THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMUNICATION ARTS AND SCIENCES AND
SOCIOLOGY, CRIME, LAW, AND JUSTICE

LEADERSHIP AND PERSONALITY: HOW WHO WE ARE AFFECTS HOW WE
WANT TO BE LED

JESSICA TUCKER
FALL 2013

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Communication Arts and Sciences and Sociology, Crime, Law, and Justice
with honors in Communication Arts and Sciences and Sociology, Crime, Law, and
Justice

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Laurie Scheuble
Senior Lecturer in Sociology
Thesis Supervisor

Lori Bedell
Senior Lecturer in Communications Arts and Sciences
Honors Adviser

Stacy Rogers Silver
Associate Professor of Sociology and Human Development
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

This research examines predictors of leadership preferences. Data were gathered from a convenience sample of students at a large northeastern university (N=402) during the fall of 2012. The findings from the study suggested that there is a strong general preference for transformational leadership as compared to transactional leadership. Predictors of leadership preference include gender of respondents, openness to new experience, agreeableness, neuroticism, public speaking skills, and introversion-extroversion.

Keywords: *Transformational, Transactional, Leadership, College Students*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people that were pivotal to the success of this thesis. I first want to thank Laurie Scheuble. I could not have asked for a more patient, understanding, or good-humored thesis supervisor. As my first Sociology professor at Penn State, it is only appropriate that she is my last. I also want to thank Lori Bedell and Stacy Silver for their valuable input throughout this process. Big thanks must go to Matt Bonczek for his unwavering support throughout my many drafts. Last but not least I would like to thank my family, who has been the vital support system during my Penn State career and my ever persistent editors of all my papers.

Chapter 1

Literature Review

In recent decades, leadership has become a growing topic of interest to researchers because of the need to determine what kind of leaders' people want and how effective leaders are by type and situation. Leadership is a social process, a series of interactions where someone assumes leadership by earning the right to lead and taking it (Karp 2013). O'Conner and Quinn (2004) argue that leadership is drawn from – instead of added to – groups of people, showing the interdependency of leadership and the group. As Burnes (2004) explains, individuals not only form groups, but are in fact being formed by the groups themselves, showing the interactive relationship between the group and individual. The social interactions that Karp (2013) discusses focus on the interactions within the group and how individuals influence each other. The group make-up and dynamics are the basis from which leadership is drawn.

The purpose of the current study is a further examination of perceptions of transformational leaders as well as transactional leaders. The study focuses on a convenience sample of undergraduate students at a large Northeastern University and examines which types of leadership styles are preferred, as well as which variables predict these preferences. My research examines transactional and transformational leadership preference as well as the four personality dimensions of the Myers-Briggs personality test. Specifically, I examine the relationship between gender, race, political affiliation, involvement with Greek life, religiosity, army/ROTC experience, previous

leadership experience and workshops in leadership, personal views on leadership, personality and preferred leadership style.

Theory

Relational leadership theory explores the leadership process and assumes that social reality lies in the context of relationships (Uhl-Bien 2006). People communicate and this leads to a construction of their relationships including the roles and expectations for leaders and group members. By communicating, leaders and followers relate their activities in the group with those around them to both create meaning and express identity (Stacey 2004; Reicher, Haslam and Hopkins 2005).

The way in which leaders and followers develop and sustain ways of relating through conversation forms their surroundings. Leadership arises from a dialogue of events and depends upon the surrounding context and those constructing it (Karp 2013).

Leadership involves the social construction of this context which legitimizes the action proposed by the leader (Grint 2005). As the group and the individual interact, leadership itself is produced by, but also produces, the context to which it refers. Leadership and context are socially constructed and interdependent (Endrissat and Arx 2013), much as the leadership and the group are interdependent. In past studies (Pfeffer 1977; Day, Harrison and Halpin 2009), the examination of leadership has focused on the leader, commonly explaining outcomes due to the leadership. However, this may be an illusion that leaders can create social environments that enhance effective outcomes; these environments, in fact, create the leader (Berger and Luckmann 1966). Often studies address the nature of leadership, but not the context of the leadership. As the two are

interdependent, an understanding of context is essential to an understanding of leadership. A part of this context is the leader's followers, which this study will examine.

Once an understanding of leadership and context is developed we begin to understand the practices of the group being lead. Context and institutionalization create group practices. Through continuous interaction, expectations of typical behavior patterns are established. If many people use these patterns, the patterns become generally accepted practices. When new members join the group, they observe practices which are then thus internalized due to socialization. Eventually these practices are so obvious that they become unquestionable and represent context for members of the community (Berger and Luckmann 1996).

There are many ways of defining leadership styles; however, two common classifications are the "transactional" and "transformational" leadership types (Burns 1978). Multiple studies have shown that these two styles produce qualitatively different outcomes and results (Hoyt and Blascovich 2003; Laohavichien, Fredendall, and Cantrell 2009). Though many studies have been conducted on the outcomes of these leadership styles, there is a lack of research about which style people prefer in their leaders as well as which personality characteristics of these individuals predict these preferences. Theoretically, it is important to consider the characteristics of group members as meanings they attach to group interactions influence the functioning of the leaders. Bass and Avolio (1990) conducted a study on transformational leadership development and concluded that further exploration of the conditional nature of transformational leadership is needed. In particular, researchers suggest that garnering a better understanding of how transformational leadership translates across different demographic groups is necessary,

and future research needs to move beyond the transformational leader and attend more to the followers of transformational leadership (Bass and Avolio 1990).

College Leadership

Numerous studies on leadership have focused on student respondents due to the fact that students are an available and easily researched survey population that have had multiple experiences with leaders over the course of their lives. A 2001 study, conducted by Reed, examined student leaders and noted the connection between being a successful student leader and having post-academic success (Reed 2001).The leadership perceptions and preferences of college students can impact their handling of leadership roles as well as follower roles for the rest of their lives. Understanding students' leadership preferences based on their personality will help students understand what they desire in a leader, and also help those in leadership roles, such as professors, internship advisors, and career development staffs reach students in the most effective way possible. How leaders manage their image ultimately influences the perception of how trustworthy their followers believe them to be (Caldwell and Hayes 2007). Though younger individuals typically view leaders more trustworthy than older individuals, transformational and transactional leaders still manage their images differently and, within a sample of student respondents, it is important to further examine leadership style preferences.

Transformational Leadership

The two leadership styles examined in the current study are transformational and transactional leadership. Burns (1978) initially introduced the concept as transformational leadership as a concept that can be seen when "leaders and followers make each other to advance to a higher level of moral and motivation" (Burns, 1978, p. 20). This definition

has been developed throughout the years, particularly by Bass (1985) to characterize a leadership style that uses a range of mechanisms to enhance the motivation, morale, and performance of a leader's followers. Burns (1978) concluded that the strong moral dimension of transformational leadership, means it is an effective leadership style in times of instability and more enduring than transactional leadership (Burns 1978). Transformational leaders are often characterized as matter-of-fact. They typically have feminine attributes over masculine attributes, such as giving emotional and physical nourishment and care to their followers (Ross and Offerman 1997). Transformational leadership style, though associated with a decrease in quantitative performance, is found to be associated with an increase in qualitative performance, such as semantic divergence, as well as leadership satisfaction and group cohesiveness (Hoyt and Blascovich 2003). The style has also been shown to affect a group's potency (the collective belief that the group can be effective) over transactional leadership (Sosik, Bruce, and Kahai 1997).

Transactional Leadership

Transactional Leadership, originally described by sociologist Max Weber (1947), is also commonly referred to as managerial leadership. Bass (1985) further explored transactional leadership in the early 1980s and formatted the style's orientation around organization, supervision, and group performance. Bass (1985) hypothesized that followers are motivated through a system of rewards and punishment. Leaders approach followers with a focus on exchanging one thing for another, a quid pro quo or this-for-that relationship. If the follower does something good, they will receive a reward. However, if the follower does something wrong, they will be reprimanded or punished (Laohavichien, Fredendall, and Cantrell 2009). This is consistent with relational

leadership theory as participants in the group construct the meanings given to the expectations and costs and rewards (Stacey 2004; Reicher et al, 2005)

The basic assumptions of transactional leadership are that people perform their best when the chain of command is definite and clear, workers are motivated by rewards and punishments, obeying the instructions and commands of the leader are the primary goal of the followers, and subordinates need to be carefully monitored to ensure that expectations are met. Rules, procedures, and standards are essential in transactional leadership. Followers are not encouraged to be creative or to find new solutions to problems. Research has found that transactional leadership tends to be most effective in situations where problems are simple and clearly-defined. While transactional leadership can be effective in some situations, it is generally considered insufficient and may prevent both leaders and followers from achieving their full potential (Laohavichien, Frendenall, and Cantrell 2009).

Myers-Briggs Personality Dimensions

I used the Myers-Briggs scale as an independent variable to examine personality factors as predictors of preferred leadership styles. The Myers-Briggs Personality Inventory (MBTI®) was originally describe by Carl Jung (McGuire and Hall 1977) and is based on his ideas of psychological types. Jung hypothesized that variations in behaviors are actually consistent and orderly based on one's internal personality preferences. The MBTI identifies 16 personality types using four personality dimensions. Carl Jung, in an interview, did make it a point to clarify that:

> There is no such thing as a pure extravert or a pure introvert. Such a man would
> be in the lunatic asylum. They are only terms to designate a certain penchant, a

certain tendency...the tendency to be more influenced by environmental factors, or more influenced by the subjective factor, that's all (McGuire and Hall, 1977, p. 20)

The same can be said for the other dimensions of personality as well. Evidence shows that people generally fall between the two extremes of the personality dimensions, though they often lean towards one end or the other (Myers, McCaulley and Most 1985).

The first personality dimension that Myers-Briggs examines is the dimension of extraversion/introversion. This dimension asks the question: where does one get and put their energy as well as does one enjoy spending their time in the outside world or the inside world? Extraverts (E) types are social and get energy from events and activities with others. They are "people people" who get excited and energized when around other people and generally feel comfortable and enjoy working with groups and have a wide range of friends. Extroverts sometimes jump too quickly into an activity without thinking. Introverts, on the other hand, lose energy around others and need to spend time alone to recharge. They get their energy from working with ideas, memories, and reactions inside their head. Introverts prefer doing things alone or with a small number of people. Introverts sometimes spend too much time reflecting and do not move to action quick enough. Introversion should not be confused with reclusive behavior or shyness (Myers et al 1985). As the MBTI® Manual states, people generally fall between the two extremes. At some moments people may appear as introverts and at other as extroverts. However, people do generally lean toward one side of the dimension (McGuire and Hall 1977)

The second personality dimension in the Myers-Briggs scale is the dimension of

intuitive/sensing. This dimension asks the question: Does one pay more attention to information coming from their five senses or more attention to patterns and possibilities that one sees in the information they receive? Intuitive (N) types use their imagination and prefer looking at life through symbols and abstract theories to see the big picture, and then focus on the facts. They are interested in new and different ideas and would rather learn by thinking a problem through than by hands-on experience. Intuitive people enjoy thinking about what might be possible, however they sometimes think so much about new possibilities that they never look at how to make them a reality. Sensing (S) types, on the contrary, prefer to live in the moment and focus on small details and then form a big picture. They prefer to pay attention to physical reality- what is actual, present, current, and real. Sensing types like to see the practice use of things and focus on the bottom line. Sometimes sensing types pay so much attention to facts, either present or past, that they miss new possibilities. Sensing should not be confused with the idea of being sensual; as these two ideas are very different (Myers et al 1985). People generally fall between the two extremes. At some moments people may appear sensing, focused on small details, and at other times intuitive, focusing on the big picture. People do however generally lean toward one side of the dimension.

The third personality dimension that Myers-Briggs examines is the dimension of thinking/feeling. This dimension asks the question: Does one place more emphasis on objective principles and impersonal facts or on personal concerns and the people involved? Thinking (T) types make decisions based on logic that is impersonal so their own and others' wishes will not influence them. They like to analyze the pros and cons of situations to find the basic truth, regardless of the specific situation, and to be consistent

and logical with their decisions. Sometimes thinking personalities either miss or do not value the "people" part of a situation and can come off as too task-oriented, uncaring, or indifferent. Thinking is not a measure of intelligence. Both ends of the thinking/feeling dimensions have a range of IQs. Feeling (F) types, conversely, logically use their personal values and take other people's feelings into account when making decisions. They are concerned with values and what is best for everyone involved in a situation. Feeling types make it a point to do all they can to establish and maintain harmony and are nervous when harmony is absent. Sometimes feeling types miss seeing or communicating the "hard truth" of situations and can come off to others as too idealistic, mushy, or indirect. It is important to not confuse feeling with emotion. Everyone has emotions about the decisions they make. The feeling/thinking dimension only identified what people place emphasis on when making decisions. People at both ends of the spectrum can have and show emotion when making decisions (Myers et al 1985).

The last personality dimension in the Myers-Briggs scale is the dimension of judging/perceiving. This dimension describes how people like to live their outer life or their orientation to the outer world. That is, what behaviors do others tend to see? Does one exhibit a structured and decided lifestyle or a more flexible and adaptable lifestyle? Does one focus on making decisions or taking in information? Some people may feel that they focus on both and this can be true. The judging/perceiving dimension only tells which preference the person extraverts, or shows to the public. A person can feel very orderly or structured on the inside, yet publicly exhibit a spontaneous and adaptable lifestyle. Yet another person may feel very curious and open-ended in their inner world, yet exhibit a more structured or decided outer life. Perceiving (P) types are flexible and

spontaneous and generally take a "go with the flow" attitude to life. They like to understand and adapt to the world rather than organize it and tend to keep plans to a minimum. Sometimes perceiving types stay open to new information so long that they miss making decisions when it comes time. Judging (J) types, meanwhile, prefer closure and order in their day-to-day life. They strive to be focused, task oriented, organized and ultimately they feel most comfortable when decisions are made and they are in control. Sometimes judging personalities focus so much on the ultimately goal that they miss new information. Judging should not be confused with judgmental. Additionally one's leaning on the judging/perceiving dimension should not be correlated with their level of organization; either preference can be organized (Myers et al 1985). As with other characteristics, people generally fall between the two extremes. At some moments people may appear as feelers and at others as thinkers. However, people do generally lean toward one side of the dimension.

Gender and Leadership Preference

In *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus* Gray explains that men and women are different when it comes to their needs, desires, and behaviors (Gray 1992). It comes as no surprise that men and women differ when it comes to their leadership preferences as well. In a Romanian study conducted in 2010, Fein and his colleagues found that females display greater preference for transformational leadership relative to transactional leadership as compared to males. The results for male leadership preferences were inconclusive (Fein, Tziner, and Vasiliu 2010). Johnston (1986) surveyed teachers and found that males wanted a leader who defines and structures roles, while females wanted a leader who was supportive and showed understanding and

concern to their followers (Johnston 1986). The female preference for a supportive and concerned leader (Johnston 1986) correlates to transformational leadership. The studies support my first hypothesis: Women will be more likely to prefer transformational leadership when compared to transactional leadership (H1) and men, who prefer leaders who define and structure roles, would prefer transactional leadership (H2). The former statement has been empirically supported for Romanian managerial participants and there is no data supporting a potential difference between Romanian managers and female college students. It is reasonable to expect that the sex difference would be found across cultures.

The gender difference hypothesis aligns with gender roles where males are expected to be assertive, ambitious and competitive, and females are expected to be supportive and nurturing (Hofstede 1980). Characteristics described of the male gender role correspond with transactional leadership, while characteristics described of the female gender role correspond with transformational leadership (Hutchins-Eberhardt 2009). In order to further examine the relationship between gender of respondent and leadership preferences, I also examine the role of gender roles on preferences. Since the characteristics of transformational and transactional leadership correspond closely with gender role expectations, I expect the findings to be in the same direction as the gender of respondent findings. I hypothesize that those who are gender role liberal will prefer transformational leadership while those who are gender role conservative will prefer transactional leadership (H3).

Religiosity and Leadership Preferences

Previous studies have found that religiosity is an important predictor of leadership

styles of student leaders. Unlike traditional conservatives, students have been shown to maintain a relatively high level of quest-oriented, open-ended religiosity (Bird and Boyatt 2004). These findings support my hypothesis that respondents with high religiosity will be more likely to prefer transformational leadership compared to transactional leadership compared to students with lower levels of religiosity (H4). As the respondents in my study are college students, it is likely they will have the same orientation towards open-ended religiosity, leading to the same preference toward transformational leadership. Also, as explained by rational leadership theory, it is possible that students with higher levels of religiosity might have different social constructions of leadership than students with lower levels of religiosity.

Political Preference and Leadership Preference

A study by Michael Hout and Claude Fischer (2002) examined the relationship between religiosity and politics. The study found that the proportion of Americans who claimed to have low religiosity doubled from seven to 14 percent. The increase in low religiosity came from political moderates and liberals (Hout and Fischer 2002). From this comes the conclusion that lower religiosity is associated with political moderates and liberals, while higher religiosity is associated with conservatism. I hypothesize that respondents with high religiosity will be more likely to prefer transformational leadership compared to transactional leadership compared to students with lower levels of religiosity. High religiosity is associated with conservatives, and transformational preference is associated with high religiosity so I expect similar findings with level of conservatism as with religiosity: respondents with a higher level of conservatism will prefer transformational leadership compared to transactional leadership (H5).

Group Differences in Leadership Preference

Brown (2007) examined aspects, behaviors, and characteristics of transformational and transactional leadership among fraternity and sorority leaders. This research examined the relationship between the self-described leadership behaviors of the respondents and how such behaviors are perceived by their followers. Findings showed that fraternity and sorority presidents used transformational leadership styles and members of these groups depicted their presidents as leaders who display and use transformational leadership behaviors and characteristics (Brown 2007). Based on Brown's (2007) findings, I hypothesize that respondents involved in Greek life will prefer transformational leadership over transactional leaders (H6). I also expect that respondents who are considering joining a fraternity or sorority will prefer transformational leadership as well. These two groups may have very different constructions of leadership roles and abilities.

Researchers have focused on a number of group differences in leadership preferences and I examine a number of these in my research. Ivey and Kline (2010) examined leadership preference among the Canadian military which represents an older age group than college students. This study showed that as rank increased, the frequency of transformational leadership behaviors increased (Ivey and Kline 2010). I hypothesize that respondents who are involved in the Army or ROTC will prefer transformational leadership over transactional leadership (H7).

I also examine the influence of specific characteristics people want in a leader on their preferred leadership type. Five commonly researched characteristics are openess to new experience, conscieniousness, extroversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism

(OCEAN). Openness to new experiences relates to how effective leaders are in situations that are unstable or new (Burns 1978). A leader who lacks openness to new experiences is more comfortable with simple problems that are clearly defined (Laohavichien et al 2009). Conscientious individuals tend to have a strong sense of direction and work hard to achieve goals (Bono 2004) and conscientiousness has been shown to have a link to contingent reward (Bass 1985). Extroversion relates to how a leader gets excited and energized by others (Myers et al 1985). Agreeableness is associated with leaders that are often characterized by more feminine attributes, including giving emotional and physical nourishment and care to their followers (Ross and Offerman 1997). Neurotic individuals tend to view the world through a negative lens and are not likely to be seen as role models (Bono 2004). I hypothesize that respondents who rate neuroticism and conscientiousness as important to leadership will prefer transactional leadership to transformational leadership. Respondents who rate openness to new experience, extroversion, and agreeableness as important to leadership will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership (H8).

Transformational leadership has in the past been labeled as charismatic or inspirational. Strong communication skills are part of the charisma that is related to transformational leadership (Bryer and Gray 2006). Therefore I hypothesize that respondents who believe that strong communication skills are important for leadership will prefer transformational leadership over transactional leadership (H9).

There is a cliché that says opposites attract. However, this cliché has little empirical support as researchers have found in multiple studies that people tend to seek out others who think and act as they do (Emlen and Buston 2003; Klohnen and Luo 2005;

Alterovitz and Mendelsohn 2009). A 2003 study focusing on respondents ranking of the importance of certain traits in a romantic partner, ranked these traits to determine to what extent the respondent exhibited the trait. It was found that people generally wanted partners with traits that they saw in themselves (Emlen and Buston 2003). A 2005 study confirmed this finding and further examined the research finding that couples were happy and satisfied with partners who they had more in common with in terms of personality (Klohnen and Luo 2005). In addition, a 2009 study of online daters showed that although respondents claimed to want someone that was their opposite, in the hopes of being balanced out, they generally contacted people who had similar personalities to their own (Alterovitz and Mendelsohn 2009). I hypothesize that respondents who prefer transactional leadership will exhibit personality traits similar to transactional leaders and respondents who prefer transformational leadership will exhibit personality traits similar to transformational leaders. (H10). These groups will then have similar views toward and interpretations of leadership. Previous studies have associated transformational leadership with extroversion, intuitiveness, feeling, and perceiving (McCaulley 1990; Hautala 2006; Brown and Reilly 2009), therefore respondents who display similar personalities will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership.

I also examine three exploratory hypotheses with my research. No research has focused on the effect of taking a leadership class and leadership style preference or leadership position and leadership style preference. My eleventh hypothesis focuses on the examination of the relationship between respondents that have taken a leadership class and their leadership style preference for transformational or transactional leadership (H11). My twelfth hypothesis examines the relationship between experience in a

leadership position and leadership style preference for transformational or transactional leadership (H12).

I also examine the relationship between race and leadership preference. A South African study examined the differences in preferred managerial leadership behavior among racial groups. Blacks emphasized a group feeling of mutual support as well as interdependence, indicating that Blacks prefer transformational leadership. Whites showed an emphasis on independence and individual freedom, indicating a preference for transactional leadership (Littrell and Nkomo 2005). The findings from this study were not replicated in other studies. Therefore this is an exploratory hypothesis (Crain-Gully 2003; Turner 2006; Hall 2012) (H13).

Hypotheses

H1 - Women will be more likely to prefer transformational leadership when compared to transactional leadership

H2 - Males, who prefer leaders who define and structure roles, would prefer transactional leadership

 H3- Respondents who are gender role liberal will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership while gender role conservatives will prefer transactional leadership to transformational leadership.

H4- Respondents with high religiosity will be more likely to prefer transformational leadership compared to transactional leadership compared to students with lower levels of religiosity

H5- Respondents with a higher level of conservatism will prefer transformational

leadership compared to transactions leadership

H6- Respondents involved in Greek life will prefer transformational leadership over transactional leaders

H7- Respondents who are involved in the Army or ROTC will prefer transformational leadership over transactional leadership

H8- Respondents who rate neuroticism and conscientiousness as important to leadership will prefer transactional leadership to transformational leadership. Respondents who rate openness to new experience, extroversion and agreeableness as important to leadership will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership.

> **H8.1**- Respondents who believe openness to new experiences is important in a leader will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership

> **H8.2-** Respondents who believe agreeableness is important in a leader will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership

> **H8.3-** Respondents who believe extroversion is important in a leader will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership

> **H8.4-** Respondents who believe conscientiousness is important in a leader will prefer transactional leadership to transformational leadership

> **H8.5-** Respondents who believe neuroticism is important in a leader will prefer transactional leadership to transformational leadership

H9- Respondents who believe that strong communication skills are important for

leadership will prefer transformational leadership over transactional leadership

H9.1 - Respondents who believe that effective communication is important for leadership will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership

H9.2 - Respondents who believe that clear communication is important for leadership will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership

H9.3- Respondents who believe strong public speaking skills are important for leadership will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership

H10- Respondents who prefer transactional leadership will exhibit personality traits similar to transactional leaders and respondents who prefer transformational leadership will exhibit personality traits similar to transformational leaders.

H10.1- Extrovert leaders prefer transformational leadership. It can be hypothesized that extroverted followers will also prefer transformational leadership

H10.2- Intuitive personalities will be more likely to prefer transformational leadership compared to sensing personalities

H10.3- Feeling personalities will be more likely to prefer transformational leadership compared to thinking personalities

H10.4- Perceiving personalities will be more likely to prefer transformational leadership as compared to judging personalities

H11- Exploratory- Relationship between respondents that have taken a leadership class and their leadership style preference for transformational or transactional leadership

H12- Exploratory- Relationship between experience in a leadership position and leadership style preference for transformational or transactional leadership

H13- Exploratory- Relationship between race and leadership preference

Chapter 2

Methods

Sample

The data for the study were collected through a survey given to students at a large Northeastern University during the fall of 2012. Students enrolled in three classes were invited to participate in this study and received extra credit for doing so. The sample consisted of a non-probability convenience sample. The 30-minute survey, approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University, was distributed to the respondents online. Participants were informed that the results would be used for projects in a capstone sociology course as well as potentially published papers. A consent form was included in the first page of the survey and respondents were assured that the information provided would be confidential. The respondent's completion and return of the survey indicated their consent. In the introductory course, 90 percent of the students participated. In the upper division classes, the participation rate for one class was 83 percent and 36 percent for the other class. Four hundred three students responded to the survey.

Description of the Sample

The self-administered questionnaire included demographic information. Question items measured individuals' personality types and their preferred leadership type. Of the 403 respondents in the data set, 54 percent were female and 46 percent were male. In terms of race, the sample was 66.3 percent Caucasian/white, 10.2 percent African American/black, 12 percent Asian, 7 percent Latino, .5 percent Native American, and 4

percent of another race. Respondents had spent an average of 3 years in college with an average GPA between 2.51 and 3. 7. One percent identified as very liberal, 23.6 percent moderately liberal, 17.6 percent moderate, 24.1 percent moderately conservative, 5.2 percent very conservative and 20.5 percent did not have a political affiliation. Additionally, 3.9 percent identified their socioeconomic class as lower, 86 percent identified as middle, and 10.1 percent identified as upper. Of the participants, 17 percent currently belong to a fraternity or sorority, 5 percent plan to belong to a fraternity or sorority and 78 percent do not and do not plan to belong to a fraternity or sorority. The average age of the respondents was 20. Sixteen percent of respondents rated religion as not at all important, 20 percent rated religion not very important, 35 percent rated it as somewhat important, and 29 percent rated it as very important. A majority of respondents (84.5 percent) have not participated in, nor thought about participating in any type of Army/ROTC experience. 4.7 percent have participated while 10.7 percent thought about participating. About 73.5 percent of respondents previously held a leadership position while 26.5 percent of respondents have not. 40.3 percent of respondents have participated in a workshop in leadership while 59.7 percent have not.

Respondents were also asked to rate the importance of different characteristics on leadership. When it comes to openness to new experiences 1 percent of respondents believe it is somewhat important, 26 percent believe it is not very important, and 73 percent believe it is not at all important. Examining extroversion, 1percent believe it is very important, 6 percent believe it is somewhat important, 51 percent believe it is not very important, and 42 percent believe it is not at all important. In regards to agreeableness, 1 percent respondents believe it is very important, 6 percent believe it is

somewhat important, 35 percent believe it is not very important, and 58 percent believe it is not at all important. When asked about the importance of conscientiousness in a leader 5 percent of respondents believed it somewhat important, 36 percent not very important and 59 percent not at all important. Respondents were also asked how important they believe neuroticism is to leadership, 19 percent responded very important, 40 percent somewhat important, 30 percent not very important, and 11percent not at all important.

Questions also focused on communication and leadership, including effective communication, clear communication, and strong public speaking skills. One percent of respondents believe effective communication is very important to leadership, 2 percent somewhat important to leadership, 7 percent not very important to leadership, and 90 percent not at all important to leadership. One percent also believed that clear communication was very important to leadership, 1 percent somewhat important to leadership, 8percent not very important to leadership, 91percent not at all important to leadership. In regards to public speaking 1 percent believe it is very important to leadership, 3 percent believe it is somewhat important to leadership, 35 percent believe it is not very important to leadership and 61 percent believe it is not at all important to leadership.

Additional questions focused on gender roles. Twenty-two percent of respondents strongly disagree that it is better if a man works while the woman cares for the family, 30 percent disagree, 30 percent were neutral, 16 percent agree, and 2 percent strongly agree. Eighteen percent of respondents strongly disagree that a man who cries is not masculine, 38 percent disagree, 23 percent were neutral, 19 percent agree, and 2 percent strongly agree. Ten percent strongly disagree that female bosses are harder to work with than male

bosses, 23 percent disagree, 41 percent were neutral, 22 percent agree, and 4 percent strongly agree. Eleven percent of respondents strongly disagree that it is okay for women to cry in public but not okay for men to cry in public, 33 percent disagree, 30 percent were neutral, 24 percent agree, and 2 percent strongly agree. Thirteen percent strongly disagree that people should be more polite to women than men, 30 percent disagree, 21 percent were neutral, 29 percent agree, and 7 percent strongly agree.

Independent Variables

Independent variables for this study include sex (0= female, 1=male), race, political affiliation, involvement in Greek life, religiosity, army/ROTC experience, previous leadership experiences/workshops, personal views on leadership and personality preferences along the dimensions of introversion/extroversion, intuitive/sensing, thinking/feeling, and judging/perceiving (Myers et al 1985). Respondents were asked about their race, with answer options of Black, White, Asian, Latino, Native American, or other. Responses were coded into white (0) and non-white (1). The question measuring political affiliation gave respondents the option of very conservative (1), moderately conservative (2), moderate, independent or don't know (3), moderately liberal (4), very liberal (5). Respondents were also asked about their involvement with Greek life with response options including involved or thinking about joining (1) and not involved (0). The question measuring the importance of religiosity to the respondent used a Likert scale where greater religiosity corresponded with higher scores on the scale (1-not at all important, 2-not very important, 3-somewhat important and 4-very important). The question on Army/ROTC participation was structured similarly to the question about involvement with Greek life where response options including involved or thought about

(1) and not involved (0). When asked about previous leadership experience and workshops in leadership, respondents had the option to respond yes (1) or no (0) and then were asked to explain their response if it was yes. Seventy-two percent of respondents had held a leadership position (1) while 28 percent had not held a leadership position (0). Forty percent of respondents had taken a leadership class (1) while 60 percent had not taken a leadership class (0).

Respondents were also asked their views on how important different characteristics were to leadership. There characteristics were openness to new experiences, extroversion, conscientiousness, neurotic, effective communication, clear communication, and public speaking. Response options were very (4), somewhat (3), not very (2), and not at all (1).

Another issue being examined in this research is the independent variable of gender roles. Seven gender role items were added and then divided by seven to form a gender roles scale. These items include: it is better if a man works while the woman cares for the children, a man who cries is not masculine, female bosses are harder to work with than male bosses, it is okay for women to cry in public but not okay for men to cry in public, and people should be more polite to women than men. The scale is an additive scale divided by the seven items in the scale. Some items were re-coded so a higher number on the scale means that the respondent is gender role liberal. The Cronbach's Alpha for the scale is .695.

Personality preferences were examined with the dimensions of introversion/extroversion, intuitive/sensing, thinking/feeling, and judging/perceiving. There were three questions relating to the introversion/extroversion dimension, the

perceiving/judging dimension, and the feeling/thinking dimension. There were two questions related to the sensing/intuitive dimension. Each of the eleven questions presented participants with two answer options at each end of the dimension being examined. Participants were asked to select which phrase they believed was more in line with their personality. Participant's preference for introversion was coded as 0 with extroversion preference coded as 1. Intuitive tendencies were coded as 1 with sensing tendencies coded as 0. Inclination toward the feeling type was coded as 1 with thinking coded as 0. Perceiving partiality was coded as 1 with judging coded as 0. Respondent's responses were added together to form a scale ranging from 3-6 for introversion/extroversion, thinking/feeling, and judging/perceiving and 1-3 for intuitive/sensing. The frequencies of these personality types are presented below.

Table 1: Frequency table presenting respondents' introversion/extroversion personality preferences

Highly introvert	129 (32%)
Somewhat introvert	164 (42%)
Somewhat extrovert	83 (21%)
Highly extrovert	18 (5%)

Table 2: Frequency table presenting respondent's judging/perceiving personality preferences

Highly judging	85 (22%)
Somewhat judging	158 (40%)
Somewhat perceiving	119 (30%)
Highly perceiving	33 (8%)

Table 3: Frequency table presenting respondents' intuitive/sensing personality preferences

Highly judging	237 (60%)
Mid-spectrum	137 (35%)
Highly perceiving	21 (5%)

Table 4: Frequency table presenting respondent's thinking/feeling personality preferences

Highly thinking	111 (28%)
Somewhat thinking	171 (43%)
Somewhat feeling	86 (22%)
Highly feeling	27 (7%)

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables in this study focused on leadership style preferences. Respondents were given eleven phrases and asked to check one of six spaces representing where their preference fell between the two phrases, which represented transactional and transformational leadership. Each phrase was categorized as "always" (1), "mostly" (2), "sometimes" (3), "sometimes" (4), "mostly" (5), "always" (6). One (1) corresponded with an inclination towards transactional leadership and six (6) with an inclination towards transformational leadership. I included eight phrases in the scale to achieve a Cronbach's Alpha of .678. These eight items were added together and divided by 8 to form a scale measuring the preference for each type of leadership. Higher scale scores corresponded to greater preferences towards transformational leadership versus transactional leadership. Possible scores ranged from eight to forty-eight. The scores were then divided by 8 to range from 1 to 6, with 1 representing highly transactional and

6 representing highly transformational. Scores of 1 to 2.25 were classified as a strong

preference toward transactional leadership. Scores of 2.25 to 3.5 were classified as a

slight preference toward transactional leadership. Scores of 3.5 to 4.75 indicated a slight

preference toward transformational leadership. Scores of 4.75 to 6 indicated a strong

preference toward transformational leadership. The mean was 2.47.

Table 5: Frequency table presenting respondent's leadership preferences

Strongly Transactional	167 (41%)
Slightly Transactional	198 (49%)
Slightly Transformational	20 (5%)
Strongly Transformational	4 (1%)

Analysis Methods

Data were analyzed with SPSS. Basic frequencies and frequencies with controls

were used to describe and understand the sample. Linear regression models were used to

explore the relationships between variables examined in the study. Linear regression is

used to simultaneously control for multiple independent and control variables when the

dependent variable is ordinal, interval, or ratio. Since my research involves controlling

for a number of independent variables to test the relationship to the dependent variables,

linear regression is an appropriate technique.

Chapter 3

Findings

Linear regression was used to examine the predictors of leadership preference. These findings are presented in Table 6. The results from Model 1 showed that the independent variable of sex of respondent had a significant relationship with leadership preference. Females were significantly more likely than men to prefer transformational leadership over transactional leadership ($p < .01$), confirming my hypothesis about female leadership preference. Males as compared to females were significantly more likely to prefer transactional leadership over transformational leadership ($p<.01$), confirming my hypothesis about male leadership preference.

Model 2 in Table 6 includes the control variables of sex and race as well as additional independent variables of religiosity, political affiliation, Greek life, and ROTC. Even with the control variables introduced in Model 2, sex remained significantly related to leadership preference ($p<.01$). None of the additional independent variables were significantly related to leadership preference. These results did not support my hypotheses about the effects of religiosity, political affiliation, Greek Life, and ROTC membership on type of leadership preferred.

I also explored the relationship between race and leadership preference in Table 6. The independent variable, race, was not statistically significantly related to leadership preference, which did not support my hypothesis.

Table 6: Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficients for Regression of Independent

Variables on Leadership Preference

	Model 1	Model 2
Sex	.179**	.165*
	(.025)	(.047)
Race	-.003	.042
	(.972)	(.659)
Religiosity		-.054
		(.193)
Political Affiliation		-.037
		(.413)
GREEK		.045
		(.641)
ROTC		.011
		(.923)
Constant	2.387	2.632
R^2	.014	.021

Note: Unstandardized coefficients appear in parentheses below standardized

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

Table 7 presents the findings for the examination of the relationship between the

gender role scale and leadership preference. Model 1 included only the effect of sex of

respondent and Model 2 included the control variable sex as well as the additional

independent variable of the gender role scale. When sex of respondent is included as a control variable (Model 2), the gender role scale is not statistically significantly related to leadership preference and sex of respondents no longer reaches statistical significance. To further explore this relationship, I analyzed the influence of gender role views on leadership preference without the sex of respondent control (Table 7a). The gender role scale is significantly related (p<.05) to leadership preference. I then ran a crosstab (not shown) to further examine these relationships. Nontraditional people were more likely to prefer transformational leadership than traditional people and women were more likely to want transformational leaders than men. Since sex of respondent and attitudes toward gender role issues are highly related it is possible that they are, to some extent, measuring the same issue. Overall, this analysis lends empirical support to the hypothesis that respondents who are gender role liberal will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership.

Table 7: Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficients for Regression of Gender Scale on Leadership Preference

	Model 1	Model 2
Sex	.154**	.113
	(.044)	(.168)
Gender		.084
Scale		(.195)
Constant	2.400	2.193
R^2	.010	.015

Note: Unstandardized coefficients appear in parentheses below standardized coefficient. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 7a: Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficients for Regression of Gender

Scale on Leadership Preference

	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	Significance
Constant	2.156		.000
Gender Roles	.118	.099	.050

I also examined the relationship between specific characteristics people want to

see in a leader and leadership preference [shown in Table 8]. The specific characteristics

examined were openess to new experience, conscieniousness, extroversion,

agreeableness, and neuroticism. I hypothesized that respondents who rate neuroticism and

conscientiousness as important to leadership would prefer transactional leadership to

transformational leadership while respondents who rated openness to new experience,

extroversion and agreeableness as important to leadership would prefer transformational

leadership to transactional leadership. Model 1 included only the effect of sex of

respondent and Model 2 included the control variable sex as well as the additional

independent variables of openness to new experiences, conscientiousness, extroversion,

agreeableness, and neuroticism. Sex was the only control variable included in these

analyses because it was the only variable that had a significant effect on leadership

preference. Openness to new experiences was significantly related to leadership

preference, which supported my hypothesis. The greater the preference for a leader that

was open to new experiences, the greater the preference for transformational leadership.

The influence of agreeableness on leadership preference is nearly statistically significant

(p<.1). This lends some support to my hypothesis, the greater the preference for a leader

that was agreeable, the greater the preference for transformational leadership.

Extroversion was not significantly related to leadership preference, which did not support

my hypothesis that the greater the preference for an extroverted leader, the greater the

preference for transformational leadership. The influence of conscientiousness indicated

that conscientiousness was not significantly related to leadership preference. This finding

did not support the hypothesis that the greater the preference for a conscious leader, the

greater the preference for transactional leadership. The influence of neuroticism on

leadership preference showed that neuroticism was significantly related to leadership

preference, which contradicted the hypothesis that the greater the preference for a

neurotic leader, the greater the preference for transactional leadership.

Table 8: Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficients for Regression of

Openness to new experience, Conscientiousness, Extroversion, Agreeableness,

Neuroticism Personality on Leadership Preference

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Sex	.147**	.103	.141*	.153*	.146*	.184*
	(.055)	(.194)	(.068)	(.049)	(.058)	(.017)
Openness to New Experience		.174*				
		(.039)				
Agreeableness			.110*			
			(.076)			
Extroversion				.022		
				(.726)		
Conscientiousness					.073	
					(.259)	
Neurotic						.087*
						(.044)
Constant	2.405	2.202	2.246	2.365	2.397	2.143
R2	.010	.020	.019	.011	.014	.022

Note: Unstandardized coefficients appear in parentheses below standardized

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

Table 9 presents the findings for the examination of the relationship between preference toward strong communication skills and leadership preference. Findings showed that the ability to communicate effectively was not significantly related to leadership preference, which contradicted my hypothesis that the greater the importance of effective communication is to a leader, the greater the preference for transformational leadership. Additionally, the ability to express ideas and communicate clearly was not significantly related to leadership preference, which also contradicted my hypothesis that the greater the importance of expressing ideas and communicating clearly is to a leader the greater the preference for transformational leadership. Strong public speaking skills was significantly related to leadership preference, which supported the hypothesis that the greater the importance of public speaking skills to a leader, the greater the preference for transformational leadership.

Table 9: Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficients for Regression of Communication on Leadership Preference

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Sex	0.15**	0.144*	0.145*	0.139*
	(-.047)	(-0.062)	(-0.059)	(-0.069)
Effective Communication		0.076		
		0.076		
Express clearly			0.096	
			(-0.339)	
Public Speaking				0.168*
				(-0.012)
Constant	2.4	2.32	2.297	2.172
R2	0.01	0.012	0.013	0.026

Note: Unstandardized coefficients appear in parentheses below standardized coefficient. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

I next examined the relationship between respondents' personality traits on the Myer's-Briggs scale and their leadership preference which is presented in Table 10. I hypothesized that respondents who prefer transactional leadership would exhibit personality traits similar to transactional leaders and respondents who prefer transformational leadership would exhibit personality traits similar to transformational leaders. Model 1 indicated that the independent variable sex had a significant relationship with leadership preference. Model 2 included the control variable sex as well as additional independent variables, introducing personality preferences, one of which was significantly related to leadership preference.

Introversion/extroversion was nearly significant at the .06 level, which supported the hypothesis that those who are more extroverted than introverted would prefer transformational leadership. Sensing/intuitive, feeling/thinking, and perceiving/judging did not have statistically significant relationships with leadership preference, which did not support hypotheses about the effects of these variables on the type of leadership preferred.

Table 10: Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficients for Regression of Myers-

Briggs Personality Preferences on Leadership Preference

	Model 1	Model 2
Sex	.147**	.201*
	(.057)	(0.13)
Intuitive/Sensing		-.021
		(.752)
Thinking/Feeling		.068
		(.145)
Introversion/Extroversion		-.089*
		(.062)
Perceiving/Judging		-.029
		(.517)
Constant	2.401	2.627
R2	.009	.027

Note: Unstandardized coefficients appear in parentheses below standardized

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

Finally, I explored the relationship between taking a leadership class and

leadership preference and holding a leadership position and leadership preference in

Table 11. Model 2 included control variables as well as additional independent variables,

introducing leadership experience including holding a leadership position and taking a

leadership class, neither of which were significantly related to leadership preference. This

finding showed no support for the hypotheses focusing on the effect of leadership

experiences on leadership preference.

Table 11: Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficients for Regression of

Leadership Experience on Leadership Preference

	Model 1	Model 2
Sex	.148**	.149*
	(.067)	(.063)
Race	.039	.059
	(.658)	(.510)
Leadership Class		-.176
		(.037)
Leadership Position		.147
		(.111)
Constant	2.395	2.349
R2	.010	.025

Note: Unstandardized coefficients appear in parentheses below standardized

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

Chapter 4

Discussion/Conclusion

The purpose of my research was to examine preferred leadership styles and predictors of these preferences in a convenience sample of college students at one University. Though transactional and transformational leadership styles have received considerable empirical attention, there is a lack of research about leadership preferences and their predictors. My study follows up on the point made by Bass and Avolio (1990) who argued that further exploration of the conditional nature of transformational leadership is needed, specifically examining it through the lenses of different demographic of groups and followers. The current research examined transformational and transactional leadership through the lens of a college student and focused on the follower's perspective. My study was informed by the research of Berger and Luckmann (1966) who state that leaders do not construct a group by themselves. Rather, it is the interaction between the leader and the group members and the meaning that is attributed to the group via interaction that informs the functioning of the group. Thus, it is important to examine the characteristics of the group members as well as their leadership preferences to fully inform the study of the leadership process. Additionally, predictors of leadership preferences were identified. Findings from this survey show that certain variables are more likely to predict leadership preference than others.

Gender and Leadership Preference

The first hypothesis I examined was based on the expectation that women compared to men would be more likely to prefer transformational leadership compared to

transactional leadership. This hypothesis was supported. These findings were consistent with the findings from a study conducted in 2010 in Romania (Fein et al 2010) which found female participants displaying greater preferences for transformational leadership relative to transactional leadership (Fein, Tziner, and Vasiliu 2010). Though this study focused on Romanian managerial participants and my study examined female college students, these findings show that female preferences transcend cultures, age and positions. The findings were also consistent with a 1986 study that found females wanted a leader who was supportive and showed understanding and concern to their followers, which describe transformational leadership (Johnston 1986).

The Romanian study had inconclusive results regarding male leadership preferences. Johnston's (1986) study that surveyed teachers however found that males wanted a leader who defines and structures roles, consistent with transactional leadership. The results found in my study confirmed this, showing a statistically significant male preference towards transactional leadership over transformational leadership. This finding for male leadership preference transcends age and positions and is confirmed in both a teacher and student population.

In another significant finding, females preferred transformational leadership at a higher rate than males. Females are more communicative and therefore may be more responsive to transformational leadership which creates stronger communication compared to transactional leadership. Males are conditioned to control their emotions, and therefore may be less responsive to a leadership style as emotionally focused as transformational leadership. Additionally, the most highly regarded leadership traits

generally emerge in the feminine dimension and are more transformational in nature (Hutchins-Eberhardt 2009).

My hypotheses examining the effect of gender role expectations where males are expected to be assertive, ambitious and competitive, and females are expected to be supportive and nurturing (Hofstede 1980) was supported. Characteristics associated with men correspond with transactional leadership, while characteristics describing women correspond with transformational leadership. In an effort to further examine the relationship between gender of respondent and leadership preferences, I also examined the role of gender roles on preferences. I hypothesized that those who are gender role liberal will prefer transformational leadership while those who are gender role conservative will prefer transactional leadership. I found the gender role scale to be significantly related to leadership preference. Nontraditional people were more likely to prefer transformational leadership than traditional people. It is important to note that since sex of respondent and attitudes toward gender role issues are highly related it is possible that they are, to some extent, measuring the same issue. Overall, this analysis lends empirical support to the hypothesis that respondents who are gender role liberal will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership.

Religiosity and Leadership Preferences

I also hypothesized that respondents with high religiosity would be more likely to prefer transformational leadership compared those with lower levels of religiosity. This hypothesis was based on previous research of religious college students which found that students generally maintain a relatively high level of quest-oriented, open-ended

religiosity (Bird and Boyatt 2004), synonymous with transformational leadership. I

expected since respondents of my study were college students as well, those with higher

religiosity would also maintain a preference towards transformational leadership.

However, level of religiosity was not found to have a statistically significant relationship

with leadership preference. One's preference for a certain type of religious leader may

not necessarily be synonymous with one's general leadership style preference or that

college student's religiosity is not as firmly established as might be found in an adult

sample. Students may be more focused on educational issues at this time of their lives as

compared to religious issues.

Political Preference and Leadership Preference

I expected that respondents with higher levels of conservatism would be more

likely to prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership. This hypothesis

was based on previous research of Americans which found that lower religiosity is

associated with political moderates and liberals while higher religiosity is associated with

conservatism (Hout and Fischer 2002). I hypothesized that respondents with high

religiosity will be more likely to prefer transformational leadership compared to students

with lower levels of religiosity. High religiosity is associated in conservatives, and

transformational preference is associated with high religiosity therefore I hypothesized

that respondents with a higher level of conservatism will prefer transformational

leadership compared to transactions leadership. As the study was done of the American

population, I believed the results would translate to the college population. However,

political preference was not found to have a statistically significant relationship with

leadership preference. Political preference is not necessarily correlated to one's level of

religiosity, which is the assumption the hypothesis was based on. Similar to religiosity, student's level of conservatism might also be a change in progress, versus the stability of an adult sample. This is why the adult sample was more predictive than this sample.

Group Differences in Leadership Preference

Respondents involved in Greek life were hypothesized to prefer transformational leadership over transactional leadership. This hypothesis was based on previous research by Brown (2007) that examined the aspects, behaviors, and characteristics of transformational and transactional leadership among fraternity and sorority leaders. The study found that fraternity and sorority presidents used transformational leadership styles and members of these groups depicted their presidents as leaders who display and use transformational leadership behaviors and characteristics (Brown 2007). Based on Brown's (2007) findings, I hypothesize that respondents involved in Greek life will prefer transformational leadership over transactional leaders. Contrary to this hypothesis, involvement in Greek life was not found to have a statistically significant relationship with leadership preference. Greek cultures are different at each University and the culture of the University where this study was conducted was not as strongly transformational as that of Brown's (2007) study.

My next hypothesis examined the relationship between Army/ROTC involvement and leadership preference. Ivey and Kline (2010) conducted a study that examined leadership preference among the Canadian military and found that as rank increased, the frequency of transformational leadership behaviors increased (Ivey and Kline 2010). This finding lead to my hypothesis that respondents who are involved in the Army or ROTC will prefer transformational leadership over transactional leadership because they

have an expereince in a highly structured environment as compared to students not involved in any facet of the military. My findings did not show a statistically significant relationship between Army/ROTC involvement and leadership preference. The study was conducted among the Canadian military, a group different from my population in both age and culture, leading to inconsistencies. Additionally, the students in this sample were not in the military (full-time) which would be a factor to include in future research.

OCEAN Personality in Leadership Preference

I examined the influence of specific characteristics people want in a leader on their preferred leadership type. Five commonly researched characteristics are openess to new experience, conscieniousness, extroversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. Openness to new experiences relates to how effective leaders are in situations that are unstable or new (Burns 1978). A leader who lacks openness to new experiences is more comfortable with simple problems that are clearly defined as compared to a leader not open to new experiences (Laohavichien et al 2009). These findings lead to the hypothesis that respondents who rate openness to new experience important to leadership would prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership. My findings showed that openness to new experiences was significantly related to leadership preference, which supported my hypothesis. The greater the preference for a leader that was open to new experiences, the greater the preference for transformational leadership.

Respondents who rate conscientiousness as important to leadership were hypothesized to prefer transactional leadership to transformational leadership. This hypothesis was based on previous research which found that conscientious individuals tend to have a strong sense of direction and work hard to achieve goals (Bono 2004) and

conscientiousness has been shown to have a link to contingent reward (Bass 1985), all indicative of a preference for transactional leadership. However, findings showed that consciousness was not significantly related to leadership preference. This finding did not support the hypothesis that the greater the preference for a conscious leader, the greater the preference for transactional leadership. Though conscientiousness is linked with contingent reward (associated with transactional leadership), it is defined as done according to one's inner sense of what is right, which is a philosophy that is associated with transformational leadership. Additionally, just because someone likes a contingent reward, getting one thing for another, does not mean that they still do not want to be inspired through transformational leadership, explaining why conscientiousness did not show a relationship with either leadership preference.

Extroversion, which relates to how a leader gets excited and energized by others (Myers et al 1985), was hypothesized to relate to transformational leadership. The greater one believes extroversion is important to leadership the greater ones preference for transformational leadership. However, extroversion was not significantly related to leadership preference, which did not support my hypothesis. This may be due to the fact that college students expect their leaders to be extroverts. In a college environment, people chosen for leadership positions are likely to be the high energy type as that is more appealing to people making the section. These individuals might be seen as get it done types as compared to more introverted folks. Therefore, respondents may associate both types of leadership with extroversion.

The greater one believes agreeableness is important to leadership the greater one's preference for transformational leadership over transactional leadership was another

hypothesis I examined. This hypothesis was based on the finding that agreeableness is associated with leaders that are often characterized by more feminine attributes, including giving emotional and physical nourishment and care to their followers (Ross and Offerman 1997), indicative of transformational leadership. The influence of agreeableness on leadership preference was statistically significant, which supported this hypothesis.

Neurotic individuals tend to view the world through a negative lens and are not likely to be seen as role models (Bono 2004), the opposite of transformational leadership. This finding was the basis of the hypothesis that the more important on believes neuroticism is to leadership the more one will prefer transactional to transformational leadership. My findings showed that neuroticism was significantly related to leadership preference, but not in the way I predicted. I found the more important one believed neuroticism to be to leadership, the more one preferred transformational leadership to transactional leadership. Neuroticism is associated with fixed obsession or engrossment. Students may believe these qualities important in a leader because they are synonymous with someone who is detail oriented, which students may want to see in a leader. Even if students want their leader to be inspiring, they also want their leader to be organized.

Communication in Leadership Preference

Respondents who believe strong communication skills are important for leadership were hypothesized to prefer transformational leadership over transactional leadership. The specific strong communication skills I examined were effective communication, clear communication, and strong public speaking skills. This hypothesis was based on the finding that transformational leadership has been labeled as charismatic

or inspirational and strong communication skills are part of the charisma that is related to transformational leadership (Bryer and Gray 2006). My findings were mixed. The ability to communicate effectively was not significantly related to leadership preference, which contradicted my hypothesis that the greater the importance of effective communication is to a leader, the greater the preference for transformational leadership. Additionally, the ability to express ideas and communicate clearly was not significantly related to leadership preference, which also contradicted my hypothesis that the greater the importance of expressing ideas and communicating clearly is to a leader the greater the preference for transformational leadership. Strong public speaking skills was significantly related to leadership preference, which supported the hypothesis that the greater the importance of public speaking skills to a leader, the greater the preference for transformational leadership. Students probably believe that the abilities to communicate effectively and express ideas clearly are important to both types of leadership, which is why they do not show a correlation with a particular type. Public speaking skills are not as essential to transactional leadership, because students are already enticed with the incentives associated with transactional leadership. Transformational leadership, not providing the same incentives, needs public speaking to motivate followers to action, therefore causing students to believe it more essential to transformational leadership.

Myers-Briggs Personality in Leadership Preference

I expected extroverts would be more likely to prefer transformational leadership as compared to introverts. This hypothesis was constructed based on the fact that transformational leaders have been founded to be extroverted Hautala (2006) found that people want team members with similar traits to themselves (Emlen and Buston 2003).

This hypothesis was empirically supported, indicating that the greater extroversion in one's personality, the greater the preference for transformational leadership. These findings are consistent with previous findings.

Intuitive personalities would be more likely to prefer transformational leadership compared to sensing personalities was another one of my hypotheses. Multiple studies have shown that qualities associated with transformational leadership have been connected with intuitive preferences (McCaulley 1990). However the relationship between the two variables was not statistically significant. Although qualities associated with transformational leadership have been connected with intuitive preferences, qualities were not examined in regards to transactional leadership, so intuitive preferences could be connected with both transformational and transactional leadership.

I analyzed the relationship between feeling and thinking personalities and leadership preference based on the hypothesis that feeling personalities would be more likely to prefer transformational leadership than thinking personalities. Based on previous research where multiple qualities associated with transformational leadership had been connected with feeling preferences (McCaulley 1990), the hypothesis was supported in the direction I expected although the relationship did not reach statistically significant levels.

The last hypothesis I examined in this research predicted that perceiving personalities would be more likely to prefer transformational leadership compared to judging personalities. Multiple studies have shown that qualities associated with transformational leadership have been connected with perceiving preferences (McCaulley 1990). From these studies I developed the hypothesis that perceiving personalities would

show the same preference. However, the relationship between the two variables was not statistically significant. People do not necessarily fall on one end of the personality spectrum; they tend to lean towards judging or perceiving. Therefore, as people may shift between different personality preferences from time to time the personality preferences cannot clearly correlate with different leadership types.

Exploratory Hypotheses

I examined three exploratory hypotheses in my research. No research has focused on the effect of taking a leadership class and leadership style preference or leadership position and leadership style preference. Through my research I found no relationship between leadership experience and leadership preference. Regardless of whether a respondent held a previous leadership position or had participated in a leadership class, neither predicted respondent's leadership preference. Leadership could be based in key personality traits, therefore regardless of taking a leadership class or holding a leadership position, respondents have key preferences for leadership based on their personality that are established before the influence of leadership class or position. Another explanation could be that people with specific leadership personalities are more likely to take leadership classes and hold leadership positions. The direction of this relationship warrants further examination in future studies.

The third exploratory hypothesis I examined was the relationship between race and leadership preference. Throughout my research I found inconsistent findings about the relationship between race and leadership preference, which lead to the hypothesis being exploratory. However, race did not have a statistically significant relationship with leadership preference. The previous studies I examined, such as Littrell and Nkomo

(2005), focused on populations in specific countries, such as South Africa and those findings are not broadly applicable.

A number of relationships examined in this study were found to be statistically significant. However, as this sample was of college students, findings should only be generalized to that population. Males were found to prefer transactional leadership while females were found to prefer transformational leadership. Those interacting with college students could benefit from tailoring their behavior, ranging from professors to student leaders to recruiting companies. When interacting with males the focus should be on the give and take while when interacting with females the focus should be on encouraging them to be better and do better. When companies are interacting with potential male college hires they should emphasize what they will give the hire in exchange for his work, while with potential female hires they should focus on how their companies encourage and engage employees. This demonstrates that men and women interpret situations different and have different views of reality in leadership situations. Additional research must be conducted to determine implications for other populations, including religiosity, political affiliation, Greek Life, ROTC membership, race, extroversion, conscientiousness, ability to express ideas and communicate clearly, sensing/intuitive, feeling/thinking, and perceiving/judging, taking a leadership class and holding a leadership position.

This study had several methodological issues. First, it was conducted at one campus which limits its applicability. Additionally it was a convenience sample, which leads question to its representativeness. There were also a limited number of questions on the survey, which scaled down the OCEAN and Myers-Briggs scales. More questions

could have led to the development of more reliable scales. Additionally, there were also some measurement issues on certain questions. The sample was also a convenience sample, which leads to questions about its representativeness.

Additionally there should be an increased scale for personality preferences with more items for each of the four dimensions. Results should be examined based on the 16 Myers-Briggs types, not just the four dimensions I examined in my research, as results may be more conclusive since there were statistically significant links between different personality preferences in my research. Future studies could use a cross-sectional design to examine different groups, in addition to college students. They could also use a panel which would enable the examination of the stability of leadership preference over time. The findings for college students may not be as clear because of the transitional phase that they are at in their lives.

Overall, the findings suggested that there are differences between both sex and some aspects of personality in relation to leadership preference. The findings of this study, as well as the limitations, have created more opportunities for research into transactional/transformational leadership preferences and their predictors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alterovitz, Sheyna Sears-Roberts and Gerald A. Mendelsohn. 2009. "Partner preferences across the life span: Online dating by older adults."*Psychology and Aging* 24:513-517.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. 1990. *Transformational Leadership Development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Bass, B.M.1985. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Berger P and Luckmann T (1966) The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Penguin.

Bird, Jamie V; Chang-Ho C Ji, and Ed Boyatt, 2004. "Christian Leadership and Religiosity Reexamined: The Evidence from College Student Leaders." *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 13:225-250.

Bono, Joyce E. 2004. "Personality and Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89.5: 901-910.

Brown, Danita M. 2007. "Transformational leadership behaviors and achieving styles of fraternity and sorority leaders." *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses* 127.

Brown, William F and Michael D. Reilly. 2009. "The Myers-Briggs type indicator and transformational leadership." *The Journal of Management Development* 28:916-932.

Bryer, Eric and Tonia Gray. 2006. "Effective leadership: Transformational or transactional?"*Australian Journal of Outdoor Education* 10.2: 13-19.

Burnes B (2004) Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: A re–appraisal. Journal of Management Studies 41(6): 977–1002.

Burns, James MacGregor.1978. *Leadership.* New York City, NY: Harper Torchbooks

Caldwell, Cam and Linda A. Hayes. 2007. "Leadership, trustworthiness, and the mediating lens." *Journal of Management Development* 26:261-281.

Crain-Gully, Denys Ita, Sr. 2003. "Exploring transformational leadership characteristics among African American church leaders in the San Francisco Bay Area." *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.* 3082000.

Day DV, Harrison MM and Halpin SM (2009) An Integrative Approach to Leader Development, Identity, and Expertise. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

Emlen, Stephen T. and Peter M. Buston. 2003. "Cognitive processes underlying human mate choice: The relationship between self-perception and mate preference in Western society." *The Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 100: 8805-8810.

Endrissat, Nada and Widar von Arx. 2013. Leadership practices and context: Two sides of the same coin. *Leadership.* 9: 278-304.

Fein, Erich C; Aharon Tziner, and Cristinel Vasiliu. 2010. "Age cohort effects, gender, and Romanian leadership preferences." *The Journal of Management Development* 29:364- 376.

Gray, John. 1992. *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus.* Harper Collins e-books.

Grint K (2005) Problems, problems, problems: the social construction of 'leadership'. Human Relations 58(11): 1467–1494.

Hall, Keith E. 2012. "Transformational leadership practices of African-American ministers at predominantly African American Churches of Christ in Nashville, TN." *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*. 3503811.

Hautala, Tiina M. 2006. "The relationship between personality and transformational leadership." *The Journal of Management Development* 25:777-794.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hoyt, Chrystal L. and Jim Blascovich. 2003. "Transformational and transactional leadership in virtual and physical environments." *Small Group Research* 34: 678-715.

Hout, Michael and Claude S. Fischer. 2002. "Why More Americans Have No Religious Preference: Politics and Generations." *American Sociological Review* 67: 165-190.

Hutchins-Eberhardt, Liesl D. 2009. "Perceptions of multi-contextual leadership roles: Reflecting on gendered leadership preferences" Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Nebraska − Lincoln. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database. 3355616.

Ivey, Gary W and Theresa J.B. Kline. 2010. "Transformational and active transactional leadership in the Canadian military." *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 31:246-262.

Johnston, John. 1986. "Gender Differences in Teachers' Preferences for Primary School Leadership." *Educational Management Administration Leadership* 14: 219-226

Karp, Tom. 2013. Studying subtle acts of leadership. *Leadership.* 9:3-22.

Klohnen, Eva C. and Shanhong Luo. 2005."Assortative Mating and Marital Quality in Newlyweds: A Couple-Centered Approach." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 88: 304-326.

Laohavichien, Tipparat; Lawrence D Fredendall, and Stephen R Cantrell. 2009. "The Effects of Transformational and Transactional Leadership on Quality Improvement." *The Quality Management Journal* 16: 7-24.

Littrell, Romie F. and Stella M. Nkomo (2005) Gender and race differences in leader behaviour preferences in South Africa. Women in Management Review 20:562 -580.

McCaulley, M. 1990. "The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and Leadership." West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

McGuire, William and R. F. C. Hall. 1977. *C. G. Jung Speaking: Interviews and Encounters.* Princeton, NJ: University Press.

Myers, Isabel Briggs; Mary H. McCaulley and Robert Most.1985. *MBTI*® *Manual: A Guide tothe Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*®*."*Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

O'Connor PMG and Quinn L (2004) Organizational capacity for leadership. In:

McCauley CD and Van Velsor E (eds) The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development, 2nd edn. San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass, pp.417–437.

Pfeffer J (1977) The ambiguity of leadership. Academy of Management Review January 1977: 104–112.

Reed, T. 2001. "Student leaders in the classroom: A study of Virginia Tech student leaders and their accounts ofcurricular and co-curricular leadership." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Reicher S, Haslam SA and Hopkins N (2005) Social identity and the dynamics of leadership: Leaders and followers as collaborative agents in the transformation of social reality. The Leadership Quarterly 16(4): 547–568.

Ross, S.M. and Offerman, L.R. 1997. "Transformational leaders: measurement of personality attributes and work group performance." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 23: 1078-86.

Stacey R (2003) Strategic Management and Organisational Dynamics. The Challenge of Complexity, 4th edn. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Sosik, John J; Bruce J. Avolio, and Surinder S. Kahai. 1997. "Effects of leadership style and anonymity on group potency and effectiveness in a group decision support system environment." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82: 89-103.

Turner, Vicki L. 2006. "A quantitative revelation of transformational leadership in African American males: Discovering Africentric rites of passage." *Environmental Sciences & Pollution Management* 67:265.

Uhl-Bien M (2006) Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. The Leadership Quarterly 17: 654–676.

Weber, Max; A M Henderson and Talcott Parsons. 1947. *Theory of Social and Economic Organization.* New York: Oxford University Press.

ACADEMIC VITA

Jessica Tucker
363 Merlin Road
Phoenixville, PA
Jat5351@gmail.com

EDUCATION
The Pennsylvania State University, Schreyer Honors College, University Park
Bachelor of Arts in Communications; Sociology   Expected Graduation: Dec 2013

WORK EXPERIENCE
The Vanguard Group, Public Relations Intern, Malvern, PA   6/13-Present
- Develop proposal to streamline weekly press reports for greater efficiency and broader reach
- Analyze Twitter trends in the financial industry and the broader private sector to develop a recommendation on whether the public relations group should utilize a specified Twitter account
- Aid in corporate strategy project by researching 22 international money media markets
- Manage and produce all press activities for My Classroom Economy outreach including 7 interviews, 3 media pitches, and local research to incorporate timely news hooks
- Manage press releases and coordinate local press efforts for Vanguard's All Cans on Deck food collection at three national sites
- Develop editorial calendar framework to streamline updates and allow coordination of media pitches
- Produce and distribute weekly press coverage for senior management and communication groups

Mars Chocolate North America, Sales Effectiveness, Hackettstown, NJ   1/13-5/13
- Conducted a five month analysis on the complexities of the MARS sales forecasting system identifying changes to make the tool effective for stakeholders
- Analyzed 5 team workloads and recommended 6-month plan to drive efficiency of team roles
- Developed proposal of a training network to increase user adoption and message dissemination; recommendation implemented
- Managed execution deadlines of 2014 planning process, led total volume management target

Brown's Cow, Communications Intern, Phoenixville, PA   5/12-8/12
- Achieved "Best of the Burbs" Award from Philadelphia Magazine through standardized staff trainings
- Created a media plan to promote 3 store events per month to increase store sales
- Engaged customers, increasing Facebook fans by 150% , through daily social media updates promoting store happenings and products
- Conducted cost/benefit analysis on 3 product ventures and recommended findings to management

LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE

Get into Giving, Founder, Phoenixville, PA   12/ 03-Present
- Identify community needs by coordinating with three local nonprofits
- Collaborate with five community groups for donations of food and gifts
- Impacted 375 people over nine years

Leadership Jumpstart, Teaching Assistant, Pennsylvania State University   8/11-12/12
- Mentored 24 students in the creation of a semester long community service project
- Identified and fostered leadership goals with individual students during monthly office hours
- Provided project teams weekly feedback and facilitated team discussions on potential improvements

SKILLS
Computer: Microsoft Office Suite, SPSS, Demantra (Oracle based), Siebel, Vocus
Peak Pilates Comprehensive Level I Teaching Certification   April 2013

AWARDS
Phi Beta Lambda/Future Business Leaders of America
- Represented Penn State Nationally in Management Concepts 3rd place   2012
- Represented Penn State Nationally in Public Speaking 4th place   2011
- Represented Penn State Nationally in Project Management 6th place   2011