlette, 1993), the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (5x-Short Form; MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1990), and the Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI; Hogan & Hogan, 1992). Two of the instruments (BASIS-A Inventory, MLQ) were paper-and-pencil assessments that were administered and scored by me. The third instrument (HPI) was an on-line instrument that was sent to the distributors for scoring. Completed scores from the HPI were sent to my confidential e-mail address. Participants were also sent their individual scores over e-mail by the distributor. Each instrument was designed to take no longer than 15 to 20 minutes to complete. I distributed 371 packets to the participants and/or their instructors. The packets contained consent forms, directions for completing the BASIS-A Inventory and MLQ inventories, on-line instructions for the HPI, copies of the BASIS-A Inventory and MLQ for completion, directions for returning the completed BASIS-A Inventory and MLQ to me, a demographic sheet, and contact information for me and for my dissertation committee chairperson.

Instruments

The BASIS-A Inventory (Wheeler et al., 1993) is a 65-Likert-Item personality inventory based on Individual Psychology personality theory. Five lifestyle themes are measured with five supporting measures (Curlette, Wheeler, & Kern, 1997). The inventory is designed to help individuals understand how their lifestyles or organized belief systems that developed during childhood are now relevant to their present functioning (Curlette, Kern, & Wheeler, 1996). The BASIS-A Inventory provides insight about an individual's general approach to life based on the individual's perceptions of the world. The questionnaire requires respondents to rate different statements relating to early childhood on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*). There are five major categories associated with lifestyle characteristics and an additional five subscales. The test-retest reliability coefficients range from .81 to .90 for a 10-week interval. The authors reported coefficient alphas of .82 to .87. To date there are over 40 studies that support and document the reliability and validity of the instrument with various populations.

The five major scales of the BASIS-A Inventory are Belonging/Social Interest (BSI), Going Along (GA), Taking Charge (TC), Wanting Recognition (WR), and Being Cautious (BC). The inventory also includes five additional scales designed to complement and add to the understanding of the five basic scales. The scales are Harshness, Entitlement, Liked by All, Striving for Perfection, and Softness. Detailed explanations on these constructs can be found in Appendix D and in the test manuals (Kern, Wheeler, & Curlette, 1997; Curlette et al., 1997).

Leadership style was measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Short Form 5X; Bass & Avolio, 1990). The MLQ is a 45-item standardized objective inventory based on the work of Bernard Bass and Bruce Avilio (Avilio, Bass, & Jung, 1995). The instrument was designed to measure transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership and the degree to which leaders exhibit these styles. The measures look at behavior for an individual based on personal perception and preferred style. The items on the inventory are to be answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from frequently to not at all. Because the transformational leadership style is regarded as the highest form of leadership, this study focused on identifying relationships to that style.

Five leadership dimensions identify the transformational leadership scale. They are Idealized-Influenced Attributed (IIA), Idealized-Influenced Behavior (IIB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Individualized Consideration (IC), and Intellectual Stimulations (IS). More in-depth descriptions of the scales can be found in Appendix E as well as the MLQ resource manual and books (Bass, 1996, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1999). Reliabilities using a parallel analysis of data ranged from .74 to .94. All of the scales' reliabilities were generally high, exceeding standard cut-offs for internal consistency recommended in the literature. Validity has been established through numerous studies having diverse sets of cultures, organizational settings, and occupational requirements. Other studies have validated the MLQ in identifying gender issues (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

The Hogan Personality Inventory (Hogan & Hogan, 1992) is well-respected and widely used in organizational applications (Anderson & Ones, 2003). It was originally developed for industrial/organizational and vocational applications and is based on

Socioanalytic Theory (Hogan & Hogan). The HPI is a measure of normal personality and is used to evaluate strengths and competencies that enhance individual career development. It provides detailed information on what is called the bright side of personality characteristics that appear in social interaction and that affect an individual's ability to get along with others and to meet occupational goals (Hogan & Hogan).

The measure consists of 206 dichotomous (true-false) items. The HPI provides seven primary scales that reflect aspects of one's personality (Hogan & Hogan, 1992) and that align closely with the Five Factor Model of personality attributes (Costa & McRae, 1992; Hogan & Holland, 2003). The primary scales of Adjustment (AD), Ambition (AM), Inquisitiveness (IQ), and Learning Approach (LA) align with measures related to getting ahead. The remaining three measures of Sociability (SO), Interpersonal Sensitivity (ITS), and Prudence (PR) relate to measures of getting along. The scales are composed of small clusters of items, homogeneous item composites that are subsets of the larger construct. The test reliability coefficients, both in terms of scale internal consistency (average coefficient $\alpha = .80$) and test-retest reliability coefficient (average $r = .71$) are within acceptable ranges. The HPI is used primarily for personnel selection, and its validity in terms of non test correlates is well-established (Hogan & Hogan, 1992). A more in-depth discussion of these scales is presented in Appendix F and in the Hogan Personality Inventory Manual (Hogan & Hogan).

Results

Of the 371 packets given out, 240 students participated with 234 completing the BASIS-A Inventory and MLQ and 202 completing the on-line HPI. Of those completing the BASIS-A Inventory, one person failed to complete the Going Along scale and one

person failed to complete the Entitlement scale. All 202 participants returning the HPI completed the inventory; however, five participants failed to complete the II-A scale, two the II-B scale, and one the IC scale for the MLQ. For those in the total sample who reported their age (n = 236), the range was from 21 to 63 with a median of 33.9 years old. Income for the participants (n = 230) ranged from $0 to greater than $249,000 with a median being in the range of $40,000 to $74,000 and ten not responding. The average number of years in school was 17 with a range of 15 to 22 years (n = 237). Years in a management position ranged from less than 1 year to 30 years (M = 5.5 yrs). Other demographic characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Overview of the Data

Means and standard deviations for the MLQ, BASIS-A Inventory, and HPI scales for the total sample are presented in Table 2. Because Avolio and Bass (1990) recommended that the ideal MLQ ratings for all transformational styles should be greater than 3.0, a separate variable, TRANF, was created from the mean of the five scales that make up the Transformational Leadership Style (IIA, IIB, IM, IS, & IC). Two more variables were created from the TRANF variable to represent groups used to classify those participants with transformational leaderships scores greater than 2.90 (High Transformational Leadership, HTL) and those with scores less than or equal to 2.90 (Low Transformational Leadership, LTL). Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations for the MLQ, BASIS-A Inventory, and HPI scales for participants with TRANF scores greater than 2.90 as well as a breakdown by ethnicity (for White or African American participants) and gender. A cut-off score of 2.90 was chosen to keep this study consistent with the 2001 Blackburn study.

The total sample on average reported themselves with high transformational scores (greater than 2.90). Women had elevated scores (greater than 2.90) on all the transformational scales, while men scored below the 2.90 cut-off score on both the IIA

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Total Sample

Characteristic	*N*	%
Gender (*N* = 240)		
Male	122	50.8%
Female	115	47.9%
No response	3	
Highest Degree Attained (N = 240)		
Bachelor's	187	77.9%
Master's	45	18.8%
Spec. in Educ.	2	0.8%
Doctorate	3	1.3%
No response	3	
Type of Organization (N = 240)		
Business	162	67.5%
Education	29	12.1%
Health Care	22	9.2%
Government	17	7.1%
Religious	4	1.7%
No response	6	

Characteristic	*N*	%
Ethnicity (*N* = 240)		
White	137	57.1%
African American	60	25.0%
Asian	17	7.1%
Latino/a	11	4.6%
Other	10	4.2%
No response	5	
Level of Management (*N* = 240)		
First	150	62.5%
Middle	53	22.1%
Senior	24	10.0%
Executive	8	3.3%
No response	5	

and IIB scales. All of the mean scores for female participants were higher than the mean scores for male participants on all the transformational scales. These findings are consistent with those of the Blackburn (2001) study. An additional finding in this study was that in the overall sample, African American participants scored higher on all the transformational scales than did White participants. As shown in Table 2, White

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for the Transformational Scales of the MLQ, BASIS-A Inventory, and HPI for Total Sample

	Total Sample		Gender				Ethnicity			
	(n = 240)		male (n = 122)		female (n = 115)		African American (n = 57)		White (n = 134)	
Scale	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
BASIS-A					Personality Styles					
BSI	34.92	5.63	34.95	6.24	34.98	5.05	35.32	6.20	35.17	5.51
GA	30.08	4.80	31.05	5.29	29.64	4.22	30.80	5.26	30.37	4.61
TC	21.34	5.92	22.04	6.83	20.74	4.88	20.98	6.81	21.28	5.85
WR	43.40	5.13	43.78	5.04	43.03	5.25	41.96	5.60	44.26	5.01
BC	14.91	6.23	15.53	6.81	14.33	5.68	15.14	6.20	14.46	5.96
H	12.84	2.42	12.84	2.65	12.81	2.21	12.93	2.35	12.59	2.42
E	16.49	4.86	16.72	5.14	16.27	4.65	16.05	4.27	16.39	5.11
L	23.55	3.40	23.70	3.36	23.40	3.48	22.23	2.74	24.34	3.22
P	23.12	3.70	23.73	3.58	22.57	3.75	23.32	3.80	22.99	3.61
S	19.91	2.93	20.04	3.33	19.79	2.54	20.70	2.78	19.80	2.90
HPI					Personality Styles					
AD	20.86	22.75	18.36	21.02	23.17	24.30	26.16	26.30	20.13	22.26
AM	36.72	28.04	37.39	28.27	36.05	28.25	40.06	27.86	37.20	28.40
SO	54.08	29.40	52.74	29.20	54.80	29.94	44.08	28.37	58.78	28.93
ITS	35.16	30.09	41.73	32.47	28.66	26.58	26.65	30.57	36.27	29.63
PR	26.82	23.32	29.88	23.76	24.61	22.80	35.78	24.72	24.68	22.47
IQ	48.78	29.90	41.56	29.19	55.00	29.42	39.16	27.52	51.24	30.05
LA	42.26	27.56	43.11	27.77	41.63	27.66	41.18	28.25	42.88	29.05
MLQ					Transformational Leadership Styles Scales					
IIA	3.00	.51	3.06	.51	2.94	.52	3.16	.49	2.98	.48
IIB	2.95	.61	3.08	.56	2.85	.62	3.08	.56	2.91	.60
IM	3.21	.59	3.25	.56	3.15	.62	3.29	.47	3.20	.58
IS	3.07	.53	3.10	.52	3.03	.54	3.13	.51	3.03	.51
IC	3.18	.58	3.24	.57	3.11	.58	3.24	.50	3.21	.58
TRANF	3.09	.40	3.16	.39	3.03	.41	3.19	.34	3.08	.40

Note. BASIS-A scales: BSI = Belonging/Social Interest, GA = Going Along, TC = Taking Change, WR = Wanting Recognition, BC = Being Cautious, H = Harshness, E = Entitlement, L = Liked by All, P = Striving for Perfection, S = Softness. HPI scales: AD = Adversity, AM = Ambition, SO = Sociability, ITS = Interpersonal Sensitivity, PR = Prudence, IQ = Inquisitiveness, LA = Learning Approach. MLQ scales: IIA= Idealized Influence-Attributed, IIB = Idealized Influence-Behavior, IM = Inspirational Motivation, IS= Intellectual Stimulation, IC = Individualized Consideration, TRANF = Overall Transformational Leadership score, the mean of all five scales.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for the Transformational Scales of the MLQ, BASIS-A Inventory, and HPI for High Transformational Leadership Group

	HTL Sample		Gender				Ethnicity			
	(n = 141)		female (n = 76)		male (n = 67)		African American (n = 34)		White (n = 81)	
Scale	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
BASIS-A					Personality Styles					
BSI	36.02	.52	5.90	.43	6.34	.31	5.53	.68	6.77	.65
GA	30.79	.44	1.53	.22	0.06	.39	0.83	.58	1.19	.54
TC	21.53	.41	1.97	.43	1.14	.08	1.07	.68	1.32	.91
WR	43.96	.04	4.44	.92	3.42	.24	2.21	.45	5.00	.19
BC	14.75	.86	5.42	.29	3.98	.60	4.72	.75	4.23	.88
H	12.35	.51	2.51	.62	2.11	.41	3.02	.56	1.90	.04
E	16.40	.92	6.38	.18	6.38	.75	6.05	.27	6.68	.38
L	23.79	.40	4.15	.29	3.40	.55	2.23	.71	4.83	.28
P	23.70	.51	4.59	.34	2.74	.50	3.33	.09	3.99	.48
S	20.44	.12	0.27	.80	0.66	.20	0.60	.82	0.59	.27
HPI					Personality Styles					
AD	23.22	23.31	18.70	20.35	28.39	25.79	22.78	24.36	24.43	23.83
AM	43.22	27.32	42.25	27.76	44.53	27.51	41.62	27.81	44.36	28.93
SO	55.45	27.66	53.02	28.77	57.28	26.91	47.46	26.82	57.97	28.22
ITS	39.90	31.06	44.29	33.81	34.39	27.62	39.38	32.01	40.97	29.72
PR	28.93	23.37	32.13	23.76	26.58	22.81	34.97	23.74	28.33	22.77
IQ	50.03	29.85	39.81	28.92	60.72	27.51	39.89	29.71	53.60	29.80
LA	43.73	28.53	42.65	29.06	45.25	28.48	43.54	30.21	43.50	28.77
MLQ					Transformational Leadership Styles Scales					
IIA	3.25	38	3.25	.40	3.34	.37	3.29	.43	3.23	.34
IIB	3.19	50	3.28	.48	3.13	.46	3.24	.50	3.20	.47
IM	3.48	40	3.46	.43	3.45	.38	3.39	.44	3.52	.38
IS	3.27	43	3.24	.43	3.23	.42	3.22	.46	3.26	.39
IC	3.43	41	3.47	.41	3.40	.43	3.39	.44	3.50	.40
TRANF	3.32	23	3.34	.24	3.31	.22	3.31	.38	3.34	.21

Note. BASIS-A scales: BSI = Belonging/Social Interest, GA = Going Along, TC = Taking Change, WR = Wanting Recognition, BC = Being Cautious, H = Harshness, E = Entitlement, L = Liked by All, P = Striving for Perfection, S = Softness. HPI scales: AD = Adversity, AM = Ambition, SO = Sociability, ITS = Interpersonal Sensitivity, PR = Prudence, IQ = Inquisitiveness, LA = Learning Approach. MLQ scales: IIA= Idealized Influence-Attributed, IIB = Idealized Influence-Behavior, IM = Inspirational Motivation, IS= Intellectual Stimulation, IC = Individualized Consideration, TRANF = Overall Transformational Leadership score, the mean of all five scales.

participants scored lower than 3.00 on the IIA and IIB scales of the MLQ. This finding should be viewed with caution as 75.5% of those in the African American group were female. It is possible that this finding is more reflective of gender than a cultural or ethnic issue.

Independent t-Tests (see Table 4) were run on the mean scores for the total sample of men and women for the five scales of the transformational leadership style and for TRANF. Statistically significant differences were noted for IIB and for TRANF. The independent t-tests comparing African American participants scores and White participants' scores on the scales of the transformational leadership style and TRANF variable resulted in statistically significant difference in IIA but no statistical difference in TRANF. The average TRANF score for those participants in the HTL group was 3.32. There were no significant differences in the mean scores of the transformational leadership scales between men and women or between African American participants and White participants in the HTL group (see Table 5).

Pearson Correlations

Pearson correlations for those participants in the HTL group were computed to examine the relationship between the transformational scales of the MLQ , the TRANF variable, and the scales of the BASIS-A Inventory and HPI. For the Transformational scales of the MLQ, the only correlations at .01 significance found with the BASIS-A Inventory were IIB and P, IM and H, and IM and P (see Table 6). In addition, the WR and P scales correlated positively with the TRANF variable ($p < .01$). The HPI had no significant correlations with the MLQ scales (see Table 7). A final correlational analysis

was completed to examine the relationship between the BASIS-A Inventory and the HPI (see Table 8). GA correlated positively with AD and PR. Other significant positive

Table 4

Independent t-Tests for Transformational Scales for Total Sample

Grouping	Test Variable	*F*	*t*	*p*
Gender (male/female)	IIA	0.229	−1.790	.075
	IIB	0.289	−2.911	.004
	IM	0.281	−1.350	.178
	IS	0.207	−1.001	.318
	IC	0.914	−1.631	.104
	TRANF	0.792	−2.348	.020
Ethnicity (African American/White)	IIA	0.003	2.441	.016
	IIB	0.563	1.812	.072
	IM	2.009	1.034	.303
	IS	0.151	1.238	.217
	IC	1.384	0.285	.776
	TRANF	3.326	1.764	.079
TRANF (HTL/LTL)	WR	0.001	−1.591	.113
	P	0.325	−2.978	.003
	S	0.098	−4.522	.000

Note. BASIS-A scales: WR = Wanting Recognition, P = Striving for Perfection, S = Softness. MLQ scales: IIA= Idealized Influence-Attributed, IIB = Idealized Influence-Behavior, IM = Inspirational Motivation, IS= Intellectual Stimulation, IC = Individualized Consideration, TRANF = Overall Transformational Leadership score, the mean of all five scales.

correlations were computed between TC and AM, between BSI and SO, and between S and AD. Significant negative correlations were noted between BC and AD, between BC and PR, between H and ITS, and between H and PR.

Table 5

Independent t-Tests for Transformational Scales for Total Sample for High Transformational Leadership Group

Grouping	Test Variable	*F*	*t*	*p*
Gender (male/female)	IIA	0.033	−0.279	.781
	IIB	0.097	−1.924	.056
	IM	1.566	0.528	.598
	IS	0.064	0.614	.540
	IC	0.747	−1.074	.285
Ethnicity (African American/White)	IIA	0.940	0.832	.407
	IIB	0.556	0.390	.697
	IM	2.181	−1.711	.090
	IS	0.944	−0.442	.659
	IC	0.614	−1.521	.131
	TRANF	6.999	−0.838	.404

Note. MLQ scales: IIA= Idealized Influence-Attributed, IIB = Idealized Influence-Behavior, IM = Inspirational Motivation, IS= Intellectual Stimulation, IC = Individualized Consideration, TRANF = Overall Transformational Leadership score, the mean of all five scales.

Discriminant Analyses

Three discriminant analyses (see Table 9) were run to determine if any of the scales of the BASIS-A Inventory or the HPI would be predictive of membership in the HTL group of in the LTL group. Chi Square analyses were run to ensure the two groups did not differ in race or gender; however, a t-test analysis revealed a slight difference in average age with the mean age for the LTL group being 32.0 yrs and the mean age for the HTL group being 35.5 yrs.

Table 6

Intercorrelation of BASIS-A Inventory Scales and MLQ Scales for High Transformational Leadership Group

	BSI	GA	TC	WR	BC	H	E	L	P	S	IIA	IIB	IM	IS	IC
GA	.170*														
TC	.256**	−.279**													
WR	.008	.056	.050												
BC	−.465**	−.372**	−.024	−.014											
H	−.531**	−.315**	.062	−.127	.417**										
E	.163	.116	.200*	.213*	−.349**	−.078									
L	−.064	.050	.037	.882**	.070	−.082	.191*								
P	.444**	.164	.283**	.194*	−.147	−.350**	.012	.146							
S	.702**	.389**	.125	−.027	−.565**	−.539	.201*	−.111	.348**						
IIA	.174*	−.080	.119	.070	−.083	−.069	.091	.034	.074	.064					
IIB	.030	.129	.063	.059	−.108	−.067	.122	.052	.247**	.094	.074				
IM	.106	.162	−.021	.151	−.169*	−.259**	.180*	.096	.222**	.127	.185*	.215**			
IS	−.092	−.051	−.076	.205*	.042	−.045	.004	.157	.047	.003	.058	−.026	.227**		
IC	.022	.073	−.043	.134	−.113	−.029	−.018	.141	.170*	.089	.038	.069	.190*	.180*	
TRANF	.080	.093	.016	.225**	−.157	−.169*	.140	.176*	.287**	.139	.463**	.549**	.653**	.519**	.532**

Note. $*p < .05$. $**p < .01$.

Table 7

Intercorrelation of HPI Scales and MLQ Scales for High Transformational Leadership Group

	AM	AD	SO	ITS	PR	IQ	LA	IIA	IIB	IM	IS	IC
AD	.414**											
SO	.043	.248**										
ITS	.371**	.205*	.285**									
PR	.375**	.065	−.213*	.161								
LA	.063	.215*	.290**	−.062	−.185*							
IQ	.259**	.239**	.136	−.003	.030	.335**						
IIA	−.038	.049	.182*	.055	−.126	−.067	.022					
IIB	−.097	.082	−.066	.032	.019	−.042	.007	.074				
IM	.081	.058	.134	.101	−.016	−.040	.149	.185*	.215**			
IS	−.014	−.087	.001	−.046	.023	.006	.021	.058	−.026	.227**		
IC	.075	−.084	−.047	.167	.137	−.158	−.004	.038	.069	.190*	.180*	
TRANF	−.006	.011	.060	.109	.018	−.107	.067	.463**	.549**	.653**	.519**	.532**

Note. $*p < .05$. $**p < .01$.

Table 8

Intercorrelation of BASIS-A Inventory and HPI Scales for High Transformational Leadership Group

	BSI	GA	TC	WR	BC	H	E	L	P	S
AD	.223*	.316**	−.163	.098	−.355**	−.182*	.152	.036	.002	.316**
AM	.171	.119	.305**	.019	−.082	.050	.178	.025	.161	.140
SO	.241**	−.087	.210*	.153	−.127	−.173	.182*	.079	.134	.181*
ITS	.133	.168	.003	.095	−.178	−.240**	.053	.092	.108	.145
PR	.160	.295**	−.060	.132	−.261**	−.247**	.042	.102	.231*	.216*
IQ	.018	−.076	−.089	−.042	.052	.094	−.150	−.022	−.163	−.061
LA	.122	.066	.031	.094	−.010	.007	.007	.090	.178	.072

Note. $*p < .05$. $**p < .01$. Information already presented in Table 6 and Table 7 has been removed from this table.

Table 9

Discriminant Analysis for Grouping Based on Leadership Style Using the BASIS-A Inventory and the HPI

Variable	Step	Wilks's λ	F	p
BASIS-A Inventory				
Softness	1st	.910	20.962	.000
HPI				
Ambition	1st	.903	20.138	.000
BASIS-A Inventory & HPI				
Ambition	1st	.904	19.078	.000
Softness	2nd	.853	15.531	.000
Wanting Recognition	3rd	.829	12.206	.000

Using the two groups (HTL and LTL), the discriminant analysis on the BASIS-A Inventory used only one BASIS-A scale (i.e., Softness (S)) for differentiating the groups. This analysis yielded a strength of association Wilks's λ = .910 measured by 1-2, which was .09. Specifically, those participants with Softness (S) scores higher than 18.63 were more likely to be classified in the group exhibiting the highest form of transformational leadership than those with scores lower than 18.63. The classification results determined that 69.5 % of HTL group and 62.2 % of the LTL group were correctly classified.

Again using the two group situation, a discriminant analysis on the seven scales of the HPI used one scale, AM, for classification into either the HTL group or the LTL group. The analysis yielded an index of discrimination Wilks's λ = .903. Specifically, those participants with elevated scores (greater than 34.12) on the AM scale were more

likely to be classified in the group exhibiting the highest form of transformational leadership. The classification results determined that 52.8 % of HTL group and 74.2 % of the LTL group were correctly classified.

The third discriminate analysis included the scales of both the BASIS-A Inventory and the HPI. The analysis used the AM scale from the HPI on the first step. The S and WR scales from the BASIS-A Inventory were used in steps 2 and 3, respectively. The results can be seen in Table 9. The classification results determined that 69.5 % of HTL group and 67.7 % of the LTL group were correctly classified.

Stepwise Multiple Regressions

The discriminant analyses looked at *between* group differences for HTL and LTL groups. To investigate further the importance of the BASIS-A Inventory and HPI variables *within* the HTL group, 10 stepwise regression analyses were run on the five transformational leadership scales using the scales of the BASIS-A Inventory and the HPI as the independent variables. Table 10 presents the results of each stepwise linear regression with the total sample and the TRANF variable. The table indicates that three of the BASIS-A Inventory scales (H, E, & P) yielded significant regression ($p < .01$) on the transformational scales. Only the Sociability (SO) scale of the HPI in relation to the IIA scale of the MLQ was identified as a predictor and that was at the $p < .05$ level of signficance. None of the other scales of the HPI were identified as predictors of the transformational leadership style.

Two more stepwise regression analyses were conducted using the HTL group. These analyses also used the scales of the BASIS-A Inventory and the HPI as the independent variables and the TRANF variable as the dependent variable. The analysis

run on the BASIS-A Inventory yielded a significant regression on the P scale ($p < .01$) and the WR scale ($p < .05$) with the model accounting for 14.8% of the overall variance in the TRANF variable. When the stepwise regression analysis was conducted using the HPI, none of the scales yielded a significant regression on the TRANF variable.

Table 10

Stepwise Regression Analysis of the BASIS-A Inventory, TRANF, and Transformational Leadership Scales for High Transformational Leadership Group

Dep. Variable	Predictor Variable	Step Interval	Partial R2	R2	Stand. β	F	t	p
	BASIS-A Inventory Scales							
IIA	BSI	1st	+.173	.030	+.173	4.26	2.06	.041
IIB	P	1st	+.248	.061	+.248	9.02	3.03	.000
IM	H	1st	−.271	.074	−.259	10.95	−3.20	.002
	E	2nd	+.170	.100	+.164	4.05	2.01	.046
IS	WR	1st	+.205	.042	+.205	6.07	2.46	.015
IC	P	1st	+.171	.029	+.171	4.46	2.16	.033
TRANF	P	1st	+.257	.083	+.257	12.56	3.11	.002
	WR	2nd	+.181	.113	+.171	4.46	2.16	.033
	HPI Scales							
IIA	SO	1st	+.182	.033	+.182	4.16	2.08	.044
IIB	No variables identified as predictors.							
IM	No variables identified as predictors.							
IS	No variables identified as predictors.							
IC	No variables identified as predictors.							
TRANF	No variables identified as predictors.							

Note. BASIS-A Inventory scales: BSI = Belonging/Social Interest. WR = Wanting Recognition. H = Harshness. E = Entitlement. P = Striving for Perfection. HPI scale: SO = Sociability. MLQ scales: IIA = Idealized Influence Attributed. IIB = Idealized Influence Behavior. IM = Inspirational Motivation. IS = Intellectual Stimulation. IC = Individualized Consideration. TRANF = mean of other 5 MLQ scales.

In an effort to understand why the multiple regression analysis using the BASIS-A scores for those participants in the HTL group resulted in the P scale having the primary regression rather than the S scale as determined by the total sample, an additional stepwise multiple regression analysis was run on only those participants in the LTL group. The results included regressions on the S scale and the P scales ($p < .01$). Independent t-tests were run on the two groups (HTL, LTL) using the P, S, and WR scales. There was no significance between the means of the groups when looking at the WR scale; however, there was a statistically significant difference in the P and S mean scores ($p < .01$). This finding is consistent with the discriminant function that used the Softness scale as a significant determinant in whether participants were classified into the group exhibiting a transformational leadership style and those who did not.

Discussion

The findings in this study support the relationships between personality attributes, lifestyle constructs, and the transformational leadership style. Putting these findings in the context of predicting leadership, the results suggest that personality can play an important part in determining who will be most likely to exhibit a transformational leadership style. Consistent and significant correlations were found between the transformational leadership scales and the Wanting Recognition (WR), Striving for Perfection(P), Softness(S), Harshness(H), and Being Cautious(BC) scales of the BASIS-A Inventory as well as the HPI scale of Ambition (AM) through a variety of analyses. A discriminate analysis identified the Softness (S) scale as an important discriminator in classifying persons into one of two groups, that is, those with elevated Softness (S) scores (greater than 18.63) were more likely to be classified as having a transformational style

of leadership and those with lower scores were more likely to be classified as not having a transformational leadership style. Interestingly, however, a multiple regression analysis determined that for participants with elevated TRANF scores (greater than 2.90), the BASIS-A Inventory Striving for Perfection (P) scale accounted for the greatest amount of variance for the TRANF scale along with contribution from the Wanting Recognition (WR) scale. For those participants in the low transformational leadership group, the Softness scale accounted for the greatest amount of variance with contribution from the Striving for Perfection (P) scale. It makes sense that the Softness (S) scale would be important as it is a measure of one's optimism, which is crucial when leading others; however, even more importantly, the Striving for Perfection (P) scale is generally reflective of someone who possesses effective coping skills related to problem-solving, obvious self-confidence, and an overall ability to handle stress in organizational settings. This person will most likely have high expectations of himself or herself as well as others and will have the interpersonal skills that will get the job done in a cooperative manner (Kern, Rawlins, & Curlette, 1998). Dinter posited in her 2000 study that high self-efficacy is closely correlated with the Striving for Perfection (P) scale on the BASIS-A giving further validation to the findings that suggest good coping skills are related to high self-efficacy.

The addition of attributes consistent with elevated scores on the Wanting Recognition (WR) scale most likely strengthen one's ability to lead in that elevated scores on this scale are reflective of those who recognize the importance of acknowledging one's contribution and giving encouraging feedback. They are generally

success oriented and can motivate others through a cooperative work style with rewards for their efforts (Kern et al., 1997).

The combination of the Striving for Perfection (P) and Wanting Recognition (WR) scales is consistent with Bass's (1990) theory of leadership. He posits that leadership is on a continuum with some components of the transactional style making up the transformational style. This is clearly illustrated in that the Striving for Perfection (P) scale reflects transformational characteristics (coping skills, success-oriented, and self-confidence) while the Wanting Recognition (WR) scale is more reflective of a transactional style of leadership in the use of the contingent reward system as a motivating technique (Kern et al., 1998). While the results suggested that for the total sample elevated scores on all the BASIS-A scales except Being Cautious (BC), Harshness (H), and Entitlement (E) correspond to elevated scores on the transformational leadership scales, it would appear that as one moves closer to the highest levels of a transformational style the traits measured in the Striving for Perfection (P) and Wanting Recognition (WR) scale take on greater importance than even the Softness (S) scale. This suggests that while optimism as measured by the Softness (S) scale may be useful in initially identifying individuals most likely to have a transformational leadership style, the attributes measured by the Striving for Perfection (P) and Wanting Recognition (WR) scales may be the ones best developed for high levels of successful leadership. For the Being Cautious (BC), Harshness (H), and Entitlement (E) scales, elevated scores correlated negatively with the transformational leadership style suggesting that a negative view of the world and a predominant focus on self can significantly interfere with one's ability to lead others successfully. Interestingly, the Taking Charge (TC) scale did not

have a significant correlation in this study. Possibly, the desire to be in control or direct others is not as important when one is assessing transformational attributes in leaders.

An additional finding for the total sample suggested that women in general report higher transformational leadership attributes than men. Bennis (2001) suggested that this may be due to centuries of traditional roles in which women were nurturers and their position in the family and society required them to learn interpersonal skills including mediating, negotiating, compromising, and recognizing the needs of others. Men, on the other hand, were required by their traditional roles to be dominating, powerful, and in control (Tannen, 1998). There were no statistically significant ($p < .01$) differences between men and women when only the HTL group was reviewed. This possibly suggests that for those classified in the transformational leadership group, differences in leadership style by sex decrease and the style becomes more homogenous.

The results of this study are by no means a definitive answer to the age-old question, "What makes a successful leader." There were several limitations in the study. First, the EMBA, GMBA, and PMBA programs included significant numbers of international students who were identified after the assessments had been completed. Cultural differences may have skewed some of the results. Second, the HPI is an on-line assessment and the MLQ and BASIS-A are paper-and-pencil. The assessments were not all completed in the same sequence nor were the testing environments consistent. Some participants completed the assessments in the classroom, others at home or work. Third, the assessments were all self-report and represented the participant's subjective perception of himself or herself. Nilsen and Campbell (1993) reported that participants who self-report tend to over evaluate their performance and that tendency in and of itself

is associated with poor leadership. Fourth, some participants failed to complete all three assessments.

The findings in this study, however, do suggest the importance of identifying personality traits and their dynamic interactions in relation to leadership style. The consistent and significant relationships between the BASIS-A Inventory scales and the AM scale of the HPI with the transformational leadership scales suggest that consideration of personality traits as an indicator and predictor of leadership style should continue to be stressed and explored. It makes sense in that those BASIS-A Inventory and HPI scores that correlated positively and significantly with the transformational scales appear to be consistent with characteristics of transformational leaders, that is, those leaders who encourage movement towards others, have consideration for subordinates, exhibit a desire to inspire others and self to success, and express a positive and confident outlook (Burns, 1978; Yammarino & Bass, 1990). Those BASIS-A Inventory scales that correlated negatively would be viewed as less desirable for successful leaders as they suggest a rather pessimistic and harsh view of the world and a predominate concern for self. If one were using the BASIS-A Inventory within an organizational, career counseling, or training setting, one might be able to conclude that if an individual had an elevated score on the Softness (S) scale (greater than 18.63) and moderate to elevated scores on the Wanting Recognition (WR) (greater than 43) and Striving for Perfection (P) (greater than 23) scales along with low scores on Being Cautious (BC) (less than 15) and Harshness (H) (less than13), he or she may be a good choice for a leadership position. Interestingly, the HPI had only one scale, Ambition (AM), which had a consistent statistically significant relationship with the transformational leadership scales. This

possibly suggests that the HPI scales do not appear to be measuring attributes related specifically to leadership styles and may not be useful in predicting the styles as described and measured by the MLQ.

Hersey et al. (2000) declared that people can increase their effectiveness in leadership roles through education, training, and development. Though there has been much written about leadership, there is little research or development on the role of education for the next generation of leaders. I hope that with the findings of this study, the body of literature on leadership will expand to identify and develop educational programs that will prepare leaders for effectively handling the enormous changes now occurring in organizations worldwide.

While there are few organizations that have not been touched by the unprecedented scope and rate of change in the world today, educational organizations in particular have been challenged to keep pace. There is very little research in the area of MBA programs and team leadership (Blackburn, 2001). Given that the variable of leadership has been identified as the most important factor causing impact on team management (Parker as cited in Kuo, 2004), understanding how personality attributes relate to transformational leadership styles will be instrumental in the development of team effectiveness. In addition, EMBA, GMBA, and PMBA programs were noted in this study to have a number of international students. Given the globalization of the workplace, future research must include effective leadership strategies as related to cultural differences and international business models. Leaders must understand the behaviors of their colleagues and subordinates as well as the meaning behind those behaviors if they are to lead them successfully. This means that research must not only

identify the personality traits but also the societal implications of those behaviors. A replication of this study with a focus on international participants is necessary to understand the differences. Along those same lines, the workplace today is increasingly composed of several generations of workers, women, and minorities. Research is needed to understand the psychological makeup of members of each group in order to educate leaders in implementing the most effective leadership strategies. Those leaders who will most likely prove the most effective will be those who exhibit personality attributes that move them towards and in unison with their colleagues and peers and that encourage the development of themselves and others. Another important area of research in leadership is the perception of peers and colleagues in relation to one's own perception of leadership skills. Self-report assessments do not tell much about leader effectiveness. A study that incorporated a 360 assessment (self-report and report by subordinates and colleagues) would be much more helpful and enlightening, especially in regard to the reception of a leader's personality traits to others. Other important areas for research are longitudinal studies. Using personality traits to predict leadership style is just the first step. Studies conducted over time are needed to establish the reliability of the prediction and examine personality styles in relation to leadership over time.

Organizations spend enormous amounts of time and money in recruiting, selecting, hiring, and training personnel to lead and manage their operations but often making poor selection decisions (Hogan et al., 1994). Being able to discern efficiently and effectively who may or may not exhibit personality attributes related to the transformational leadership style should reduce considerably an organization's investment in the process. The findings in this study suggest that optimism as measured

by the Softness (S) scale of the BASIS-A may be helpful in classifying potential leaders early in the selection process, thus quickly eliminating those who would not have the qualities required for effective leadership. This study also suggests that simply identifying possible leaders is only the first step. The personality attributes measured by the Striving for Perfection (P) and Wanting Recognition (WR) scales of the BASIS-A as well as the Ambition (AM) and Interpersonal Sensitivity (ITS) scales of the HPI should be explored for training and developing future leaders. Clark and Clark (1999) suggested that leaders are more made than born, and Adler wrote that all human methods of achievement are complicated and cannot be mastered without training. He believed that if training is neglected, abilities will remain undeveloped. It is not enough to simply have a special talent (Dreikurs, 1953). In looking to the future, successful leaders will need to be educated on understanding themselves and their colleagues if they are to lead organizations into the future. The results from this study suggest that personality attributes are very much a part of successful leadership attributes and skills. Increased knowledge by educators and researchers into this area of leadership will be essential in providing the skill-building programs necessary for identifying and developing leaders of the future.

References

Adler, A. (1998). *Alfred Adler: Understanding human nature*. (C. Brett, Trans.). Center City, MN: Hazelton Foundation. (Original work published 1927).

Ansbacher, H. L., & Ansbacher, R. R., (Eds). (1979). *Superiority and social interest*. New York: Norton.

Anderson, N., & Ones, D. (2003). The construct validity of three entry level personality inventories used in the UK: Cautionary findings from a multiple-inventory investigation. *European Journal of Personality, 17,* S39-S66.

Ansbacher, H. L., & Ansbacher, R. R. (Eds.). (1956). *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler.* New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.

Avolio, B. (1999). *Full leadership development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Avolio, B., & Bass, B. M. (1990). *Developing potential across a full range of leadership.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Avolio, B., & Bass, B.M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and Sampler Set* (3rd ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.

Avolio, B., Bass, B., & Jung, D. (1995). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Technical report.* Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden, Inc..

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

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial application.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1996). *A new paradigm of leadership.* Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral Sciences.

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.* Palo Alto CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Bennis, W., Spreitzer, G., & Cummings, T. (Eds.). (2001). *The future of leadership: Today's top leadership thinkers speak to tomorrow's leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W., & Thomas, R. (2002). *Geeks and geezers: How era, values, and defining moments shape leaders.* Boston: Harvard University Press.

Blackburn, D. (2001). *The relationship between personality attributes related to lifestyle and leadership styles*. Unpublished master's thesis, Georgia State University, Atlanta.

Bono, J., & Judge, T. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 901-910.

Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper Row.

Byrd, R. E. (1987, Summer). Corporate leadership skills: A new synthesis. *Organizational Dynamics, 16*(1), 34-43.

Cannella, A. A., & Monroe, M. J. (1997). Constrasting perspectives on strategic leaders: Toward a more realistic view of top managers. *Journal of Management, 23*(3), 425-448.

Carlyle, T. (1907). *Heroes and hero worship*. Boston: Adams. (Original work published 1841)

Chemers, M. (2000). Leadership research and theory: A functional integration. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, & Practice, 4*, 27-43.

Clark, K., & Clark, M. (Eds). (1990). *Measures of leadership.* West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Conway, J. M. (2000). Managerial performance development constructs and personality correlates. *Human Performance, 1*3(1), 23-47.

Costa, P. T., & McRae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Curlette, W. L., Kern, R.M., & Wheeler, M. S. (1996). Uses and interpretations of the BASIS-A Inventory. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 52*, 95-103.

Curlette, W.L., Wheeler, M.S., & Kern, R.M. (1997). *BASIS-A Inventory technical manual.* Highlands, NC: TRT Associates.

Day, D., Zaccaro, S., & Halpin, S. (2004). *Leader development for transforming organizations.* Mahwah, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Digman, J. M. (1997). Higher order factors of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 1246-1256.

Dinter, L. D. (2000). The relationship between self-efficacy and lifestyle patterns. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 56*(4), 462-473.

Dreikurs, R. (1953). *Fundamentals of Adlerian Psychology*. Chicago, IL: The Alfred Adler Institute.

Eddy, J., Spaulding, D., Richards, T., Morris, A., Murphy, D., Maimberg, E., & Brubaker, T. (1998). Retaining quality students and faculty: The need for refined higher education leadership policies and procedures. *College Student Journal, 32*(2), 222-227.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goski, J., Blackstone, G., & Lang, J. (2002). A model of leadership development. *Public Personnel Management, 31*(4), 517-522.

Haveman, H., Russo, M., & Meyer, A. (2001). Organizational environment in flux: The impact of regulatory punctuations on organizational domains, CEO succession, and performance. *Organization Science, 12*(3), 253-273.

Heath, R. (2002). Community relationship building: Local leaders in the risk communication infrastructure. *Journal of Public Relations, 14*(4), 317-353.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K, & Johnson, D. (2001). *Management of organizational behavior.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hogan, R. (1983). A socioanalytic theory of personality. In M. M. Page (Ed.), 1982 *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 55-89). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist, 49*, 493-504.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1992). *The Hogan Personality Inventory manual*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessments System.

Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: A socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(1), 100-112.

Hollander, (1964). *Leaders, groups, and influence*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hollinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice on instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329-351.

Hunt, J. G. (1997). Transformational/charismatic leadership's transformation of the field: An historical essay. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*, 129-144.

Judge, T., & Bono, J. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 751-765.

Judge, T., Bono, J., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 765-780.

Kahai, S., Sosik, J., & Avolio, B. (1997). Effects of leadership style problem structure on work group process in an electronic meeting system environment. *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 121-146.

Kellerman, B. (1987). *The politics of leadership in America: Implications for higher education in the late 20th century.* Paper presented at the Invitational Inter-disciplinary Colloquium on Leadership in Higher Education, National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Kern, R. M., Rawlins, C. C., & Curlette, W. L. (1998). *BASIS-A interpretive guide for leadership and management*. TRT Associates: Inc

Kern, R. M., Wheeler, M. S., & Curlette, W. L. (1997). *BASIS-A Inventory interpretive manual: A psychological theory.* Highlands, NC: TRT Associates, Inc.

Kuo, C. (2004). Research on impacts of team leadership on team effectiveness. *The Journal of American Academy of Business, 5*(1/2), 266-277.

Lim. B., & Ployhart, R. (2004). Transformational leadership: Relations to the Five-Factor Model and team performance in typical and maximum contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(4), 610-621.

Lord, R., DeVader, C., & Aliger, G. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 402-410.

Louis, K. (2003). School leaders facing real change: Shifting geography, uncertain paths. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 371-383.

Miranda, A., Goodman, E., & Kern, R. (1996). Similarities between social interest and contemporary definitions of corporate leadership. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 52*(3), 261-269.

Nilsen, D., & Campbell, D. P. (1993). Self-observer rating discrepancies: Once an overrater, always an overrater? *Human Resource Management, 32*(2), 265-281.

Parker, G. M. (1990). *Team players and teamwork: The new competitive business strategy.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers

Ployhart, R., Lim, B., & Chan, K. (2001). Exploring relations between typical and maximum performance and the five-factor model of personality. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 809-843.

Reinhardt, A. (2004). Discourse of transformational leader meta-narrative on finding the right person for the job. *Advances in Nursing Science, 29*(1), 21-32.

Rong, X., & Brown, F. (2002). Immigration and urban education in the new millennium: the diversity and challenge. *Education Urban Society, 33*(3), 123-133.

Schiffer, A. (2000). I'm not that liberal: Explaining conservative democratic identification. *Political Behavior, 22*(4), 293-311.

Schminke, M., & Wells, D. (1999). Group process and performance and their effects on individuals' ethical frameworks. *Journal of Business Ethics, 18*(2), 367-381.

Skelton-Green, J. (1997). Leadership crisis in psychiatric services: A change in theory perspective. *Psychiatric Quarterly, 68*(1), 43-66.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25*(1), 35-72.

Storey, J. (2004). Changing theories of leadership and leadership development. In J. Storey (Ed.), *Leadership in organizations: Current issues and key trends* (pp. 11-37). London, England: Routledge.

Tannen, D. (1998). The argument culture. New York: Random House. In W. Bennis, G. Spreitzer, & T. Cummings (Eds.). (2001). *The future of leadership: Today's top leadership thinkers speak to tomorrow's leaders* (pp.103-115). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wheeler, M. S., Kern, R. M., & Curlette, W. L. (1993). *The BASIS-A Inventory*. Highlands, NC: TRT Associates.

Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership and multiple levels of analysis. *Human Relations, 43*, 975-995.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at work.* New York: American Management Association.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Informed Consent Form

Georgia State University

Department of Education

Title: Personality Attributes and Leadership Styles in Organizations

Principal Researcher: Michele Frey, Ed.S., L.P.C., N.C.C.

Subjects are being invited to participate in a research study. This study will look at the relationships between personality traits and leadership styles. Subjects will be asked to complete four instruments and a demographic information form. The instruments are the Basic Adlerian Scales for Interpersonal Success – Adult Form (BASIS-A), the Hogan Personality Assessment (HPI), and the Multifactor Leadership - Short Form (MLQ).

The BASIS-A and MLQ-5 are paper and pen instruments. They will be completed while the researcher is present. The HPI is an on-line only instrument. Subjects will be asked to complete this instrument on their computers. The HPI will be scored by the distributors. The results will be sent to the researcher for analyses as well as to the individual participant. The researcher will score the BASIS-A and the MLQ. Each of the instruments should take about 15 to 20 minutes to complete. The scores from the HPI will include an interpretive report as well.

The privacy of subjects is of great concern. The researcher will code all the responses with a number rather than with your name. Once the data are typed into the computer, the key to the identities will be destroyed. All findings will be summarized. They will be reported in group form only. The results will be identified only by broad descriptions (region of country, type of company but no name, etc). Individual responses will not be shared. Only summarized group responses will be provided. All personal information obtained in this study will be kept private. If enrollment is so low that conclusions about small groups of participants can be made, the small group results will not be provided. Consent forms will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in the researcher's office. They will never be publicly associated with the participants' assigned codes.

Your name will not appear on the results you receive, only the ID number given to you at the beginning. If you have any questions about the results, you may contact the researcher at the number below.

There are no expected risks to the subjects; however, some minor discomfort may be connected with revealing personal feelings. Participation is completely voluntary. You may refuse to be in the study. You may also choose to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of privileges that you now have. You may skip questions you prefer not to answer.

This study involves research, and you may ask questions concerning this procedure. Please direct questions to the principal researcher, Michele Frey, at mrm1@bellsouth.net or 770-445-1695. You may also contact the committee chair for this study, Dr. Roy Kern, at rkern@gsu.edu or 404-651-3409, at Georgia State University. Susan Vogtner at the Georgia State University Research Office (404-463-0674) can provide you with general information about the rights of human subjects in research.

If you are willing to volunteer for this research, please sign below.

_____ _____

Participant's Signature Date

_____ _____

Investigator's Signature Date

APPENDIX B

Participant Research Packet Instructions

Dear Participant:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. Enclosed you will find:

a. Consent form to participate
b. Demographic information sheet
c. Instructions for taking the HPI on line
d. BASIS-A Inventory
e. MLQ Inventory

- Please carefully read and then sign the consent agreement.
- Fill out the demographic data sheet.
- The BASIS-A is a pencil inventory. Consider each statement from the perspective of when you were a child. Please carefully color in the bubble on the pink scan sheet that most closely reflects your feeling about the statement. If you make a mistake, please do not attempt to erase. Simply place an X over the incorrect response and color in the correct one. Do not remove the scan sheet. **CAUTION:** Be sure the number of the statement matches the number of the response. The statements go down the page, the responses go across.
- The MLQ is also a pencil inventory. Simply circle the correct response. Be sure to fill out the front and back of the sheet. You do not have to fill out the name or leader information.

When you have completed the **consent form**, the **demographic data sheet**, the **BASIS-A**, and the **MLQ** (you should have 4 items), please put them all back in the envelope and return them to _____.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE *BASIS-A* AND THE *MLQ* BEFORE BEGINNING THE ON-LINE ASSESSMENT.

The HPI is an on line assessments. Please follow the instructions enclosed to access the site and complete the assessments. You will receive a 19 page interpretive report of your scores on the HPI within minutes of completing the assessment. If you do not, please contact me.

Thank you again. If you have any questions or concerns, feel free to call me at 770-505-0640 or you can e-mail me at mrm1@bellsouth.net.

Michele Frey, Ed. S, L.P.C

APPENDIX C

Hogan Leadership Assessments
Logon Instructions

Using at least a minimum version of Microsoft Internet Explorer 4.0 or Netscape Navigator 6.2, access the assessment by typing:

http://www.assessmentlink.com/Research
or
http://www.assessmentlink.com/Research/Participant/logon.aspx

1. Enter User ID: _____
2. Enter Password: Hogan
3. Click: Logon
4. Enter your information and click: Submit. You are ready to take the HPI.
5. Click: Start
6. It is a true/false assessment and should take only about 15 minutes to complete.
7. When you have finished, click: Submit.
   Your results and an interpretive report should be e-mailed to you within a few minutes.

Thank you so much for your patience in taking these assessments. I think you will find the results interesting and helpful in building your management and leadership skills.

APPENDIX D

MLQ Transformational Leadership Primary Scale Descriptions

Primary Scale	Leader Behaviors
Idealized Influence -Attributed (II-A)	Instill pride by association. Go beyond self-interest for the good of others. Build respect and display a sense of power and confidence. Reassure others that obstacles will be overcome.
Idealized Influence -Behavioral (II-B)	Talk about values and beliefs. Consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions. Emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission and purpose. Champion exciting, new possibilities.
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	Articulate an appealing vision of the future, challenge followers with high standards, talk optimistically and enthusiastically, and provide encouragement and meaning for what needs to be done.
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	Questions old assumptions, traditions, and beliefs; Stimulates new perspectives and ways of doing things; Encourages expression of ideas and reasons.
Individualized Consideration (IC)	Considers individual's needs, abilities, and aspirations. Listens attentively; Furthers follower's development. Acts as a coach to advise and teach.

Note. Adapted from Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and Sampler Set* (3rd Edition). Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.

APPENDIX E

BASIS-A Inventory Personality Styles

Primary Scale	Measures
Personality Styles as related to Leadership	
Belonging-Social Interest	High scorers: Friendly, optimistic, trusting of others, cordial. Work well with peers and subordinates. Communicate optimism about the organization and its members. Tend to be visionary in strategic planning with an ability to inspire others to meet organizational goals. Low scorers: More comfortable with ideas than interfacing with people. May prefer to create leadership positions that don't require them to compete in a free-flowing situation in which their natural introversion may put them at a disadvantage.
Getting Along	High scorers: Rule-focused, structured, and prefer clear regulations and roles in the organization. Avoid conflicts and are forgiving. Low Scorers: Exercise an independent and aggressive stance with others. May appear to be critical of others, question authority, and react argumentatively.
Taking Charge	High scorers: Tend to elicit extra effort from others, prefer to be viewed as the group leader, and readily take on responsibilities needed to achieve group goals. However, may tend to dominate relationships with others creating dependency or resentment. Low scorers: Influence others through cooperation but can take a leadership position if the need arises Most likely lead in a way that encourages others to be respectful and considerate of each other thus a avoiding conflicts. They may struggle if the need to openly confront another arises.
Wanting Recognition	High scorers: Tend to be sociable, cooperative, and personable. Attempt to win the praise and respect of others to validate their successes and may readily understand the need to validate the work of others. More likely to used a contingent reward system because of their need for personal validation. Low scorers: Tend not to be concerned about the approval or opinion of their associates. May be perceived as aloof and lacking in consideration. May project a laid-back, complacent attitude that could be interpreted by others as a lack of concern for their achievements.

Being Cautious	High scorers: Sensitive to the outside world and the feelings of others under stress. May have a highly developed skill for reading the non-verbal behaviors of others and for intuitively evaluating people and relationships. May work to correct injustices using sensitivity and compassion; however, they may rely more on feelings than thinking. Low scorers: Tend to be trusting, flexible, and accepting. cooperative with others using a relaxed style, are optimistic about the future, and demonstrate confidence in others. Low scores are comfortable with change and ambiguity.

Subscales

Harshness	A high score on this scale suggests that as a leader, one may perceive himself or herself in a more critical way than others do. These negative patterns of thought could lead to discouragement and pessimism.
Entitlement	A high score on this scale suggests a leader's need for self-validation and a desire for recognition from others.
Liked by All	A high score on this scale suggests that a leader would be mostly likely to use a contingency/reward system as well as have a high need for Acceptance while avoiding conflicts.
Striving for Perfection	A high score on this scale validates that a leader possesses effective coping skills related to problem-solving, self-confidence, and an overall ability to handle stress in an organizational setting.
Softness	A high score on this scale is a indication that as a leader, one will perpetuate an optimistic and encouraging attitude. A high score may also be a reflection of one's attitude to function well under stress within the organizational setting.

Note. Adapted from Kern, R.M., Rawlins, C. C., & Curlette, W. L. (1998). *BASIS-A Interpretive Guide for Leadership and Management.* TRT Associates: Inc.

APPENDIX F

Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI)

Primary Scale	Measures
Personality Styles	
Adjustment	Reflects the degree to which a person is calm and even-tempered or, conversely, moody and volatile. High scorers appear confident, resilient, and optimistic. Low scorers appear tense, irritable, and negative.
Ambition	Reflects the degree to which a person seems leaderlike, seeks status, and values achievement. High scorers seem competitive and eager to advance. They enjoy taking charge and making decisions and are eager to take on difficult challenges. However, high scorers may tend to intimidate or overly compete with associates. Low scorers appear as uninterested and not as concerned with advancement.
Sociability	Assesses the degree to which a person appears talkative and socially self-confident. High scorers present as outgoing, colorful, and impulsive. They like working with others. As a leader, one would most likely be good at networking and building relationships outside the work group because he or she would be perceived as outgoing and approachable. Low scorers seem reserved and quiet, avoid calling attention to themselves, and do not mind working alone.
Interpersonal Sensitivity	Reflects social skill, tact, and perceptiveness. High scorers tend to be pleasant and engaging. They generally succeed in jobs that require social interaction and tend to arouse trust in others. Low scorers seem independent, frank, and direct. They do not mind taking unpopular positions and will confront poor performers. Low scorers tend to push others for results though they may be more focused on the results than how others feel about the task. Low scorers may be lacking in tact and diplomacy.
Prudence	Is concerned with self-control and conscientiousness. High scorers would tend to prefer structure and clear rules. As leaders, they would be good at planning ahead and paying attention to details as well as meeting organizational deadlines; however, they may struggle in

	ambiguous and new situations. They tend to resist rules and close supervision but may be creative and spontaneous. Low scorers are able to change directions quickly, are good at multi-tasking, and will make decisions.
Inquisitiveness	Reflects the degree to which a person appears as curious, adventurous, and imaginative. High scorers tend to be quick-witted and visionary but may be easily bored and not pay attention to details. Low scorers are more likely to be practical, focused, and able to concentrate for long periods of time.
Learning Approach	Reflects the degree to which a person enjoys academic activities and values education as an end to itself. High scorers seem to enjoy reading and studying. Low scorers are less interested in formal education and prefer hands-on learning.

Note. Adapted from Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1992). *The Hogan Personality Inventory Manual*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessments System.

APPENDIX G

Demographic Information Form

Gender
- 1. Male
- 2. Female

Race/Ethnicity
- 1. African-American
- 2. Latina/Latino
- 3. Native/Alaskan American
- 4. Caucasian
- 5. Asian
- 6. Pacific Islander
- 7. Other _____

Years of School Completed
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21+

Diplomas/Degrees Earned
- 1. Bachelor's Degree
- 2. Master's Degree
- 3. Specialist's Degree
- 4. Doctoral Degree

Age _____

Yearly Income Level Before Taxes
- 1. Under $5,000
- 2. 5,000- 9,999
- 3. 10,000- 19,999
- 4. 20,000- 29,000
- 5. 30,000- 39,000
- 6. 40,000- 49,000
- 7. 50,000- 74,000
- 8. 75,000- 99,999
- 9. 100,000- 249,999
- 10. 250,000 and over

Years in Management _____

Level of Management past or present
- 2. First line manager (manages workers)
- 3. Middle management (manages managers)
- 4. Senior management (over regions and/or more than 1 department)
- 5. Executive management

Type of Organization
- 1. Business
- 2. Education
- 3. Health Care
- 4. Government
- 5. Religious

APPENDIX H

Participant Demographic Characteristics

Age	M = 33.9 years, SD = 9.75; N = 236
Years in School	M = 17.1 years, SD = 2.59; N = 237
Years in Management	M = 5.5 years, SD = 6.21; N = 234
Sex	N = 237
Male	N = 122 (50.8%)
Female	N = 115 (47.9%)
Missing	N = 3 (1.3%)
Ethnicity	N = 235
White	N = 137 (57.1%)
Black	N = 60 (25.0%)
Asian	N = 17 (7.1%)
Latino/a	N = 11 (4.6%)
Other	N = 10 (4.2%)
Missing	N = 5 (2.1%)
Academic Degree	N = 237
Bachelor	N = 187 (77.9%)
Master	N = 45 (18.8%)
Ed. S.	N = 2 (.8%)
Doctorate	N = 3 (1.3%)
Missing	N = 3 (1.3%)
Income	N = 230
$ 0 to 19,999	N = 41 (17.1%)
$ 20,000 to 39,999	N = 44 (18.3%)
$ 40,000 to 74,999	N = 78 (32.5%)
$ 75,000 to 99,999	N = 46 (19.2%)
$100,000 to 249,000	N = 20 (8.3%)
> $249,000	N = 1 (.4%)
Missing	N = 10 (4.2%)
Level of Management	N = 235
First Line	N = 150 (62.5%)
Middle	N = 53 (22.1%)
Senior	N = 24 (10.0%)
Executive	N = 8 (3.3%)

Missing	N = 5 (2.1%)
Type of Organization	N = 234
Business	N = 162 (67.5%)
Education	N = 29 (12.1%)
Health Care	N = 22 (9.2%)
Government	N = 17 (7.1%)
Religious	N = 3 (1.7%)
Missing	N = 6 (2.5%)

APPENDIX I

Intercorrelation of BASIS-A Inventory Scales and MLQ Scales for Total Sample

	BSI	GA	TC	WR	BC	H	E	L	P	S	IIA	IIB	IM	IS	IC
GA	.211**														
TC	.174**	-.272**													
WR	.035	.103	.089												
BC	-.422**	-.336**	.055	-.038											
H	-.538**	-.320**	.078	-.124	.424**										
E	.128	.023	.200**	.204**	-.218**	-.049									
L	-.028	.083	.064	.892**	.028	-.086	.171**								
P	.392**	.145*	.273**	.201**	-.156*	-.273**	.008	.138*							
S	.670*	.347**	.066	-.026	-.531**	-.562**	.102	-.098	.375**						
IIA	.310**	.140*	.109	.073	-.193**	-.229**	.050	.048	.185**	.257**					
IIB	.162*	.174**	.078	.065	-.127	-.185**	.102	.054	.155*	.240**	.333**				
IM	.246**	.244**	.029	.135*	-.194**	-.268**	.115	.094	.198**	.330**	.525**	.491**			
IS	.063	.029	-.107	.132*	-.055	-.164*	-.030	.093	.097	.179**	.263**	.304**	.365**		
IC	.152*	.168*	.027	.159*	-.070	-.133*	-.008	.160	.272**	.237**	.431**	.281**	.475**	.396**	
TRANF	.263**	.224**	.033	.152*	-.195**	-.277**	.071	.118	.239**	.363**	.700**	.693**	.813**	.714**	.532**

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. BASIS-A scales: BSI = Belonging/Social Interest, GA = Going Along, TC = Taking Change, WR = Wanting Recognition, BC = Being Cautious, H = Harshness, E = Entitlement, L = Liked by All, P = Striving for Perfection, S = Softness. MLQ scales: IIA= Idealized Influence-Attributed, IIB = Idealized Influence-Behavior, IM = Inspirational Motivation, IS= Intellectual Stimulation, IC = Individualized Consideration, TRANF = Overall Transformational Leadership score, the mean of all five scales.

APPENDIX J

Intercorrelation of BASIS-A Inventory Scales, Age, Years in School, and Years in Management for Total Sample

	BSI	GA	TC	WR	BC	H	E	L	P	S	AGE	YRS SCHL
GA	.211**											
TC	.174**	-.272**										
WR	.035	.103	.089									
BC	-.422**	-.336**	.055	-.038								
H	-.538**	-.320**	.078	-.124	.424**							
E	.128	.023	.200**	.204**	-.218**	-.049						
L	-.028	.083	.064	.892**	.028	-.086	.171**					
P	.392**	.145*	.273**	.201**	-.156*	-.273**	.008	.138*				
S	.670*	.347**	.066	-.026	-.531**	-.562**	.102	-.098	.375**			
AGE	.079	.078	-.055	-.071	.053	-.154*	-.205**	-.074	.101	.122		
YRSSCHL	-.112	-.048	.004	-.001	.093	.084	-.003	.028	.041	-.072	.058	
YRSMGMT	.033	.077	.023	.046	.082	-.108	-.045	.032	.143*	.109	.670**	.035

Note. BASIS-A scales: BSI = Belonging/Social Interest, GA = Going Along, TC = Taking Change, WR = Wanting Recognition, BC = Being Cautious, H = Harshness, E = Entitlement, L = Liked by All, P = Striving for Perfection, S = Softness. Adapted from Kern, R.M., Rawlins, C. C., & Curlette, W. L. (1998). *BASIS-A Interpretive Guide for Leadership and Management.* TRT Associates: Inc. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

APPENDIX K

Intercorrelation of BASIS-A Inventory Scales and HPI Scales for Total Sample

	AD	AM	SO	ITS	PR	IQ	LA	IIA	IIB	IM	IS	IC
AM	.437**											
SO	.020	.268**										
ITS	.347**	.272**	.279**									
PR	.389**	.125	-.286**	.166*								
IQ	.061	.229**	.305**	.000	-.172*							
LA	.127	.138	.127	.000	.048	.341**						
IIA	.149*	.350**	.173*	.230**	.042	.013	.024					
IIB	.011	.156*	-.001	.115	.095	-.028	.051	.333**				
IM	.139	.278**	.104	.221**	.093	.008	.109	.525**	.491**			
IS	.090	.179*	.051	.079	.000	.104	.036	.263**	.304**	.365**		
IC	.091	.219**	.15	.219**	.197**	.020	.068	.431**	.281**	.475**	.396**	
TRANF	.139	.311**	.090	.219**	.103	.008	.070	.700**	.693**	.813**	.643**	.714**

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.. HPI scales: AD = Adversity, AM = Ambition, SO = Sociability, ITS = Interpersonal Skills, IQ = Inquisitiveness, LA = Learning Approach. Adapted from Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1992). *The Hogan Personality Inventory Manual*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessments System.Note 2. MLQ-5X scales: IIA= Idealized Influence-Attributed, IIB = Idealized Influence-Behavior, IM = Inspirational Motivation, IS= Intellectual Stimulation, IC = Individualized Consideration, TRANF = Overall Transformational Leadership score, the mean of all five scales. Adapted from Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and Sampler Set* (3rd Edition). Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.

APPENDIX L

Intercorrelation of HPI scales MLQ scales, Age, Years in School, and Years in Management of Total Sample

	AD	AM	SO	ITS	PR	IQ	LA	IIA	IIB	IM	IS	IC	TRANF	AGE	YRS SCHL
AM	.437**														
SO	.020	.268**													
ITS	.347**	.272**	.279**												
PR	.389**	.125	-.286**	.166*											
IQ	.061	.229**	.305**	.000	-.172*										
LA	.127	.138	.127	.000	.048	.341**									
IIA	.149*	.350**	.173*	.230**	.042	.013	.024								
IIB	.011	.156*	-.001	.115	.095	-.028	.051	.333**							
IM	.139	.278**	.104	.221**	.093	.008	.109	.525**	.491**						
IS	.090	.179*	.051	.079	.000	.104	.036	.263**	.304**	.365**					
IC	.091	.219**	.15	.219**	.197**	.020	.068	.431**	.281**	.475**	.396**				
TRANF	.139	.311**	.090	.219**	.103	.008	.070	.700**	.693**	.813**	.643**	.714**			
AGE	.046	.088	-.172	.127	.110	-.177	.012	.058	.114	.112	.107	.258**	.174*		
YRSSCHL	-.028	-.030	.016	-.126	-.138	.087	.196	-.007	.086	.044	.111	.093	.089	.058	
YRSMGMT	.114	.177*	-.088	.105	.122	-.113	.089	.078	.085	.110	.115	.207**	.161*	.035	.679**

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. HPI scales: AD = Adversity, AM = Ambition, SO = Sociability, ITS = Interpersonal Sensitivity, PR = Prudence, IQ = Inquisitiveness, LA = Learning Approach.. MLQ scales: IIA= Idealized Influence-Attributed, IIB = Idealized Influence-Behavior, IM = Inspirational Motivation, IS= Intellectual Stimulation, IC = Individualized Consideration, TRANF = Overall Transformational Leadership score, the mean of all five scales.