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Transformational leadership describes a leader who motivates followers to performance beyond expectations, but it has often been attacked for its potential to be abused. A newer form of leadership has been proposed, that of authentic leadership. Authentic leadership is an over-arching concept that proposes to include transformational leadership and all positive forms of leadership (Avolio and Gardner, 2005). At the heart of authentic leadership is the concept of ethicality.

The concept of authenticity may contribute to the transformational leadership paradigm, producing an ideal form of leadership. Authentic leadership may not be an over-arching form of leadership, but one suited particularly to transformational leadership. I propose that authentic transformational leadership resides in leaders’ and followers’ implicit leadership theories.

This experiment addresses authentic transformational leadership and the role of implicit leadership theories in directing leader behavior. A model is developed that outlines the relationship between authentic transformational leadership and implicit leadership theories, including the separate implicit theories of leader and follower, leader-member exchange (LMX), and leader effectiveness. Hypotheses concerning these relationships are developed.

The study is experimental, using WebCT as a delivery tool. Scenario-based surveys were developed to collect data, using both known measures and measures developed specifically for this experiment. Two pilot studies were conducted to test the
soundness of the delivery tool and the validity of the constructed scenarios and measures, which largely supported the hypotheses. In the main study, all hypotheses were supported with the exception of one. The results of the unsupported hypothesis, however, suggest authentic transformational leadership may be an ideal form of leadership.

There are several contributions to the literature made by this study. The first contribution is the development of authentic transformational leadership as an ideal form of leadership. Second, the development of both follower and leader implicit leadership theories and their relationship to authentic transformational leadership is studied through leader effectiveness, a concept not previously researched. Lastly, the role of a follower's implicit leadership theory and its effects on a leader are examined, a notion that is largely under-researched.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Transformational leadership, theorized to inspire followers to performance beyond expectations, is currently the most widely studied leadership theory (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). As a key focus of my experiment, I suggest that authentic transformational leadership is an ideal form of leadership recognized by both leaders and followers, seen as effective by both. Individuals’ cognitive representations of an ideal leader, followers’ and leaders’ implicit leadership theories (Lord & Emrich, 2001) will reflect authentic transformational leadership behaviors to the degree they are considered to represent an ideal form of leadership, and these implicit theories will be manifested in their behavior. Furthermore, leaders rely on leader-member exchanges to provide them with input on appropriate leadership behaviors which are based upon their followers’ implicit leadership theories. Given these premises, the following research questions provide the basis for my research: (1) Is authentic transformational leadership an ideal set of leadership behaviors? (2) Are these behaviors seen as effective by followers, communicated to leaders via leader-member exchanges, and, therefore, enacted by leaders? (3) Are implicit leadership theories stable, or are they continually adjusted? These questions are addressed and developed further in this chapter.

Statement of the Problem

In the past, transformational leadership has been attacked for its potential to be abused. Bass and Steidlmeyer (1999) point out that the ethics of transformational leadership have been challenged. For example, transformational leaders: (1) can use
impression management behaviors that pave the way to immoral behavior (Snyder, 1987); (2) manipulate followers into losing more than they gain (White & Wooten, 1986); (3) encourage followers to go beyond their self-interests to better the organization and emotionally engage followers in pursuits that may be contrary to the followers’ best interests (Stevens, D’Intino, & Victor, 1995); (4) hinder organizational learning and development that involve shared leadership and participative decision-making (McKendall, 1993); and (5) operate with a lack of the checks and balances normally provided by opposing interests, influences, and power, which allows tyranny and oppression of a minority by a majority (Keeley, 1995). Conger and Kanungo (1998) discussed charismatic leadership (a component of transformational leadership) as a leader that can harm followers through mistreatment and trickery.

Transformational leadership is also, however, linked to many positive organizational outcomes. Transformational leadership is found to influence such outcomes as performance (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996; Berson, Shamair, Avolio, & Popper, 2001; Howell & Avolio, 1993; MColl-Kennedy & Anderson, 2002; Zacharatos, Barling & Kelloway, 2000), organizational goals (Awamleh, 1999; Conger, 1999; Dubinsky, Yammarino, Jolson, & Spangler, 1995; Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993), leadership trust (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996), self-efficacy beliefs (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996), leadership satisfaction (Hater & Bass, 1988; Yammarino & Bass, 1990), follower satisfaction and absenteeism (George & Jones, 1997; Staw, Sutton, & Pelled, 1994; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). This seeming contradiction between abuses and positive organizational outcomes can be understood when one considers the popularity of transformational leadership behaviors in both academic and
practitioner settings (as evidenced by the amount of the aforementioned positive outcomes) and the understanding of leaders that followers desire these behaviors in their leaders. Armed with this information, some leaders may choose to simply enact transformational behaviors to please followers as an authentic transformational leader would, without truly being transformational and caring for the welfare and interests of the followers.

Ethics are a basic component of authentic transformational leadership. Leaders who have transformational capability without ethical intent are the crux of the problem. Ethical leadership is defined by Brown, Trevino, and Harrison (2005) as the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making. Ethics are an integral part of leadership that cannot be ignored. We have seen the damage done by unethical leaders in recent scandals by business leaders that have dominated the news in recent years (e.g. Kenneth Lay and Enron, Joseph Nacchio and Qwest Communication, Bernard Ebbers and WorldCom, Dennis Kozlowski and Tyco International, Joseph Bernardino and Arthur Anderson, Gary Winnick and Global Crossing, Charles Keating and Lincoln Savings and Loan, Kim Tae Gou and Daewoo Motors). As a result, it is my assertion that followers are not satisfied with leaders that seem to be transformational (display some transformational leadership behaviors without being authentically transformational) or are merely effective. Ethicality is no longer something nice to have in a leader, but a necessity. It is the authentic transformational leader that is desired by followers.
Theoretical Foundation

Authentic and Transformational Leadership

As discussed recently, authentic leaders know who they are, know what they believe in and value, and act on those values and beliefs openly and candidly (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004). Their followers would consider them to be ethical because they are integrated and balanced people who treat ethical behavior as part of their lives and display ethical actions (May, Chan, Hodges, & Avolio, 2003). Authentic leadership proposes to be an over-arching concept that includes transformational leadership and all positive forms of leadership (May et al., 2003). Transformational leaders are able to inspire followers to transcend their own self-interests and are capable of having a profound and extraordinary effect on followers (Robbins & Judge, 2005). Authentic transformational leaders are those leaders who are able to intellectually stimulate, inspirationally motivate, individually consider, and ideally influence their followers in an ethical manner. Authentic transformational leaders are trustworthy, honest, and believable. They are transparent in their dealings, ethical in their actions, and morally developed. It is their authenticity that removes the potential for them to abuse this leadership style, as described by Bass and Steidlemeyer (1999).

Implicit Leadership Theories

At the heart of this discussion is the concept of implicit leadership theory. Each person has an idea of what is an ideal leader. Individuals have an implicit understanding of what they believe to be ideal leadership, and cognitively categorize each new leader with a comparison of that leader to their implicit theories (Offermann, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994). Perhaps they have modeled their idea of ideal leadership
after a high-school coach, a pastor, their parents, or a particularly influential friend or family member. More than likely, they have pulled qualities from several sources. The way they were raised, their own system of values, their personality, and the experiences they have had through life all can affect a person’s implicit theory of leadership, not to mention their own gender, age, and culture as well as the culture of the leader they are categorizing (Zacharatos, Barling, & Kelloway, 2000).

The question as to whether implicit leadership theories are stable over time or are able to change is up for discussion. While Weick and Bougon (1986) argue that changes in cognitive structures continuously occur, other cognitive theorists claim that cognitive structures are not easily changed (e.g., Bartunek, 1984). When changes do occur, however, they likely take place incrementally, as a process of adaptation with only a partial effect on scripts and maps; they do not occur as sweeping changes covering more substantial parts of cognitive structure (Bartunek, 1984).

Only one empirical study indicates that a person’s implicit leadership theory tends to be stable over time (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). I, regardless, propose that it is likely to change and develop throughout a person’s lifetime for several reasons. Both followers and leaders alike come across new or different examples of effective leader behaviors over time, and it is important to consider a follower’s implicit leadership theory separate from a leader’s. In any leadership situation, leaders and followers cognitively match effective leader behaviors to their ideal representations of leadership; followers observe the leader’s behavior, and leaders take in feedback on their own behaviors from their followers. In addition to the many influences on a leader’s implicit theory of leadership, I propose the follower has an effect as well, and can possibly alter a leader’s
theory, through strong leader-member exchanges. High quality leader-member exchanges describe a relationship between leader and follower that marks trust, communication, and reciprocity (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). In a longitudinal study, Epitropaki and Martin (2005) illustrate that the closer employees perceived their actual manager’s profile to be to the implicit leadership theories the employees endorsed, the better the quality of leader member-exchange. This dyadic congruence leads to such outcomes as employees’ organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and well-being. This research demonstrates that implicit leadership theory dyadic congruence is important between leader and follower; in situations of dyadic congruence, leaders and followers have good relationships and high-quality leader-member exchanges. This link between implicit leadership theory dyadic congruence and leader-member exchange begs the question: which came first? It is certainly possible that dyadic congruence makes it easier to strengthen a leader-member exchange relationship, but it is also possible that the strengthening of the leader-member exchange relationship leads to leader-follower, implicit leadership theory, dyadic congruence. Due to the ambiguous link between implicit leadership theory dyadic congruence and leader-member exchanges, I suggest that it is because of quality leader-member exchanges that the leader learns the follower’s wishes concerning leadership. Leaders wish to be seen as effective, so take cues from followers (observed because of the high level of communication that marks quality leader-member exchanges) and change their behaviors to please the follower. I further suggest those cues given by the follower indicate the preference for an authentic transformational leader, as components of that leadership style are likely seen as effective by all.
Metacognitions of Leader Behavior

A cognitive process model of leadership developed by Wofford and Goodwin (1994) provides an appropriate context within which to view my theory. Their theory is centered on metacognitive processes that both guide and interpret behavior. The source of a leader’s behavior involves the activation of cognitive scripts, which are goal-oriented structures with different tracts for variations on the script. Leaders select the appropriate script to assist them in assimilating environmental information as well as produce behavior. Implicit leadership theories can be viewed as metacognitions that control aspects of leadership behavior because leaders use the content of their theories to guide their leader behavior—there is a correlation between cognitions and behavior. For example, Wofford, Joplin, and Comforth (1996) found that leaders change their behavior according to follower feedback, and measures of new script tracts were linked to behavioral intentions, supporting the correlation between cognitions and behavior. Additionally, Wofford, Goodwin, and Whittington (1998) found that transformational self-schema and motivational schema were indicators of transformational cognitions, which in turn, predicted transformational leadership behavior. In essence, these studies support the idea that a leader’s implicit leadership theory (metacognitions) guides their behavior, and that leaders appear to take cues from their followers.

Implicit leadership theories are metacognitive processes which guide leader behavior. In my research, I consider whether authentic transformational leadership behaviors are ideal and seen as effective by both leaders and followers; I propose that there are components of authentic transformational leadership in everyone’s implicit leadership theories. Observations and feedback regarding these leader effective ideal
behaviors can reinforce or even change a person’s implicit theory of leadership. The feedback leaders receive will come from communication with their followers. It is possible that leaders will alter their behavior based on cues given by the followers, or even through observation of (or feedback on) their own behaviors as effective or not. I am not suggesting that a single cue from a follower can alter a person’s implicit leadership theory, but that it can alter his or her behavior—the relationship between implicit leadership theories and authentic transformational leader behavior is likely non-recursive. Incrementally, the alteration of behavior can change one’s implicit leadership theory, as suggested by Bem (1972) and self-perception theory. The major premise of self-perception theory is that people sometimes base their attitudes on their behaviors—“I acted this way, so I must believe it!” In my research, I go no further than the question “Do people believe that leaders change their behavior based on cues from followers and observations of their own effectiveness?” The developmental aspect of implicit leadership theory is a question for future studies. Seeing the change in behavior, however, is a step towards that goal.

**Authentic Transformational Leadership Effectiveness**

There are several positive outcomes that may stem from the effectiveness of an authentic transformational leader. Many researchers have proposed outcomes relating to authentic, transformational, ethical, and charismatic behaviors. These include trust (Robinson, 1996), organizational commitment (Conger, 1999), satisfaction (George & Jones, 1997), performance (Howell & Avolio, 1993), and organizational citizenship behavior (Gardner & Schermerhorn, 2004). Additionally, it has been proposed that authentic leaders develop higher levels of self-awareness and self-regulated positive
behaviors of leaders and followers, with the result being positive self-development in each (Luthans and Avolio, 2003). These outcomes are reflected in the theoretical model in Figure 1 that includes: antecedents to implicit leadership theories; the relationship between leader implicit leadership theories and authentic transformational behaviors, the relationship between follower implicit leadership theories, LMX, authentic transformational leader behaviors and leader effectiveness; and outcomes of leadership effectiveness based on authentic, transformational, charismatic and ethical behaviors.

The above stream of research and questions lead to the following propositions:

**Proposition 1:** Antecedents to implicit leadership theories (both leader and follower) include demographic variables, work experience, leadership experience, and personality.

**Proposition 2:** The relationship between leader implicit leadership theories and leader authentic transformational leader behaviors is non-recursive.

**Proposition 2a:** The relationship between a leader’s implicit leadership theory and leader authentic transformational leadership behavior is influenced by a match between cognition and behavior.

**Proposition 3:** Authentic transformational leader behaviors influence leader effectiveness.

**Proposition 3a:** The relationship between authentic transformational leader behaviors and leader effectiveness is influenced by follower implicit leadership theories.

**Proposition 4:** Perceived leader effectiveness leads to trust, organizational commitment, satisfaction, performance, and positive organizational citizenship behaviors.

**Proposition 5a:** Leader effectiveness influences follower implicit leadership theories.

**Proposition 5b:** Leader effectiveness influences leader implicit leadership theories.

**Proposition 6:** Follower implicit leadership theories influence leader implicit leadership theories.

**Proposition 6a:** The LMX relationship influences the relationship between follower implicit leadership theories and leader implicit leadership theories.
Figure 1. Theoretical model of implicit leadership theories and authentic transformational leader behaviors.
Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research is to examine specific links in the model presented in Figure 1. Specifically, I examine the relationship between leader effectiveness and the implicit leadership theories of leaders and followers, as well as the relationship between authentic transformational leader behaviors and implicit leadership theories. In this research I attempt to answer the following research questions:

1. *Is authentic transformational leadership an ideal set of leadership behaviors that are seen as effective by followers and enacted by leaders?*

2. *How does the LMX relationship affect the relationship between a follower’s implicit leadership theory and a leader’s implicit leadership theory?*

3. *What effect does leader effectiveness have on the implicit leadership theories of leaders and followers?*

Significance of the Research

Understanding what makes people either authentic or false leaders is an essential step towards being able to identify such leaders. If a leader’s ethicality and transformational capability are able to define a leader as authentically transformational, it will be much simpler not only to identify such leaders, but to educate people in early development stages as to what may lead people down false leadership paths. Such education will be able to potentially keep people from being false themselves, and will enable managers to make better promotion decisions. Ideals of leadership have often been explored through content and measurement (e.g. Lord & Maher, 1993; Offermann et al., 1994) and effectiveness (e.g. Brown & Lord, 2001; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005;
Pierro, Cicero, Bonaiuto, van Knippenberg, & Kruglanski, 2005). It has not been explored through ethicality.

In addition, researchers indicate that dyadic congruence between leader and follower implicit leadership theories is important for various organizational outcomes (see Engle & Lord, 1997); however, there are not any studies on the effect of a follower’s implicit theory on a leader’s implicit theory. It is important to discover what makes leaders behave the way they do, including a look into the effect of their own leader effectiveness feedback on their implicit leadership theory. This theory partially places the weight of leader behavior on the shoulders of the follower. Leadership is a process that includes many aspects. It is an integral linkage between leader and follower, both having a strong influence on the other. Much research tends to ignore the role of the follower when it comes to leader behavior (e.g., Lord & Maher, 1993; Offermann et al., 1994; Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). It is necessary to incorporate a discussion of the follower in any formulation of leadership, as put forth in the basic tenets of leadership categorization theory: “If leadership resides, at least in part, in the minds of followers, then it is imperative to discover what followers are thinking” (Lord & Emrich, 2001, p. 551).

Definition of Terms

The following is a list of terms and their conceptual definitions:

Authentic Leadership — Authentic leaders know who they are, know what they believe in and value, and act on those values and beliefs openly and candidly. Their followers would consider them to be ethical people. Additionally, it is a positive root form of leadership; that is, it is an overarching concept that may encompass other forms of
leadership and should be considered as beneficial (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). At the heart of authenticity is ethicality (Robbins & Judge, 2005; May, Chan, Hodges, & Avolio, 2003).

Transformational Leadership — Transformational leaders are able to inspire followers to transcend their own self-interests and are capable of having a profound and extraordinary effect on followers. Transformational leaders build subordinates’ respect and trust by 1) behaving in a fair manner and doing what is right rather than what is expedient; 2) by increasing followers’ awareness of the mission or vision toward which they are working and raising followers’ expectations of what they can achieve, thereby motivating them to pursue the group’s goals; 3) by encouraging their followers to look at old problems from new and differing perspectives, giving rise to followers’ creative thinking and innovation; and, lastly, 4) by granting individualized attention to their followers, considering their needs and abilities, playing an especially important role in the followers’ growth and development (Robbins & Judge, 2005; Zacharatos, Barling, & Kelloway, 2000).

Authentic Transformational Leadership — Authentic transformational leaders are those leaders who are able to intellectually stimulate, inspirationally motivate, individually consider, and ideally influence their followers in an ethical manner. Authentic transformational leaders are trustworthy, honest, and believable. They are transparent in their dealings, ethical in their actions, and morally developed. Simply, an authentic transformational leader has transformational capability and a high level of ethicality (Nichols, 2006).
Implicit Leadership Theory (ILT) — ILT’s are personal assumptions about the traits, abilities, and behaviors that characterize an ideal leader. They represent cognitive structures or schemas specifying those traits, abilities, and behaviors that individuals expect from leaders. They are stored in memory and are activated when interacting with a person in a leadership position (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004), or receiving feedback on their own leadership effectiveness.

Leader-Member Exchange — LMX theory describes the role-making process between a leader and an individual subordinate. In addition, the theory describes how leaders develop different exchange relationships over time with various subordinates. Low quality exchanges are marked by contractual relationships where the subordinate only follows to receive rewards controlled by the leader, demonstrating no reciprocity in the relationship. High quality exchanges are marked by greater levels of trust, communication, loyalty, and reciprocity between leader and follower, resulting in positive personal and organizational outcomes (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Leader Effectiveness — Leader effectiveness illustrates a leader who motivates a person or group to accomplish more than they could have without the leader’s guidance (Quinn, 1988). Leader effectiveness may be used to describe leaders who are trusted by their followers and whose followers would describe them as an excellent and effective leader (van Knippenberg and van Knippenberg, 2005). Outcomes of leader effectiveness resulting from observations of authentic, transformational, ethical, and charismatic leadership include trust (Robinson, 1996), organizational commitment (Conger, 1999), satisfaction (George & Jones, 1997), performance (Howell & Avolio,
1993), organizational citizenship behaviors (Gardner & Schmerhorn, 2004), and positive self-development (Avolio & Luthans, 2003).

Preview of the Study

I conducted an experimental laboratory study online utilizing Blackboard/WebCT assessment tool. WebCT allowed me to inform the participants as to the nature of the study, administer a timed survey they could access only once, collect demographic information, perform manipulation checks, debrief the participants and collect any suggestions they may have. Online undergraduate students who are familiar with the technology provided the sample, so as to avoid confusion with the technological format of the study. In the main experiment, twelve scenarios were administered to test the several hypotheses, using randomized groups. The scenarios were based on three known and tested measures, (the MLQ 5x, Bass & Avolio, 1990; the LMX-7, Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; and a leader effectiveness measure, van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005) as well as several measures I constructed. Two pilot studies were conducted to ensure validity and reliability of the scenarios and measures developed specifically for this research, and to ensure the soundness of WebCT as a delivery tool. The pilot studies provided initial confirmation of my hypotheses, provided guidance to strengthen some of the scenarios and measures, and validated the use of WebCT as an appropriate data collection tool. Modifications to scenarios and measures that were made as a result of the pilot study are incorporated into the Methods section.

Chapter Summary

The above discussion provided an introduction to the study, including a statement of the problem, the theoretical foundation of the study, the purpose and
significance of the study, and definitions of key terms. Chapter 2 offers a detailed review of the pertinent literature. During this review, the research model is presented and relevant study hypotheses are developed. The research design and methodology used to complete the study is described in Chapter 3. The results of the study are then reported in Chapter 4. Finally, Chapter 5 explains study findings outlines the theoretical and practical implications of the study, examines study limitations, and explores promising avenues for future research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provides an extensive review of the literature pertaining to this study. First, an overview of authentic transformational leadership is presented. Included in this section is a discussion of authentic leadership, including definitions, what authentic leadership is not, and a discussion on specific authentic leadership components. This overview is followed by a discussion of transformational leadership, including an outline of the basic tenets of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, charismatic leadership and the possible abuses. This section is followed by a summary of the development and discussion of authentic transformational leadership.

Second, a discussion of implicit leadership theories and metacognitive research ensues. Leader-member exchange and its relationship to implicit leadership theory are included in this discussion, as well as leader effectiveness. Each section includes empirical support pertaining to the hypotheses, which are presented at the end of the chapter along with a research model.

Authentic Transformational Leadership

In this section, I build the construct of authentic transformational leadership through the discussion of its various components. First, authentic leadership is described, as it was recently proposed. It is discussed in the form the original authors set forth, without comment to the validity of their arguments or the development of the theory, though this is discussed later. Next, transformational leadership is discussed as well as its relationship to charismatic leadership and possible abuses of
transformational leadership. The conclusion of this section ties the various components together to give a coherent picture of authentic transformational leadership.

**Authentic Leadership**

The subject of authentic leadership is a hot topic of research [see the 2005 *Leadership Quarterly* (16) special issue on authentic leadership]. Authenticity itself, however, has been a topic of discussion since the early Greeks, and their philosophy, “to thine own self be true” (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Authenticity is described by the French philosopher Sartre (1943) as a self-referential state of being. In Maslow’s (1968, 1971) needs theory, he discusses self-actualized persons, or people who are in-tune with themselves, having an accurate perception of who they are with strong ethical convictions. This description matches that of an authentic person. Two key elements included in the definition of authenticity are ethicality and self-awareness.

Avolio et al. (2004) conceive of authentic leaders as people who have realized elevated degrees of authenticity in that they know themselves, what they value and believe, and they operate based upon those beliefs and values while visibly and clearly interacting with others. Authentic leaders are leaders who truly understand their own behaviors, as well as the causes of those behaviors. Furthermore, they are perceived by others as understanding their own and others’ values/moral perspective, strengths, and knowledge. They are cognizant of their environment and clearly picture the framework in which they lead. Qualities of such leaders include being positive, optimistic, self-assured, pliant, and having a great store of moral fortitude (Avolio, Luthans, and Walumbwa, 2004). May et al. (2003) mark authentic leaders as those who are able to integrate their ethical behavior fully into both their personal and
organizational lives, creating an ethical climate that focuses on the employees and the stakeholders, recognizing their inherent worth. All of these authors consider authentic leadership to be a root or over-arching form of leadership that includes transformational, spiritual, and ethical leadership.

**What Authenticity is Not**

In order to better define what authenticity is, Chan, Hannah, and Gardner (2005) discuss what authenticity is not: sincerity, impression management, or self-monitoring. Authenticity is different than sincerity. Trilling (1972) described sincerity as the absence of pretense in which there is a consistency between actions and feelings. Insincerity is simply the feeling of a lack of congruence between one’s feelings and his/her actual relationships with other people (Chan et al., 2005). Authenticity is more than feeling, and concerns actually being one’s true self. It is self-contained, not dependent upon relationships with other people.

Authenticity is also not impression management (Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Rosenfeld, Giacalone, & Rordan, 2002). Impression management is concerned with the manipulation of the social environment to portray a specific image to an audience. Authentic people may utilize impression management techniques to portray their true image, that image being consistent with their nature. People who are inauthentic will hide their true thoughts, simply saying what they think others want to hear. The difference is based in intention; the authentic person seeks to portray who he/she truly is, the inauthentic person seeks to fool others (Chan et al., 2005).

Inauthentic people, however, will still be inauthentic outside of social situations where
impression management techniques are not necessary. They still have a lack of self-awareness and an inability to be true to the self.

Self-monitoring (Snyder, 1987) may seem very similar to the continuum of the inauthentic to the authentic. High self-monitors display differing behaviors dependent upon what they believe to be right for the situation, as an inauthentic person may do. Low self-monitors are more likely to look inward for advice on how to behave in a particular situation just as one might expect authentic individuals to do in their efforts to be true to themselves. Inauthentic people, however, have false self-behavior, not understanding who they are and certainly not able to project a true image of themselves. High self-monitors may or may not report their behavior as being false (Snyder, 1979), and self-monitoring does not depend on the condition of lying or being untrue to one’s core values. High self-monitors will adapt themselves to the situation, showing behavioral flexibility, with a well-built belief that they are portraying their most appropriate self for the current situation. Inauthenticity comes about through a sense of false self that is socially implanted against one’s will, often being reported by the person (Harter, 2002). In other words, inauthentic people, instead of appropriately adapting themselves to a situation that still represents who they are as high self-monitors might, understand that their behavior is counterfeit and may judge it to be the result of social or situational pressures. Authenticity involves a commitment to one’s values and identity, and is state-like in concept (Erickson, 1995). Self-monitoring, however, is a personality attribute, a trait-like preference and that involves the proficiency for using self-knowledge (low self-monitor) as opposed to knowledge of others (high self-monitors) (Chan et al., 2005). With authenticity, there is a true commitment to the self, an aspect
unimportant to the concept of self-monitoring. Authentic people are concerned with revealing their true selves to others, while self-monitors are concerned with social impression.

Authentic leaders are not necessarily low self-monitors, however (Chan et al., 2005). While the similarity in characteristics may lead to authentic people being low self-monitors, authentic leaders have a responsibility to their followers as well as to themselves. Low self-monitors are less open to contextual clues; authentic leaders may still be very open to contextual clues and still access a wide range of behaviors that are true to themselves. They are very self-aware (Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa, 2005; Luthans & Avolio, 2003) and are able to react to situational priming cues to make their true selves more salient. Indeed, authentic leaders who are also high self-monitors will be better able to reveal their true selves to others, underlining and enforcing their authenticity.

Components of Authentic Leadership

Avolio and Gardner (2005) discuss the components of authentic leadership as positive psychological capital, positive moral perspective, leader self-awareness, leader self-regulation, leadership processes/behaviors, follower self-awareness/regulation, follower development, organizational context, and performance beyond expectations. This framework of authentic leadership marks the theory as developmental in nature as well as holistic in that it covers a vast range of leadership perspectives. The rationale for each component is briefly explained below.
Positive Psychological Capital

Luthans and Avolio (2003) identified confidence, optimism, hope, and resiliency as positive psychological capacities and personal resources of the authentic leader. These psychological states are conjectured to increase self-regulatory and self-awareness behaviors of the leader, creating an entire process of positive self development. These positive psychological capacities have theoretical and psychometric support for being state-like (open to development and change) (Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, 2004). Thus, these capacities may play an important role in the development of individuals, groups, and organizations (Luthans & Avolio, 2003).

Positive Moral Perspective

May et al. (2003) discuss the moral component of authentic leadership. Authentic leaders engage in an ethical and transparent decision-making process, where they draw on moral capacity, courage, and resiliency in addressing ethical issues. Their integrated framework discusses how an authentic leader who is aware of moral issues ultimately has ethical actions. Moral decision-making relies upon recognizing moral dilemmas, transparently evaluating the alternatives, and developing intention to act in a manner consistent with one’s evaluations. The moral capacity of the leader influences the relationship between the environmental characteristics of the dilemma and the leader’s ability to recognize a moral dilemma. Leader moral capacity consists of how they construct their own leadership roles, their perspective taking ability, and their experience with previous moral dilemmas. Moral courage is the determination of the leader to follow through on moral intentions and behave ethically, despite outside pressures to behave otherwise. Acting courageously, however, must not occur in a
single instance, but must be sustainable over time. Moral resiliency allows an authentic leader to positively and continuously adapt to situations that pose significant adversity or risk to the leader’s principled actions. Sustained ethical actions are considered to be a key component of authentic leadership (May et al., 2003).

**Leader Self-Awareness**

Another fundamental aspect of authentic leadership is leader self-awareness; leaders are cognizant of their own existence and what constitutes that existence over time (Silvia & Duval, 2001). Self-awareness is a continual and emergent process whereby a leader comes to understand his/her unique talents, strengths, sense of purpose, core values, beliefs, and desires (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Self-awareness includes values, cognitions regarding identity, emotions, and motives/goals (Gardner et al., 2005).

**Leader Processes/Behaviors and Follower Self-Awareness/Regulation/Development**

Several processes and behaviors through which leaders influence followers have been proposed, including positive modeling, personal and social identification, emotional contagion, and positive social exchanges. Positive modeling of the different components of authenticity (self-awareness, self-regulatory processes, positive psychological states, and/or a positive moral perspective) is fundamental to the influence of authentic leaders on follower development. Positive modeling, in leadership terms, is the idea of leading by example, whereby leaders set themselves up as positive role models for their followers. When leaders demonstrate transparent decision making, confidence, optimism, hope, resilience, and consistency between their
words and deeds, followers take note (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Positive modeling is an identification process, it is not the sole source of identification. Followers come to identify with authentic leaders and their values through personal and social identification processes as well (Avolio, Gardner et al., 2004; Avolio, Luthans et al., 2004; Gardner et al., 2005; Ilies, Morgenson, & Nahrgang, 2005). Authentic leaders attempt to create positive feelings in followers and a sense of identification with the fundamental purposes of the leader. Authentic leaders fashion the circumstances for elevated trust and extract positive emotions from followers (Avolio, Gardner et al., 2004).

Another leadership process whereby authentic leaders influence followers and their development is that of emotional contagion. Emotional contagion is based on two theories. Frederickson (2003) developed a model that posits that a leader's positive emotions may be contagious and linked to positive organizational outcomes. The second theory is provided by Kernis (2003) with the contention that authenticity, specifically the self-awareness and relational transparency aspects, promotes positive affective states in followers. Emotional contagion is a process whereby an authentic leader feels positive emotions, which spread through social contagion to other organizational members, creating positive emotional and cognitive development (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). The simple idea is thus: happy leaders make happy followers.

The last process relies on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), that of positive social exchanges. Ilies et al. (2005) put forth that when authentic leaders share self-relevant information, display personal integrity, and have an authentic relational orientation, leader-follower relationships take on high levels of trust, respect, and positive affect. These strong relationships then foster greater value congruence and
follower reciprocation in the form of behavior that is consistent with the leader’s values (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

Due to these influence processes, authentic leaders are theorized to raise the self-awareness and help form the self-regulatory processes of followers. Followers develop increased clarity about their values, identity, and emotions. As well, followers begin to develop internalized regulatory processes, balanced information processing, transparent relations with the leader and associates, and authentic behavior (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). When followers begin to self-regulate their behavior through a deeper self-awareness, they begin to strive toward goals that are partially derived from, and congruent with, those of the leader. An authentic relationship is then formed that is marked by open and positive exchanges, complementary goals, and overlapping values.

The developmental process of authentic leadership includes not only a growth aspect for the leader, but also one for the follower. Indeed, authentic leadership development is based on the idea that leaders and followers will develop simultaneously, in a relational process. Leader and follower become more authentic as their relationship becomes more authentic. When followers develop a deeper self-awareness, they begin to share more with the leader. In turn, the leader is able to benefit through a better understanding of the follower, more richly developing his or her own leadership skills (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

Organizational Context

The context within which leaders lead is certainly important. Environments that provide open access to information, resources, support, and equal opportunity for
everyone to learn and develop assists leaders and followers in being more productive and effective, and authentic leaders foster such an organizational climate. Avolio and Gardner (2005) propose that organizational context moderates the relationship between authentic leadership and performance. They theorize four important dimensions: uncertainty, and an inclusive, ethical, and positively oriented strength-based climate. These dimensions of the organization support and enhance authentic leadership, leading to greater performance.

*Transformational Leadership*

Transformational leadership is perhaps one of the most researched leadership paradigms over the last three decades; over 100 theses and dissertations investigated the concept during the five-year period of 1990 to 1995 alone (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1995). In a content analysis of published articles, Lowe and Gardner (2001) found that one third of the research in *Leadership Quarterly* was about transformational/charismatic leadership. Furthermore, Judge and Piccolo (2004) found in a search of keywords in materials published from 1990 to 2003 in the PsycINFO database, that there have been more studies on transformational or charismatic leadership than on all other popular theories of leadership (e.g., Fiedler’s contingency theory, path-goal theory, substitutes for leadership) combined.

In their meta-analysis, Judge and Piccolo (2004) also found support for the validity of transformational leadership, which generalized across many situations, including when it is studied in rigorous settings. Judge and Piccolo report that transformational leadership has been studied in the lab (Jung & Avolio, 1999) and in the field (Yammarino, Dubinsky, Comer & Jolson, 1997), as well as researched in
correlational (Hater & Bass, 1988) and experimental (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996) studies. Transformational leadership has been studied in the military (Kane and Tremble, 2000), education (Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995), and business (Howell & Avolio, 1993) settings. It has been studied at a variety of levels, from entrepreneurial CEOs (Baum, Locke, & Kirkpatrick, 1998) to supervisors (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999). Transformational leadership is a very popular academic pursuit.

James McGregor Burns first introduced the concepts of transforming and transactional leadership in his 1978 seminal work, Leadership. Transformational leadership is often mistakenly put in opposition to transactional leadership, comparing them on the same continuum. Bass (1985) argues that they are separate concepts, a viewpoint that differs from Burns’ original work. Bass believes the best leaders are capable of both transactional and transformational behaviors. He described four specific dimensions of transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration) and three specific dimensions of transactional leadership (contingent reward, active management-by-exception, passive management-by-exception). Leaders’ behaviors may represent any or all of these seven dimensions.

Transactional leadership focuses on the exchange between leader and followers, influencing each other in such a way that both receive something of value, such as a pay raise for the follower, in exchange for greater productivity for the leader. Based on an exchange relationship to meet self-interests, the transactional leader clarifies for the follower what the follower needs to do to be rewarded for the effort, (i.e., contingent reward). A transactional leader may monitor the follower’s performance and take
corrective action if the follower errs (i.e., *active management-by-exception*) or may passively wait for problems to present themselves before taking corrective action, (i.e., *passive management-by-exception*). Transactional leader behavior is very common in the workplace today (Yammarino & Bass, 1990) and can be witnessed throughout many levels of differing organizations. Transactional leaders are able to influence subordinates because it is in the best interests of the subordinates to do what the leader wants (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987); however there is no individualization or focus on subordinate needs or personal development.

Transformational leadership is complementary to the transactional leadership style and may be ineffective with the complete absence of a transactional type of relationship between leader and follower (Bass, Avolio, & Goodheim, 1987). According to the Augmentation hypothesis, transformational leadership actually builds on transactional leadership to achieve high levels of performance from followers (Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990). The primary difference between the two styles is in the process by which the leader motivates followers and in the types of goals set.

Transformational leadership is concerned with not only performance, but the development of followers to their fullest potential (Avolio, 1999; Bass & Avolio 1990). Transformational leaders are effective motivators, encouraging followers to support the greater good rather than their own self-interests (Kuhnert, 1994). The behaviors of transformational leaders are based in their personal values and beliefs (Bass, 1985). Their behavior stems from deeply held personal value systems, or end values (Burns, 1978). Transformational leaders offer a purpose that goes beyond short-term goals and focus on higher-order intrinsic needs, whereas transactional leaders focus on the proper
exchange of resources (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). This long-range and higher-order focus results in achievement of higher levels of performance among followers than previously thought possible (Bass, 1990).

These higher levels of performance are attained through the four behaviors defined by Bass (1985): idealized influence (charisma), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Idealized influence, or charisma, involves followers identifying with their leaders and wanting to emulate them because they admire the leader. Followers find the leader to be a strong role model who displays conviction, takes stands, and appeals to followers on an emotional level. These leaders are deeply respected and trusted by the follower. Inspirational motivation describes the ability to articulate an appealing, inspiring vision to followers. Leaders communicate high expectations, inspiring them through motivation to become committed to, and a part of, the shared vision of the organization. Leaders with inspirational motivation provide meaning for the task at hand and challenge followers with high standards. Intellectual stimulation involves leadership that stimulates followers to be innovative and creative. This aspect pushes followers to challenge their own beliefs as well as those of the leader and the organization. Leaders use intellectual stimulation to encourage dissent and the questioning of assumptions. Individualized consideration describes a leader behavior of one who attends to the needs of the followers. Such leaders act as coaches and mentors, listening carefully to each follower, trying to assist followers in becoming fully actualized. These four leadership behaviors produce more positive outcomes (such as satisfaction, productivity, and motivation) than transactional leadership (Bass, 1990).
Charismatic leadership research has a history much longer than that of transformational leadership, though many researchers consider them identical in concept, using the terms interchangeably (e.g. DeGroot, Kiker, & Cross, 2000; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Charismatic leadership is rooted in the work of Weber (1921, 1947), where he discusses implications for charismatic leadership in organizations. Shils (1965) proposed that charisma could be found in a work environment in ordinary people. Tucker (1968), often credited with the first full theory of charismatic leadership, described the charismatic leader/follower relationship. He attempted to demystify charisma, advocating that charisma only existed when followers said it did. House (1977) extended Tucker's work with a more complete charismatic model.

Conger and Kanungo (1988) introduced situations to charismatic leadership research, explaining charisma as an attributional occurrence. Followers attribute charisma to leaders perceived as effective. Certain conditions must exist: 1) the leader must see the opportunity and develop a vision to address it; 2) the vision must be communicated to followers and those followers must be persuaded that change must occur; 3) the leader’s personal success, sacrifice, and risk-taking must convince followers to trust his/her abilities and vision; and 4) the leader must convince the followers that the vision is both realistic and attainable (Conger, 1991). Thus, charisma was not viewed as a personal characteristic, but as an ability to recognize deficiencies in the system.
Charismatic leadership involves many of the premises of transformational leadership (Humphreys & Einstein, 2003). Shils (1965) suggested that charisma can be found everywhere, similar to Bass’ (1985) conceptualization of transformational leadership, in which he proposed that transformational leader behaviors are often present at various levels and in diverse types of organizations. Tucker (1968) described charismatic leaders as those with the ability to communicate a vision and assist followers in solving problems, both key leader behaviors in Bass’ (1985) transformational leadership model. House (1977) distinguished personality characteristics and behaviors of charismatic leaders that also fit with the transformational framework (Bass, 1985, 1990; Tichy & DeVanna, 1986), such as self-confidence, dominance, a strong belief in the moral correctness of the vision, and the need to influence other people.

House (1977) further suggested that charismatic leaders arouse their followers to give blind obedience, commitment, loyalty, and allegiance to the leader, and to the cause the leader represents. It is this definition that casts doubt on charismatic leadership, setting it up as a two-edged sword (Humphreys & Einstein, 2003). Although charismatic leaders are able to lead followers to higher levels of performance and morality, they also can exhibit tendencies to manipulate and enslave them (Conger, 1990; Howell and Avolio, 1992; Sankowsky, 1995). This dark side of charismatic leadership (Conger, 1990) also casts a shadow on transformational leadership because of their overlapping relationship. It is important to note, however, that those leaders with charisma are not necessarily transformational. Leaders who are charismatic may emotionally appeal to their followers without exhibiting other transformational behaviors.
Charisma is but one component of transformational leadership; perhaps a very visible component, but by no means the most important (Bass, 1985).

Even though charisma is the most suspect transformational behavior when considering the potential for abuse, it is also possible that the entire range of these behaviors could be abused. The popularity of transformational leadership may encourage unethical leaders to mimic behaviors associated with it. When one considers the broad spectrum over which transformational leadership has been studied and the plethora of positive organizational and personal outcomes associated with it [e.g., overall employee performance (Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993); turnover intention (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995); increased employee satisfaction (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990); extra effort (Seltzer & Bass, 1990); organizational commitment (Bycio et al., 1995); and organizational citizenship (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000)], it is likely that transformational leadership behaviors are seen by leaders and followers, practitioners and academicians alike, as a set of ideal leadership behaviors. Mimicking these behaviors pleases unknowing followers (as they may be unaware of the leader’s true abilities or intentions), granting power and personal benefit to the leader (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Savvy leaders recognize the potential gain of utilizing such behaviors to garner favor with their followers.

Furthermore, Bass and Steidlmeyer (1999) provide several examples that demonstrate conditions under which transformational behavior could be construed as unethical. Transformational leaders can use impression management immorally (Snyder, 1987) and manipulate followers into losing propositions (White & Wooten,
They may emotionally engage followers in pursuits that may be contrary to the followers’ best interests (Stevens, D’Intino, & Victor, 1995) and hinder organizational learning and development that involve shared leadership and participative decision-making (McKendall, 1993). Transformational leaders may operate with a lack of checks and balances normally provided by opposing interests, allowing for tyranny and oppression of a minority by a majority (Keeley, 1995) and use charismatic leadership, which can harm followers through mistreatment and trickery. These examples all have a common theme, transformational leaders can be unethical if their motives are not pure. Although Bass did not discuss ethics in his original formulation of transformational leadership, he later addressed the idea that true transformational leadership should have a moral dimension (Bass, 1990). He continued to address the moral qualities of transformational leaders when he described how each of the four specific transformational behaviors can be abused if the leader is not authentically transformational (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999).

**Authentic vs. Inauthentic Transformational Leaders**

First and foremost, authentic transformational leaders are ethical (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999). They are true to self and others demonstrating their moral and ethical standards across all four transformational dimensions. Transformational leaders who are not ethical can be characterized as pseudo-transformational (or inauthentic). Pseudo-transformational leaders are those leaders who appear to be transformational, but in truth are not. A comparison of the way each type of leader demonstrates each of the four specific transformational dimensions is presented in the following paragraphs.
Idealized Influence

Inauthentic transformational leaders are deceptive and manipulative. They display many of the qualities of a transformational leader, though actually seek power and position at the expense of their followers. They appear authentic, though are false to the organization's mission, their hidden purposes self-aggrandizing. Whereas authentic transformational leaders have vision with a sense of responsibility to the organization and followers to the point of self-sacrifice (in an altruistic sense), inauthentic transformational leaders have vision but cannot be trusted and are willing to sacrifice followers for their own purposes. In using their charisma, or idealized influence, these leaders seek to be idolized rather than idealized (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999).

Inspirational Motivation

Inauthentic transformational leaders want to seem to motivate through empowerment, though actually seek to control (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Empowerment should be uplifting and focused on the good of the follower; inauthentic transformational leaders focus on conspiracy, illusory risk, excuses, and anxieties (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). They are pre-disposed to self-serving biases and are known to be deceptive, domineering, and egotistical with an inflated and positive public image, an image they may indeed be idolized for, though they are privately serving only their own interests. While their motivation seems inspirational, it is, in fact, false without concern for the organization or followers. Their motivation is to enhance their image while serving their own needs. To unknowing followers, deceptive leaders will motivate them
to do what they think is best for the organization, when the leader is truthfully the only one who benefits.

**Intellectual Stimulation**

Authentic transformational leaders intellectually stimulate their followers in a dynamic interaction that encourages questions, debate, and the attempt to formulate creative solutions to problems. Inauthentic transformational leaders prey on the unawareness of their followers so their followers will more willingly accept a vague picture of the leader concerning their morality and true intentions. This acceptance, gained through the promotion of ambiguity and inconsistency, provides opportunities for the self-enhancement of pretenders (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Authentic transformational leaders use hard evidence and base discussion on the merits of the issues, whereas inauthentic leaders use false logic and depend on authority to make their arguments. Instead of rational debate, inauthentic leaders depend on emotional argumentation. The inauthentic leader uses a veneer to hide his/her true intentions. What looks like intellectual stimulation is nothing more than the leader sounding intelligent to confuse followers into doing what the leader wants.

**Individualized Consideration**

Individualized consideration is dependent on altruism to differentiate leadership from authoritarian control (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996). Inauthentic transformational leaders concentrate on the maintenance of follower dependence, while true transformational leaders act as mentors and coaches to develop their followers into leaders. Inauthentic transformational leaders encourage personal distance, invite blind obedience, encourage favoritism and competition, and exploit feelings of followers to
maintain deference (Sankowsky, 1995). While both authentic and inauthentic transformational leaders may have a need for power, the authentic transformational leader will convert this need into attainable goals for the good of the organization and the follower. The inauthentic leader works only to increase that power while looking condescendingly on his/her followers and pretending to be helpful. Table 1 concisely outlines the differences between authentic and inauthentic transformational leadership along the four constructs of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Bass summarizes the difference between authentic and inauthentic transformational leadership nicely in an essay in Ciulla’s Ethics, the Heart of Leadership (1998). Bass discusses that leaders are only transformational when they focus on what is right and good; when they focus on the needs of the follower to self-actualize and achieve; when they encourage and develop morality within their followers; and when they motivate their followers to put aside selfish interests and concentrate on the good of the group, organization, or society. Those leaders who are not truly transformational may also transform and motivate their followers. Such leaders, however, do so for their special interests at others’ expense, not focusing on what is good for the whole. They promote fantasy and rationalization in place of achievement. They encourage a type of unhealthy competitiveness, an “us versus them” attitude that serves the leader’s self-interests. They generate envy and hate instead of harmony and cooperation. Perhaps most importantly, Bass points out that this discussion is about two ideal types, and that most leaders fall somewhere in between (Bass, 1998). For each of the four constructs of transformational leadership, the simple difference between an authentic
transformational leader and an inauthentic transformational leader comes down to ethics.

Table 1

Comparison of Authentic and Inauthentic Transformational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authentic Transformational</th>
<th>Inauthentic Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idealized Influence</strong></td>
<td>Universal brotherhood, confidence, high standards for emulation, ethical policies and processes</td>
<td>Us vs. them, seek power and position at expense of followers, behavior does not match self-professed image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Stimulation</strong></td>
<td>Question assumptions, decisions based on merits of issues, generate creative solutions, rational discourse</td>
<td>False logic, overweight authority, underweight reason, control the agenda, emotional argumentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspirational Motivation</strong></td>
<td>Harmony, charity, good works, shared goals, look for the best in people, social orientation</td>
<td>Plots, conspiracies, excuses, insecurities, look for the worst in people, offer empowerment but treat as children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualized Consideration</strong></td>
<td>Altruism, turn followers into leaders, socially directed need for power</td>
<td>Authoritarian, maintain dependence, expect blind obedience, favoritism, competition, self-aggrandizing need for power, treat all followers the same while espousing individualized treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Authentic Transformational Leadership**

To be viewed as transformational in both Bass’ (1985) and Burns’ (1978) conceptualizations, it is necessary that a leader be authentic. Authentic leadership lends itself more closely to transformational leadership than other forms of leadership. Transformational leaders have been depicted as being optimistic, hopeful, developmentally-oriented, and of high moral character (Bass, 1998), all of which
describe authentic leaders (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Furthermore, Avolio and Gardner (2005) show that transformational and authentic leadership overlap on nine out of ten main dimensions of authentic leadership, and twenty-five out of twenty-nine sub-dimensions (see Table 2). Instead of arguing for a separation of the theories, as was their intention, they showed how very close in nature the two theories are. The one main dimension where authentic leadership may differ from transformational leadership is that of follower development. However Avolio and Gardner (2005) argue that transformational leaders may not actively set out to transform followers into leaders, but do so by being role models and that authentic leadership is much more relational, where both leader and follower are formed in their respective development. The idea that transformational leaders do not develop followers is antithetical to the very concept of transformational leadership. Burns (1978) describes a transforming leader as one that can comprehend not only the existing needs of followers but also mobilize within them newer motivations and aspirations to furnish a foundation for future leadership. Each sub-dimension of transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) has aspects of, or directly refers to follower development. The intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration constructs alone are primarily concerned with the development of followers.
Table 2

Avolio and Gardner’s (2005) Comparison of Authentic Leadership Development Theory with Transformational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authentic Leadership Components</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive psychological capital</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive moral perspective</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader self-awareness</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced processing</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational transparency</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic behavior</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership processes/behaviors</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive modeling</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and social identification</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional contagion</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting self-determination</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive social exchanges</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower self-awareness</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitions</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower self-regulation</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced processing</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational transparency</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Based upon this comparison, it is clear that ethics is a key aspect of transformational leadership, and thus not unique to authentic leadership theory. Regardless, unethical leaders can use transformational leadership to further their own agendas just as they can use other leadership styles unethically. Authentically transformational leaders, however, use the behaviors of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration in an ethical manner. Thus, authentic leadership theory, developed to emphasize an ethical component to leadership, does not add significantly to the transformational leadership theory construct. Following this discussion, it has become clear that we have not found new paradigms, but re-discovered an old one. The label of authentic transformational leadership is simply more descriptive and gives credit to the years of quality research.
behind it. As we add to research on authentic leadership, we are simply furthering research on transformational leadership, or more specifically, authentic transformational leadership. It would seem likely, based on the description of the authentic transformational leadership construct, that it could be considered an ideal form of leadership. It includes concepts relative to effectiveness and ethics, both key requirements for good leadership (Kellerman, 2000).

In the next section, I move to consideration of whether individuals do consider authentic transformational leadership as ideal. The concept of an ideal leader lies individually within each person, represented in his/her implicit leadership theory, and each person’s implicit theory of leadership will differ for any number of reasons. I will discuss implicit leadership theories relative to their formation and development, their content, and how their content may be altered.

Implicit Leadership Theories

Perceptions of leadership can be based on two alternative processes identified by Lord and Maher (1991). An inference-based perceptual process can be used to garner conclusions about leadership from observed, relevant events and outcomes; leadership is inferred from outcomes of salient events. These processes rely upon attribution, such as a successful business turnaround being attributed to the top management team or CEO (Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quinanilla & Dorfman, 1999). In contrast, recognition-based perceptual processes rely on the degree of fit between observed leader behavior and a person’s implicit theory of what a leader is or should be. When there is a fit between observed behavior and one’s personal theory of leadership, the individual exhibiting the behavior is recognized as a good leader. This use of
implicit leadership theory as a guide for understanding and interpreting leader behavior is the focus of this study.

Implicit theories are cognitive frameworks or categorization systems that people use during information processing to encode, process, and recall specific events and behavior (Shaw, 1990). People have their own unique thoughts as to the nature of leaders and leadership. A person's implicit leadership theory is based on beliefs on how leaders generally behave and what is expected of them (Eden & Leviathan, 1975). Implicit leadership theory suggests individuals are labeled as leaders or non-leaders based on cognitive categories (Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986; Calder, 1977).

Essentially, implicit leadership theories represent ideal instances of leadership (Lord et al., 1986). Individuals use implicit leadership theories as a cognitive simplifying mechanism. In essence, implicit leadership theories free up cognitive resources.

*Antecedents to Implicit Leadership Theories*

Implicit leadership theories come from many sources. Hunt, Boal, and Sorenson (1990) note that many different background variables such as personality traits may influence implicit leadership theories. Research suggests that five basic personality dimensions underlie all others (Digman, 1990): (1) agreeableness — the tendency to be sympathetic and helpful to others; (2) conscientiousness — the tendency to be reliable and punctual; (3) extroversion — the tendency to be active and talkative; (4) openness — the tendency to be open to ideas; and (5) neuroticism — the tendency to experience guilt and irrational ideas. Keller (1999) empirically used these five traits to show that individuals do characterize leaders as ideal that are similar to themselves,
demonstrating preferences in implicit leadership theory development. People form implicit leadership theories based on personality antecedents.

The significance of personality similarity for implicit leadership theories may be extended to demographic similarity in general. Demographic variables such as age, gender, and culture affect the way people view leaders and leadership, as individuals look to their respective groups as a basis for shared identity and social interaction (Mehra, Kilduff, & Brass, 1998). As leaders emerge from within one’s demographic group, they are viewed as more effective because of the similarity. As a result, the traits of that leader are likely to be included in the content of the follower’s implicit leadership theory.

In addition, Knights and Willmott (1992) suggest the institution itself shapes leaders to represent the ideal leader in terms of the organization’s culture. They posit that an institutional theory of leadership may be more appropriate than any study of traits, styles, or situational characteristics. Leadership processes are embedded in cultural assumptions and understood ideas about how both leaders and followers organize and structure relationships. Through work and leadership experience within the organization, leaders and followers develop an ideal form of leadership relative to their organization, which becomes part of their implicit leadership theories.

Leader effectiveness, as perceived by either leader or follower, also assists in forming implicit leadership theories, but does so differently than the other antecedents. Continued perceptions of situations where leaders are viewed as effective or ineffective may constantly reinforce or alter the contents of implicit leadership theories, whereas the other antecedents are more likely to be stable over time. Perceptions of leader
effectiveness have many positive organizational outcomes. These outcomes include trust (Robinson, 1996), organizational commitment (Conger, 1999), satisfaction (George & Jones, 1997), performance (Howell & Avolio, 1993), and organizational citizenship behaviors (Gardner & Schermerhorn, 2004). When a follower perceives a leader to be effective, greater levels of trust, organizational commitment, satisfaction, performance, and positive organizational citizenship behaviors are engendered. Followers include those leader behaviors into their implicit leadership theory. The leader effective leadership behaviors, those that followers would term good, excellent, trustworthy, and effective, produce the aforementioned positive organizational outcomes. Perceptions of leader effectiveness are an important element in the development of implicit leadership theories. This importance is due to both the continual reinforcement and alteration caused by leader effectiveness on implicit leadership theories, as well as the important organizational outcomes stemming from leader effectiveness.

**Categorization and Cognitive Prototypes**

Cognition studies, both individual and organizational, posit that individuals are subject to their environment and create cognitive maps to deal with the world around them (Weick, 1979). These schemes guide the observations and interpretations of the individual’s experiences. As a result, individuals use cognitive prototypes to categorize perceptions, a prototype being a collection of characteristic attributes or traits. Leadership prototypes (Lord & Maher, 1991) are identified as a result of categorization, which occurs in a process using cognitive categories or typifications (Schutz, 1973). In leadership categorization theory (Lord & Maher, 1991), it is argued that to be successful and exert influence in any leadership attempt, followers must perceive the person to be
a leader. Such a perception involves giving meaning or identity to an event, person, object or idea (i.e., categorization). Hence, the better the fit between the perceived leadership behaviors and the leadership prototype, the more likely this individual will be seen as a leader (Offerman, Kennedy & Wirtz, 1994; Foti & Luch, 1992). In other words, leadership perceptions are based on cognitive categorization processes in which perceivers match the perceived attributes of potential leaders they observe to an internal prototype of leadership categories (Foti & Luch, 1992).

Expectations and predictions of leadership are developed through these prototypes and categorizations, distinguishing good leaders from bad and effective from ineffective, based on the attributes and behaviors held within the implicit leadership theory of the observer (Lord & Maher, 1991). In effect, leadership is an outcome of cognitive processes in which people label individuals as leaders based on the fit between observed leader behavior and their own implicit theory of leadership. From this perspective, leadership only exists in the eyes of the follower.

Consequently, the center of study becomes a follower-focused approach, whereby follower perceptions of leaders and constructed implicit leadership theories are central to perceptions of leadership, not the leader him/herself. This approach differs from earlier leadership theories and allows for more diverse models of leadership depending on the variations in the implicit leadership theories of followers (Holmberg & Akerblom, 2006). When considering a follower-centric view of leadership, the implication is that the implicit theories of followers affect the implicit theories of leaders. Leadership does not exist in a vacuum; it requires not only leaders, but followers as well. When looking at followers as a cause of leadership, the interesting notion that
leaders take cues from their followers to enact certain follower-pleasing behaviors arises. One way in which these behaviors may be communicated to the leader is through the relationship between leader and follower. Exchanges occur between leaders and followers that cue leaders to follower leadership preferences, which reside in the follower's implicit leadership theory. The following section discusses this relationship, described in leader-member exchange theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

**Leader-Member Exchange**

A follower's implicit leadership theory cannot affect the leader's implicit leadership theory unless it is communicated directly to the leader. An exchange between the leader and the follower must occur for this to happen. The major thrust of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory is that various types of relationships form between leaders and followers, or members. LMX theory conceptualizes leadership as a process and focuses on the interactions between leaders and followers — the relationship is the focal point. The theory was first outlined in the works of Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975), Graen and Cashman (1975), and Graen (1976). It has since undergone several revisions, and is still a popular topic of research today (e.g., Chen, Lam, & Zhong, 2007; Erdogan & Enders, 2007; Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007; Kacmar, Zivnuska, & White, 2007).

The early version of LMX was known as vertical dyad linkage theory (Dansereau et al., 1975), where the focus of research was on the nature of vertical linkages leaders formed with each one of their followers. A leader’s relationship to the work unit as a whole is viewed as being made up of a series of vertical dyads, or individual working relationships with each of the leader’s followers. The exchanges between leader and
follower define their dyadic relationship. Researchers found two basic types of linkages, in-group and out-group. In-group relationships are based on expanded and negotiated role responsibilities. Out-group relationships are based on the formal employment contract. Subordinates become part of the in-group or out-group based on the quality of their relationship with the leader, including congruence of personality and other personal characteristics. Additionally, followers are able to select themselves into one group or the other based on their willingness to expand and negotiate their role responsibilities with the leader. Those followers interested in working with the leader and negotiating what the follower will do for the group as a whole can become part of the in-group. These negotiations involve activities that go beyond the formal employment contract. When followers are willing to negotiate their roles and do more for the leader and the organization, the leader also does more for the subordinate, including opening communication lines and providing access to valuable resources. Followers not interested in negotiating their role responsibilities become part of the out-group. In-group followers obtain more information, influence, confidence, and concern from their leaders than do out-group members. As well, in-group members tend to be more dependable, involved, and communicative than out-group members. Those followers of the out-group simply come to work, do their job, and go home (Dansereau et al., 1975).

Organizational effectiveness studies were conducted, predicated on the relationships described in vertical dyad linkage theory. The quality of leader-member exchanges was related to positive outcomes for leaders, followers, group, and the organization (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). High quality leader-member exchanges produced less employee turnover, more positive performance evaluations, higher
frequency of promotions, greater organizational commitment, more desirable work assignments, better job attitudes, more attention and support from the leader, greater participation, and faster career progress over 25 years (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993).

Findings from such studies provided the impetus for modern research on LMX theory. Modern LMX research has involved a multitude of areas such as attitudinal similarity (Turban, Jones, & Rozelle, 1990), demographic similarity (Liden et al., 1993), job satisfaction (Major, Kozlowski, Chao, & Gardner, 1995), perceived similarity (Liden et al., 1993), organizational climate (Kozlowski and Doherty, 1989), organizational commitment (Green, Anderson, & Shivers, 1996), performance appraisal (Liden et al., 1993), well-being (Epitropaki & Martin, 1999), work attitudes (Erdogan, Kraimer, & Liden, 2002), and worker productivity (Scandura & Graen, 1984).

Graen and Uhl-Bien (1991) emphasized that leaders should attempt to develop high-quality exchange relationships with all of their followers, though it may not always be possible or likely. They promoted building partnerships in which the leader attempts to create effective dyads with each subordinate (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Their research provided additional information on characteristics of the relationship as it progressed over time. Early stages of the LMX relationship are considered to be low-quality and closely resembling an out group relationship, limited to exchanges written out in the employment contract (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Over time the relationships become more similar to in-group relationships, characterized as high quality. Leaders give the followers support beyond what would be found in a formal or contractual relationship, and followers are given more responsibility and autonomy. High quality
leader-member exchanges describe a relationship between leader and follower that marks trust, communication, and reciprocity.

*Implicit leadership Theories and Leader-Member Exchange*

Leaders’ implicit leadership theories provide the foundation for interpreting and guiding their own behavior. Lord and Maher (1993) suggest that followers use their own implicit leadership theories to interpret the behavior of their dyad partner, the leader. Implicit leadership theories act as an uncertainty reduction mechanism within the relationship such that leaders and followers alike use their own and the other’s implicit theory (to the degree they are aware of the content) to respond to one another. In sum, implicit leadership theories are important to the follower, the leader, and to the relationship between the two.

In a longitudinal study, Epitropaki and Martin (2005) showed that the closer employees perceived their actual manager’s profile to be to the implicit leadership theories the employees endorsed (dyadic congruence), the better the quality of leader member-exchange, leading to such outcomes as employees’ organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and well-being. This study demonstrates that implicit leadership theory dyadic congruence is important between leader and follower. This link between implicit leadership theory dyadic congruence and leader-member exchange begs the question: which came first? It is certainly possible that dyadic congruence makes it easier to strengthen a leader-member exchange relationship, but it is also possible that the strengthening of the leader-member exchange relationship leads to leader-follower, implicit leadership theory, dyadic congruence.
To be perceived as a leader, a follower needs to recognize leadership within an individual. When someone is labeled as a leader, perceivers use their implicit leadership theories as a starting point for retrieving previously observed leadership behaviors and often experience trouble distinguishing between observed and unobserved behaviors that are prototypical of leadership, stressing the importance of the leader-member exchange relationship (Lord & Emrich, 2001). The closer the leader and the follower are, the less ambiguity there is for the follower as he or she tries to distinguish leader prototypes. This notion that followers have problems distinguishing between observed and unobserved behaviors shows that perceptions of leadership entail wide-ranging interpretations of behavior and situational factors, are complex, and that follower perceptions of leadership are more accurate when they are able to closely observe the leader’s behavior. Furthermore, the leader is better equipped to learn the follower’s wishes concerning leadership and take cues from the follower for his/her own behavior when their relationship quality is good. This information will enable the leader to change his or her behavior as needed, resulting in a more effective leader evaluation; however, the role of metacognitive processes is key to this behavior change.

Metacognitive Processes

Metacognitions represent higher level cognitive structures that control moment-to-moment cognitions (Lord & Emrich, 2001). They control the cognitive contexts that influence thought and behavior; thus, are significant to the discussion of substantial changes in leader behavior.

In a review of cognitive literature research, Lord and Emrich (2001) outline several important studies of metacognitive processes and leadership (Wofford &
Goodwin, 1994; Wofford, Joplin, & Comforth, 1996; Offermann, Schroyer, & Green, 1998; Wofford, Goodwin, & Whittington, 1998). In their review, they point to a significant theoretical basis for studying metacognitive processes that was developed by Wofford and Goodwin (1994). It is their assertion that leader behavior finds its basis in the activation of scripts, which are goal-oriented structures with different tracts or elements. According to Wofford and Goodwin (1994), leaders use suitable scripts to assist them in assimilating environmental information and their own thoughts to produce behavior.

In an empirical study to test Wofford and Goodwin’s (1994) metacognitive theory, Wofford, Joplin, and Comforth (1996) found that leaders changed to more directive scripts when feedback uncovered problems and group members were thought to have low motivation and ability. Furthermore, a linkage between cognitions and behavior was supported through correlations of behavioral intentions and new script tracks. In other words, leaders behaved according to their cognitions, which were affected by feedback from followers. Consistent with their research, Offermann, Schroyer, and Green (1998) also found that leaders shift their behavior based on feedback. Using an attribution theory perspective, they gave leaders feedback about their groups (they had performed well or poorly) and gave one of three explanations (effort, ability, or luck). As part of their procedure, they used videotapes of interactions that indicated increased talkativeness and negative comments after failure resulting from low effort or after success resulting from luck. Their results showed punishment recommendations (behavioral intentions of the leader) were highest when poor performance (feedback) was combined with ability or effort (causal attributions). These results indicate that
performance feedback and causal attributions influenced the behavioral intentions of leaders, representing the metacognitive processes of leaders. Leaders changed their behavior based on feedback from followers. This change in behavior is representative of a change in the leader’s metacognitive processes.

Metacognitive processes of leaders were further examined in the field by Wofford, Goodwin, and Whittington (1998). They used content analysis of open-ended questions to build measures of leader schemas and scripts, and obtained behavioral reports of leaders' behavioral styles from the followers. Their results indicated that transformational self-schema and motivational schema (as measured through the content analysis of open-ended questions answered by the leaders) were indicators of leader transformational cognitions, which related to transformational leadership behavior (as perceived by the follower). In addition, transactional motivational schema and self-schema representing management-by-exception cognitions were related to transactional management-by-exception behavior (as perceived by the follower).

Brown’s (2000) discussion of metacognitions and their relationship to behavior sheds additional light on this discussion. Results of research reveal that motivational orientations of leaders affect metacognitive processes in subordinates, in turn regulating subordinates' task behavior. Subordinates performed an experimental task two weeks after measuring their perceptions of the supervisors’ motivational orientation. Results indicated the motivational orientation of the supervisors had a strong effect on the metacognitive processes of the subordinates, as indicated by a change in subordinate task behavior. Followers change their behavior based on what their supervisors think.
In summary, these studies indicate that leaders and followers use metacognitive processes to guide behavior. They show that certain features of their dyadic partner (leader or follower) provide significant input to the content of metacognitions. An individual’s implicit leadership theory can be altered through feedback from others as well as through self-feedback obtained from observation of self (and/or aspects) of the environment. Furthermore, there is an implication for evaluation of leader effectiveness based on the content of individual implicit leadership theory. The follower’s implicit theory must contain information that acknowledges effective leadership can be described by the leader’s behavior. Put simply, the leader’s and follower’s implicit leadership theories must contain similar information in order for the follower to consider the leader effective.

_Perceptions of Leader Effectiveness_

Researchers studying the transformational leadership paradigm (e.g. Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Burns, 1978) have posited that transformational leadership is more effective than other forms of leadership in terms of encouraging followers to achieve higher levels of performance (Berson & Avolio, 2004). Lowe, Kroeck, and Sivasubramaniam (1996) conducted a meta-analysis including research on transformational and transactional leadership. They found that transformational leadership was perceived to be more effective, producing better work outcomes than transactional leadership.

Other research illustrates the significance of the LMX relationship and implicit leadership theories for leader effectiveness. Pierro, Cicero, Bonaiuto, van Knippenberg, and Kruglanski (2005) found a significant, positive relationship between leader group
prototypicality and leader effectiveness. Leader group prototypicality is the extent to which a leader is representative of the group or organizational identity (Hogg, 2001). With high quality LMX relationships, it would stand to reason that leader group prototypicality would be strong. van Knippenberg and van Knippenberg (2005) found this proposition to be true. Group prototypical followers were a part of the in-group, illustrating a basic tenet in LMX research. The closer the relationship between leader and subordinates, the more likely the leader is to be representative of the group as a whole; personality and personal determinants are significant factors in determining LMX relationships (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). As the bond between leader and follower grows stronger, the more alike they will tend to be. The leader will have high-quality LMX relationships with his/her various followers, and will develop a more prototypical group identity. Leader effectiveness is evaluated more positively as a result. A number of additional studies report similar results. For example, prototypical group members are more likely to emerge as leaders (Fielding & Hogg, 1997; van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, & van Dijk, 2000) and are more influential and effective (Hains, Hogg, & Duck, 1997; Hogg, Hains, & Mason, 1998; Platow & van Knippenberg, 2001; Platow, van Knippenberg, Haslam, van Knippenberg, & Spears, 2002; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2003). In all, situations marked by group prototypical leaders with high quality LMX relationships are more likely to be seen as effective by their followers, leading to positive organizational outcomes. Perceptions of leader effectiveness in turn influence a follower’s implicit leadership theory.
Towards a Follower-Centric Approach to Authentic Transformational Leadership

These research results suggest the importance of the follower to studies of leadership, which has historically been leader-centric in focus throughout the past several decades, focusing on leader traits, styles, and behaviors (Yukl, 2002). Recently, leadership has begun to be examined more through the eyes of the follower (Lord & Emrich, 2001). Both Avolio (2007) and Grint (2000) direct attention to the dearth of follower-focused research, arguing that leadership studies as a whole have suffered and are incomplete at best because followers have been excluded. In addition, Lord, Brown, and Frieberg (2001) aver that there is a largely unexamined source of variance in the leadership process due to the exclusion of the follower in many research studies. Grint (2005) points out that if good followers do nothing, leadership will fail; in fact, followers teach leadership to leaders. Howell and Shamir (2005) concluded that followers actually are heavily and actively responsible for creating the leadership relationship, giving power to the leader, influencing his or her behavior, and determining the outcomes.

Research on transformational leadership is no exception. Avolio (2007) identified only three published studies that focused on the follower’s relationship to leadership and work outcomes. Dvir and Shamir (2003) looked at follower developmental characteristics as predictors of transformational leadership. Ehrhart and Klein (2001) found that followers scoring high in achievement orientation, self-esteem, and risk-taking were more likely to be drawn to transformational leaders, and Wofford, Whittington, and Goodwin (2001) looked at follower motive patterns as situational moderators for transformational leadership. LMX theory, however, is often examined in
conjunction with transformational leadership (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), providing an exception to the lack of follower-focused research. Using LMX theory as a means of describing how followers may ultimately influence leaders’ implicit leadership theories provides greater opportunity to examine a follower’s input to the leadership process.

Overview of the Research Model

Authentic transformational leadership is an ideal form of leadership in which leaders use the transformational behaviors of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration in an ethical manner. Using both ethical and transformational leadership behaviors removes the vices of an inauthentic transformational leader, or a leader who appears to be transformational through enacting transformational behaviors but who has unethical motives.

Implicit leadership theories are ideal instances of leadership, a person’s own unique thoughts as to the nature of leaders and leadership. Leadership is an outcome of cognitive processes in which people label individuals as leaders based on the fit between observed leader behavior and their own implicit theory of leadership. If a leader’s implicit leadership theory contains authentic transformational leader content, his or her behavior will reflect that.

In order to change leader behavior, implicit leadership theories must be changed. A change in a leader’s implicit leadership theory can occur when a leader observes his or her followers’ implicit theories of leadership, finding out what it is the follower expects of him or her. The influence of a follower’s implicit leadership theory on a leader’s implicit leadership theory is influenced by a strong leader-member exchange.
relationship which is marked by trust, communication, and reciprocity. Feedback on leader behavior from followers through the leader-member exchange relationship is one mechanism through which the leader’s implicit leadership theory is affected. Furthermore, self-observations of their own effective or ineffective behaviors may affect their implicit leadership theory.

Authentic transformational leadership behaviors, however, are only seen as effective leader behaviors by followers if such behaviors are incorporated into a follower’s implicit leadership theory. Development of implicit leadership theories is an ongoing process involving cognitive matches between leader behavior and previous categorizations of ideal leader behavior. New observations of effective leader behavior influence current categorizations of leadership.

A subset of the theoretical model, the research model, can be found in Figure 2. The research model excludes antecedents to implicit leadership theory, and the non-recursive relationship between leader implicit leadership theory and authentic transformational leadership behavior, focusing instead only on the effect of leader implicit leadership theory on authentic transformational behavior. The following hypotheses represent the relationships in the theoretical model to be tested, which are derived from the arguments presented.
Hypotheses

**Hypothesis 1:** Leader implicit leadership theories influence authentic transformational leader behavior. Specifically, there is an expectation of consistency between a leader’s implicit leadership theory and a leader’s behavior.

**Hypothesis 2:** The relationship between leader authentic transformational leader behaviors and leader effectiveness is influenced by follower implicit leadership theories. In order for followers to see authentic transformational leadership behaviors as effective, those behaviors must reside within their implicit leadership theory.

**Hypothesis 3:** Feedback on leader effectiveness has an effect on the content of follower implicit leadership theories. When followers receive information that their leaders are effective, they include those effective behaviors into their implicit leadership theory.
Hypothesis 4: Feedback on leader effectiveness influences the content of the leader’s implicit leadership theory. When leaders receive feedback that their current behaviors are effective, the content of their implicit leadership theory is reinforced. When leaders receive feedback that their current behaviors are ineffective, those behaviors are removed from their implicit leadership theory.

Hypothesis 5: The leader-member exchange (LMX) relationship influences the relationship between follower implicit leadership theories and leader implicit leadership theories. Specifically, when LMX is high, a leader will take cues from the follower and adjust his/her behavior. When LMX is low, the leader will not.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provides a review of authentic leadership development and transformational leadership literature and outlines an ideal of leadership, authentic transformational leadership behavior. It discusses the influence of the leader’s implicit leadership theory on authentic transformational leadership behaviors, and outlines the relationship between those behaviors and leader effectiveness. Included is a discussion of the relationship between leader effectiveness, implicit leadership theories (both the leader’s and follower’s), and leader-member exchange.
The bulk of this chapter describes the methodology in detail used in the pilot studies. The methodology for the main study incorporated necessary changes made after analyzing results of the pilot studies, but otherwise following the same design, methods, and procedure. For the pilot studies, the sample is described first, followed by a discussion of the measures used, including manipulations and dependent variables. The research designs are described next followed by the manipulation checks. After the procedure is described, I discuss the modifications to the main study that were made based on the results of the pilot studies. IRB approval is included in Appendix A1 and subsequent appendices are references as their content is discussed in the body of the chapter.

Two pilot studies were run for several reasons. I wrote multiple original scenarios to test the five hypotheses. The manipulations in these scenarios were based in part on known measures that assessed variables I wanted to manipulate. In addition, instruments to test the dependent variables were also based both on known measures and measures I created. The purpose of the first pilot study was to measure the validity of the scenarios/manipulations and to obtain reliabilities and establish validities for the dependent variable measures. Furthermore, WebCT was used as a delivery tool for the study. This tool incorporates an electronic, web-based format previously unused to collect this type of data. WebCT is typically used for classroom support and the delivery of online coursework, with the ability to securely administer content and exams to students. The first pilot study was instrumental for learning the intricacies of this
program and ensuring subjects were easily able to access and use the program. It was also necessary to ensure WebCT could be used without contaminating data collected, verifying the validity of its use. Before the first pilot study, the scenarios and measures were sent to five experts in the field of leadership to verify construct validity. Changes based on their comments were incorporated into the scenarios where appropriate.

Pilot Study 1

Sample

The sample used in the first pilot study consisted of 220 undergraduate students enrolled in online classes, reflecting a 73% response rate. The sample was comprised of primarily juniors and seniors in college; 64% consisted of females and 72% were under the age of 25. Fifty-seven percent had at least one year of full-time work experience. Ninety-one percent reported having at least one year of leadership experience (as indicated by committee chair experience, club leadership experience, and experience in managing other people in a work setting). Forty-seven percent of subjects had taken a course in ethics.

I wanted to discern whether or not the demographic variables of age, gender, and classification have an effect on perceptions of leadership and a person’s implicit leadership theory. It is possible that the various age groups may respond differently, their implicit leadership theories either still in formation or having already been formed (Lord & Maher, 1991). Men and women may also view implicit leadership theories differently. In addition, the amount of work experience a respondent has may alter his/her implicit leadership theory; those with more experience may have been more likely to be exposed to a greater number of leadership styles. Furthermore, a person’s
own leadership experience also may affect the content of his/her implicit leadership theory, having observed the effectiveness (or lack thereof) of his/her own past behavior. Finally, authentic transformational leadership is a leadership behavior with an ethical foundation. Subjects who have taken a course in ethics may respond differently to such behavior than subjects who have not.

WebCT has a survey tool, which was used to collect the demographic data. Unknown at the time of data collection, the survey tool in WebCT collects anonymous data, so the six-digit identification number assigned to each student was not attached to the demographic data, and therefore, could not be linked to survey data. Due to the error in data collection, the demographic control factors were unable to be considered in my analysis. As a result, only the summary data were obtained.

**Manipulations**

*Hypothesis 1: Leader implicit leadership theories influence authentic transformational leader behavior.*

Scenarios were developed to test hypothesis 1, describing a leader’s implicit leadership theory, with either authentic transformational (ATF) or transactional (TA) components, and a description of the leader’s behavior in a situation, either congruent or non-congruent with the leader’s beliefs. The ATF implicit leadership theory was described based on an ethical leadership measure developed by Brown, Trevino, and Harrison (2005; $\alpha=.90$) and transformational items from the MLQ 5x (Bass & Avolio, 1990). In a meta-analysis by Judge and Piccolo (2005), they found mean reliabilities of .90 for the transformational dimensions of the MLQ 5x. Transformational items from the MLQ 5x and items from the ethical measure were used to create the scenarios. For
example, in Brown et al.’s (2005) ethical leadership measure, the first item is “Conducts h/h life in an ethical manner.” A sentence was wrote for the scenario that reads “Frank believes that a leader should conduct his life in an ethical manner.” In the case of the MLQ 5x, for part of the intellectual stimulation component of transformational leadership, the item “I emphasize the value of questioning assumptions” was taken to write a sentence reading “Frank also thinks a leader should emphasize the value of questioning assumptions.” The same was done for the transactional implicit leadership description.

One condition was created that showed congruence between a leader’s implicit leadership theory (LILT) and the leader’s ATF behavior, and a second condition that showed non-congruence. In addition, congruent and non-congruent conditions were created to incorporate transactional leader behavior in order to see if the effects obtained were applicable only to ATF behaviors or whether they also were obtained for a different style of leadership. Comparing across the two styles should indicate whether or not the leadership style itself had an effect. It is my contention that there is an expectation for congruence between LILT and leader behavior, regardless of leadership style. In other words, subjects believe that a leader will act in accordance with his beliefs, regardless if the leader enacts ATF or transactional leadership styles. People expect leaders to enact leadership behaviors congruent with their implicit leadership theory (see Appendix B1-A).
**Hypothesis 2:** The relationship between leader authentic transformational leader behaviors and leader effectiveness is influenced by follower implicit leadership theories.

Two conditions were created using ATF behaviors. In one condition, the implicit leadership theories (ILT) of both the leader and the follower contained ATF leadership behavior content. In the second condition, the LILT contained ATF leadership behavior content, but the follower’s implicit leadership theory (FILT) did not. ATF leadership behaviors were described based on an ethical leadership measure developed by Brown, Trevino, and Harrison (2005; \( \alpha = .90 \)) and transformational items from the MLQ 5x (Bass & Avolio, 1990) in the same manner as described with hypothesis 1. The congruence/non-congruence conditions were created by including in each scenario a description of the LILT content and then a description of a follower who either agreed or disagreed with the leader’s behavior style (i.e., LILT content and FILT content contained similar information about leader behavior). See Appendix B2-A, scenarios 2.1 and 2.2.

Similar to hypothesis 1, it was necessary to determine if the congruence between LILT and FILT was necessary in order for the leader to be judged effective when leadership styles that are different from ATF were demonstrated. My intention was to have two conditions of a leadership style that were authentic transformational (LILT-FILT congruent, LILT-FILT non-congruent), two conditions that were non-authentic/non-transformational (LILT-FILT congruent, LILT-FILT non-congruent) and two conditions of unethical transactional leadership (LILT-FILT congruent, LILT-FILT non-congruent). The non-authentic/non-transformational (non-ATF) leadership style was described as the opposite of authentic transformational. The unethical transactional leadership style
scenario was created in order to describe a leader who was unethical (opposite of the ethical component of authentic transformational leadership) and who used a different style of leadership that may or may not be judged as effective (i.e., transactional leadership behavior). I used three different leadership styles because I wanted to rule out style as a possible reason for the results. My intention was to have one ATF style, and two styles that simply were not ATF. The result ended in one style opposite of ATF and one style different than ATF. If there was no significant difference in results for leadership style, I would be able to conclude that congruence produced the effect, and not the leadership style.

I inadvertently left out the non-ATF/congruent and the unethical transactional/non-congruent conditions. Therefore, I was not able to make all possible comparisons between conditions. The comparisons I did make are explained when I present the pilot study results. For the unethical transactional scenario, I again based the scenario content on the Brown et al. (2005) measure and the transactional items from the MLQ 5x (Bass and Avolio, 1990). The mean transactional dimension reliability obtained for the MLQ 5x is .75 (Judge and Piccolo, 2005). The non-ATF scenario was written by describing a leader who exhibited behaviors contrary to transformational and ethical items from the MLQ 5x and the Brown et al. (2005) ethical measure. The process for manipulating congruence was similar to that described earlier for the ATF scenarios (see Appendices B2-A, scenarios 2.3 and 2.4).
Hypothesis 3: Feedback on leader effectiveness has an effect on the content of follower implicit leadership theories.

Leader effectiveness was manipulated in the pilot study using four items based on an effectiveness measure developed by van Knippenberg and van Knippenberg (2005; $\alpha = .93$). Each item was transformed into a sentence to include in the scenario describing a leader’s effectiveness. For example, in the effective condition, the scenario read “Joe completely trusts Frank, and has been heard to comment that Frank is an excellent supervisor” (Joe is the follower and Frank is the leader). For the ineffective condition, the same sentence reads “Joe, however, does not trust Frank and has been heard to comment that Frank is a terrible supervisor” (see Appendix B3-A).

Hypothesis 4: Feedback on leader effectiveness influences the content of the leader’s implicit leadership theory.

Leader effectiveness was manipulated by describing feedback that informed the reader of a leadership evaluation that was either positive or negative in cases where the leader either a) tried new leader behaviors or b) utilized the same leadership behaviors he had been using (see Appendix B4-A).

The purpose for developing scenarios that describe feedback on new behaviors recently implemented compared to behaviors that had been used over time was to determine if feedback on new behaviors had the same effect on LILT content as feedback on current behaviors (which may be more likely to be represented in the leader’s ILT than new behaviors). This variation in the manipulation removed the possibility for an alternative explanation for results.
Hypothesis 5: The leader-member exchange (LMX) relationship influences the relationship between follower implicit leadership theories and leader implicit leadership theories.

Leader-member exchange was manipulated in the pilot study by transforming questions from the LMX-7 (Scandura & Graen, 1984; $\alpha = .91$) to scenarios. For example, in the high LMX condition, the item “How well does your manager understand your job problems and needs?” was transformed into “Frank knows a great deal about Joe’s job problems and needs.” In the low LMX condition, the same sentence reads “Frank doesn’t know about Joe’s job problems and needs” (Frank is the leader and Joe is the follower). See Appendix B5-A.

Dependent Variable Measures

Five different dependent variables were measured, in accordance with the five hypotheses tested. Each measure utilized a 5-point Likert scale. Table 3 reports the means, standard deviations, and reliabilities for dependent variable measures across all scenarios.
Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations and Reliabilities for Dependent Variable Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Consistency between leader beliefs and behavior</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Consistency between leader beliefs and behavior</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Consistency between leader beliefs and behavior</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Consistency between leader beliefs and behavior</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Perceptions of leader effectiveness</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Perceptions of leader effectiveness</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Perceptions of leader effectiveness</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Perceptions of leader effectiveness</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 FILT Content</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 FILT Content</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 LILT Content—changed behavior</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 LILT Content—changed behavior</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 LILT Content—current behavior</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 LILT Content—current behavior</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 LILT Content</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 LILT Content</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 1:** Leader implicit leadership theories influence authentic transformational leader behavior.

The belief that a leader’s implicit leadership theory is consistent with the leader’s behavior was measured using four items developed for this study. The goal was to measure the degree to which subjects believed a leader’s actions would reflect his/her beliefs about leadership using scenarios that manipulated this relationship. Each item was measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Total scale scores were obtained by taking a mean of each subject’s answers (see Appendices B1-B and B1-C).
Hypothesis 2: The relationship between leader authentic transformational leader behaviors and leader effectiveness is influenced by follower implicit leadership theories.

Followers’ opinions about their leaders’ effectiveness were expected to be contingent upon whether the content of FILT was consistent with LILT (assuming the leader’s behavior was representative of his/ her ILT). After reading scenarios that manipulated varying combinations of the independent and moderator variables, leadership effectiveness was assessed. Responses were obtained across four items, each measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal) (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). This measure was chosen due to its short length and successful use in past studies (e.g., Pierro et al, 2005). Total scale scores were obtained by taking a mean of each subject’s answers (see Appendix B2-B).

Hypothesis 3: Feedback on leader effectiveness has an effect on the content of follower implicit leadership theories.

After reading scenarios to manipulate this relationship, subjects were asked to give their opinion as to whether FILT would change based on feedback. Responses to six items measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal). This measure was developed specifically for this experiment. Total scale scores were based on the mean of each subject’s answers (see Appendix B3-B).

Hypothesis 4: Feedback on leader effectiveness influences the content of the leader’s implicit leadership theory.

After reading scenarios to manipulate this relationship subjects were asked to give their opinion as to whether LILT would change based on feedback. Responses
were obtained to six items measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal). This measure was developed specifically for this experiment. Total scale scores were based on the mean of each subject’s answers (see Appendix B4-B).

Hypothesis 5: The leader-member exchange (LMX) relationship influences the relationship between follower implicit leadership theories and leader implicit leadership theories.

Scenarios manipulated the relationship between FILT and LILT at different levels of LMX quality. Perceptions that the content of LILT would be influenced by the content of FILT depending on the LMX relationship between followers and leaders was obtained from responses to eight items on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal). This measure was developed specifically for this experiment. Total scale scores were based on the mean of each subject’s answers (see Appendix B5-B).

Research Design

An experimental research design was used to examine perceptions of manipulated relationships proposed for this experiment (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Scenarios for each hypothesis were designed to allow for either a 2x2 factorial design or a single factor experimental design. The research design for each hypothesis is outlined in the following section.

Hypothesis 1—Leader implicit leadership theories influence authentic transformational leader behavior. Specifically, there is an expectation of consistency between a leader’s implicit leadership theory and a leader’s behavior.

The design for this hypothesis was a single-factor experimental design in which congruence between a leader’s beliefs and his actual behavior was manipulated for
each of two styles of leadership (ATF and transactional). A single-factor design was used rather than a 2x2 (congruence x leader style) because questions to assess the dependent variable were different between the two styles of leadership (see Appendix B1-A). Two scenarios described authentic transformational leadership behaviors (ATF Behavior), and two described transactional leadership behaviors. Two scenarios indicated congruence between a leader’s beliefs about leadership and actual behavior, and two scenarios indicated non-congruence between a leader’s beliefs about leadership and actual behavior. An instrument was administered to assess the follower’s perception as to whether the leader would or would not act as described based on his/her beliefs about leadership (consistency). See Appendices B1-B and B1-C.

Dependent variable — Perception of consistency between leader beliefs (ILT) and behavior

Manipulations:

Condition 1.1: Congruence between LILT content and ATF
Condition 1.2: Non-congruence between LILT content and ATF
Condition 1.3: Congruence between LILT content and transactional leader behavior
Condition 1.4: Non-congruence between LILT content and transactional leader behavior

Hypothesis 2 — The relationship between leader authentic transformational leader behavior and leader effectiveness is influenced by follower implicit leadership theories. In order for a follower to evaluate authentic transformational leadership behaviors as effective, those behaviors must reside within the follower’s implicit leadership theory.
The design for this hypothesis should have been a 2x3 (congruence x leader behavior) design in which congruence between FILT and LILT was manipulated for each of three styles of leadership (ATF; non-ATF; unethical transactional). Only four of the six conditions were included in the pilot study (explained earlier, see page 66), two scenarios represented conditions that varied based on the congruence between FILT and LILT where LILT contained ATF behaviors (one condition of congruence, one condition of non-congruence). For non-ATF behaviors, I described a non-transformational leader without ethics and then I also described a leader who used transactional leadership behaviors and was unethical to represent a different leadership theory all together. For the non-ATF condition, the follower’s and leader’s ILTs are not congruent. For the transactional leader condition, their ILTs are congruent. My intention was to find out if perceptions of leader effectiveness (see Appendix B2-B) required congruence between LILT and FILT content relative to ATF behaviors as well as other non-ATF leader behaviors, or if results differ for different leader behaviors. Because of the two conditions I failed to include in my first pilot study (non-ATF/congruence; transactional behavior/non-congruence), I will not be able to establish from the design whether effects are unique to ATF behavior. Therefore, I included all six conditions in the second pilot study.

Dependent Variable — Perceptions that followers will see leader effectiveness

Manipulations:

Condition 2.1 — Non-congruence between LILT and FILT content (ATF)
Condition 2.2 — Congruence between LILT and FILT content (ATF)
Condition 2.3 — Non-congruence between LILT and FILT content (non-ATF)
Condition 2.4 — Congruence between LILT and FILT content (unethical transactional)

Hypothesis 3 — Leader effectiveness has an effect on the content of FILT. When followers see a leader as effective, the follower includes those effective behaviors into his/her implicit leadership theory.

In this hypothesis a single-factor experimental design was used. Two scenarios were constructed (see Appendix B3-A). One scenario described an effective leader, the other an ineffective leader. I assessed subjects’ beliefs about the degree to which leader effectiveness affects the content of the follower’s implicit leadership theory (FILT) (see Appendix B3-B).

Dependent Variable — Perceptions of the incorporation of leader behavior into FILT content

Manipulations:
Condition 3.1 — Effective leader
Condition 3.2 — Ineffective leader

Hypothesis 4 — Feedback on leader effectiveness influences the content of the leader’s implicit leadership theory. When leaders receive feedback that their current behaviors are effective, the content of their implicit leadership theory is reinforced. When leaders receive feedback that their current behaviors are ineffective, those behaviors are removed from their ILT. When leaders receive feedback that a new leadership behavior they have tried is effective, they incorporate that behavior into their ILT. When leaders receive feedback that a new leadership behavior they have tried is ineffective, they will not incorporate that behavior into their ILT.
To test this hypothesis, I used a 2x2 factorial design (feedback x behavior type) (see Appendix B4-A). Two scenarios described positive or negative feedback for a new leader behavior and two scenarios described positive or negative feedback for current leader behavior. I used this approach to help determine if a change in the content of the LILT affected a change in the FILT content more easily when feedback was based on a new behavior compared to feedback on a current behavior. An instrument was then administered to evaluate subjects’ perceptions of the effect of the feedback given to the leader on the content of his ILT (see Appendix B4-B).

Dependent Variable — Perceptions that a leader would alter his LILT Content

Manipulations:

Condition 4.1: Negative feedback on new behavior
Condition 4.2: Positive feedback on new behavior
Condition 4.3: Negative feedback on current behavior
Condition 4.4: Positive feedback on current behavior

Hypothesis 5 — The leader-member exchange (LMX) relationship influences the relationship between FILT and LILT. Specifically, when LMX is high, a leader will take cues from the follower and adjust his/her ILT. When LMX is low, the leader will not.

A single-factor experimental design was used to manipulate LMX quality. One scenario described a high-quality LMX relationship; the other described a low-quality LMX relationship (see Appendix B5-A). An instrument was then administered to measure subjects; beliefs that the content of LILT would be affected by the content of FILT (see Appendix B5-B).
Dependent Variable — Perceptions that LILT Content is affected by FILT

Manipulations:

Condition 5.1: High LMX

Condition 5.2: Low LMX

Procedure

Data was collected online over one week, via the assessment tool of WebCT. WebCT allows the researcher to have complete control over who accesses which surveys, in a certain order, at specific, time-limited hours and dates. An online release form that described the purpose of the study and asked for the subject’s consent through their agreement to continue with the study was provided as the first document viewed by subjects. This document also assured the confidentiality of their responses (See Appendix A). Each subject, through WebCT Vista, had a six-digit identification number that created the sense of anonymity because their names were not required.

Subjects were directed to the survey via the WebCT Vista homepage. All subjects were enrolled in an online course utilizing WebCT Vista. The survey (titled “Leadership Survey”) was set up as a “course,” and the students were “enrolled” into the survey the same way they would be enrolled into a regular online course. The WebCT Vista homepage gives them the option to pick which course they would like to view from a list of courses in which they are enrolled. Subjects had only two options, their current online course and the “Leadership Survey.” Their online course instructors informed them of the research opportunity, directing them to the survey. Subjects were given one week to access the survey, and received extra credit from their online instructor for doing so.
Subjects first accessed an introduction/instruction sheet (see Appendix A). Once the introduction/instruction sheet was completed and submitted, subjects were then able to access the next survey, which appeared to them automatically. Due to access restrictions made possible by WebCT, subjects were not able to revisit previously completed sections, nor were they able to go on to subsequent sections until previous sections were completed. Subjects viewed and/or responded to five documents in order—an introduction/instruction sheet, a survey, manipulation checks, a demographic data sheet, and a debriefing form. Subjects were randomly assigned to sixteen different groups, representing sixteen separate conditions used to test all five hypotheses. Subjects could only access the surveys assigned to their group and could not view other subjects’ answers. Once the survey was completed, subjects could not access the survey again.

Manipulation Checks for the Pilot Study

Manipulation checks for each scenario were conducted to verify the validity of the created scenarios. The following section outlines the reasoning and results for each set of manipulations by hypothesis. Changes based on these manipulation checks are discussed later in this chapter. Questions for manipulation checks can be found in Appendix C.

Hypothesis 1: Leader implicit leadership theories influence authentic transformational leader behavior.

Congruence between LILT content and leader behavior was manipulated across four scenarios. In two scenarios, a leader who believes a leader should enact ATF behaviors was described. In one scenario, the leader behaves congruently with his
beliefs; in the second, the leader does not. In order to ensure that the leader’s behaviors correctly depicted his ATF beliefs (or not), responses to four questions on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal) were averaged to obtain a total scale score. In a comparison of means, a significant difference was found between the congruent behavior condition (mean = 4.10, $SD = .73$) and the non-congruent condition (mean = 2.23, $SD = .87$) ($t = 5.72$, $p < .001$). These results support the manipulation by showing that in the congruent-ATF condition, behaviors did represent a leader’s ATF beliefs and in the non-congruent-ATF condition, they did not (see Appendix C-1).

In the other two scenarios, a leader was described who believes a leader should exhibit transactional behaviors. In one scenario, the leader behaves congruently with his beliefs, in the second the leader does not. In order to ensure that the leader’s behaviors correctly depicted his transactional beliefs (or not), responses to six questions on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal) were averaged to obtain a total scale score. In a comparison of means, significant differences were found between the congruent behavior condition (mean = 3.10, $SD = .73$) and the non-congruent condition (mean = 1.81, $SD = 1.15$) ($t = 3.13$, $p < .005$). The manipulation of congruency of transactional beliefs with transactional behavior was supported. In the congruent/transactional condition, behaviors did represent a leader’s transactional beliefs and in the non-congruent/transactional condition, they did not (see Appendix C-1).
Hypothesis 2: The relationship between leader authentic transformational leader behaviors and leader effectiveness is influenced by follower implicit leadership theories.

To test hypothesis 2, scenarios were constructed that described different types of leader behavior and different levels of congruency between leaders’ and followers’ ILTs. Two scenarios described ATF behavior, scenarios 2.1 and 2.2. Five questions were asked to verify whether subjects agreed that the leader described in the scenario exhibited ATF behaviors (thus representing ATF in their ILTs). Responses were obtained on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal) and averaged to obtain a total scale score. High scores support the perception that the leader contained ATF content in his ILT. Low scores suggest subjects did not perceive ATF content in the leader’s ILT. Thus, the ATF condition should reflect high scores, and the non-ATF and transactional conditions should reflect low scores. Data for manipulation checks for scenario 2.2 were not collected due to an error made in setting the release criteria in WebCT Vista (subjects were unable to access the manipulation checks). Furthermore, two conditions were missing in the study (non-ATF/congruent and unethical transactional/non-congruent) as discussed previously. As a result, a comparison of means across all conditions was not possible.

One item was used to measure congruence between leader and follower ILTs, “To what degree do you think Joe believes a leader should behave the same way Frank does?” Again, because of problems with data collection for scenario 2.2, I was unable to check the congruence manipulation between conditions of congruence for ATF behavior (scenarios 2.1 and 2.2). Appendix C-2 contains questions for manipulation
checks. See the later section, Pilot Study Results and Changes Made in Data Collection, for modifications to this manipulation check.

**Hypothesis 3: Feedback on leader effectiveness has an effect on the content of follower implicit leadership theories.**

In order to assess the validity of the leader effectiveness manipulation described in scenarios 3.1 and 3.2, responses to four questions were obtained on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal) and averaged to obtain a total scale score. Significant differences in means were found between the effective leader condition (mean = 4.04, \(SD = .69\)) and the ineffective leader condition (mean = 2.31, \(SD = .92\)) (\(t=5.73, p < .001\)). Support was obtained for this manipulation (see Appendix C-3).

**Hypothesis 4: Feedback on leader effectiveness influences the content of the leader’s implicit leadership theory.**

In the scenarios for hypothesis 4, leader effectiveness was manipulated by feedback given on positive or negative leadership effectiveness. In order to assess the validity of the leader effectiveness feedback, responses to three questions were obtained on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal) and averaged to obtain a total scale score (see Appendix C-4). Two scenarios (4.1 and 4.2) provided feedback on leader behaviors that were new for the leader, one with a positive evaluation (mean = 2.93, \(SD = .63\)) and the second with a negative evaluation (mean = 1.67, \(SD = .63\)). Two other scenarios (4.3 and 4.4) provided feedback on current leadership behaviors, one with a positive evaluation (mean = 2.95, \(SD = .74\)) and the second with a negative evaluation (mean = 1.81, \(SD = .74\)). To determine if the effectiveness manipulation was viewed similarly regardless of whether the feedback on
effectiveness was given on current or new behavior, I conducted a two-way ANOVA. Supporting the manipulation, subjects did perceive a significant difference in feedback conditions, and there was no difference based on type of behavior (new or current). In addition, there was no interaction effect between feedback and behavior. Table 4 displays results of the two-way ANOVA. Results suggest no need for four conditions in the main study; therefore, I will only use scenarios 4.3 and 4.4 (see appendix B4-A) describing feedback on current behavior.

Table 4

*Results of Two-Way ANOVA for Hypothesis 4: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects*

*(Dependent Variable: Effectiveness)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>17.657a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.886</td>
<td>11.139</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>292.747</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>292.747</td>
<td>554.050</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>16.809</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.809</td>
<td>31.812</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback*Behavior</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>25.890</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>335.222</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>43.547</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a R squared = .405 (adjusted R squared = .369)*
Hypothesis 5: The leader-member exchange (LMX) relationship influences the relationship between follower implicit leadership theories and leader implicit leadership theories.

Leader-member exchange (LMX) was manipulated in two scenarios (scenarios 5.1 and 5.2), one indicating high LMX between leader and follower and one indicating low LMX between leader and follower. Responses to four questions were obtained on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal) and averaged to obtain a total scale score. Comparison of means indicated a significant difference between the high LMX condition (mean = 3.38, SD = .56) and the low LMX condition (mean = 2.24, SD = .72) \((t = 4.56, p = .001)\). Support was obtained for this manipulation (see Appendix C-5).

Pilot Study Results and Changes To Be Made in Data Collection

The following section reports results from the pilot study. Based on these results, reliabilities, and information gained from the manipulation checks, changes to the main study are outlined. Each hypothesis is taken in turn.

Hypothesis 1: Leader implicit leadership theories influence authentic transformational leader behavior.

To test this hypothesis, four scenarios were constructed where congruence between the leader’s beliefs and his style were manipulated (see Appendix B1-A). In scenarios 1.1 and 1.2, the leader’s beliefs were described as representative of authentic transformational behavior and in two scenarios (scenarios 1.3 and 1.4) the leader’s beliefs were described as transactional. For each leader belief condition, the leader’s beliefs and his behavior were described as congruent or non-congruent. After reading
the scenarios, subjects responded to an instrument that assessed the perception that the leader would or would not act as described based on the leader’s beliefs about leadership (see Appendix B1-B).

The two different types of leadership beliefs/behaviors were varied in order to determine if any effects were due to the leadership style itself. I could not conduct a two-way ANOVA that analyzed the degree to which subjects believed there was consistency between leader beliefs (ILTs) and behavior, including both leader styles in the same analysis, because there were different dependent variable questions between the authentic transformational scenarios and the transactional scenarios. I believed this difference in questions was necessary because authentic transformational leaders and transactional leaders behave differently. After reviewing the dependent variable questions for both sets of scenarios, I have concluded that these questions can be rewritten to allow for a more generic measure that can be analyzed across all conditions (see Changes Made, pg. 86).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted for the authentic transformational conditions and another one-way ANOVA was conducted for the transactional conditions. In the authentic transformational behavior conditions, there was a significant difference between a leader’s belief/action congruence (mean = 4.47, \(SD = .60\)) and a leader’s belief/action non-congruence (mean = 1.99, \(SD = .98\)) (\(F = 73.30, p < .001\)). Similar results were found in the transactional behavior conditions (leader’s belief/action congruence; mean = 3.50, \(SD = .60\); leader’s belief/action non-congruence (mean = 1.92, \(SD = .66\); \(F = 37.64, p < .001\)). These results reveal that subjects expected the
leaders described in the scenario should behave consistently with their beliefs and this was true with both styles of leadership. Results support Hypothesis 1.

Reliabilities for dependent variable measures for two of the scenarios (1.1 and 1.3) were acceptable (see Table 3). Reliabilities for the other two scenarios (1.2 and 1.4) were not acceptable (see Table 3). I did verify that there were no problems with coding the data. Possible removal of each individual item was examined to see if reliabilities could be markedly improved. The results of this analysis did not indicate any improvement to the reliabilities.

When examining each scenario, a possible explanation for the poor reliabilities was identified. Each scenario was divided into two sections, a section describing the leader’s beliefs followed by a section describing the leader’s actions. These sections are not clearly delineated, which may have been a problem particularly for the non-congruent conditions. In the non-congruent conditions, subjects first read a passage describing how a leader thinks. The next passage describes actions by the leader that do not reflect how the leader thinks he should behave. Subjects may be easily confused and may answer the questions in response to either the leader’s beliefs or the leader’s actions, not paying attention to the lack of congruency. Further instructions are needed in the scenario to indicate to the subjects that they should compare the two sections for consistency, such as “Having read how Frank believes a leader should act, now read the following passage describing how he actually acted and think about how the two descriptions compare.”

In addition, manipulation check results revealed I had accurately depicted behavior consistent with beliefs, but the questions were different for each leader
behavior (ATF versus transactional). Furthermore, I did not assess whether I had accurately portrayed ATF or transactional leader beliefs and behavior, nor did I ask questions to assess whether I had accurately manipulated congruency regardless of the leader behavior. Therefore, I developed a modification to the manipulation check questions which more accurately assesses the manipulations. These manipulation checks will ensure that the leader’s beliefs and actions were properly described, as well as confirm that the congruency manipulation was clear.

Finally, the measure for the dependent variable, subjects’ opinions about the degree to which they expect the leader’s beliefs and actions to be consistent, can be modified to become a generic measure that can be used across all four conditions. Therefore, a 2x2 (behavior x congruence) design can be incorporated for this hypothesis allowing for all comparisons.

Changes made:

The original intention in comparing two different behaviors (authentic transformational and transactional) was to show that results were not based on a particular leadership style. While ANOVA results provided some support for this expectation, I was unable to examine a main effect for behavior and the measures in the non-congruent conditions were not reliable. Therefore, I retained the transactional leadership behavior scenarios in the second pilot study. To avoid confusion, the sections in the second pilot study were clearly marked “Frank’s Beliefs about Leadership” and “What Frank Did” with clear instructions between the two sections instructing subjects to compare Frank’s beliefs with his actions and to answer the questions that follow.
In addition, the measure for the dependent variable was modified to facilitate a comparison across all four conditions, allowing for a 2x2 (leader behavior style x congruence) design. All of these alterations were expected to improve the reliabilities for the dependent variable measure.

1. Given Frank’s beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you believe Frank actually would behave as described in the above scenario?
2. Given Frank’s beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you think the situation describing Frank’s actions is NOT true? (Reverse Coded)
3. Given Frank’s beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you believe the scenario describes Frank’s actions as they might actually have occurred?
4. Given Frank’s beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you think the situation described above is representative of the way Frank would typically act?

The new set of questions to assess the congruency manipulations allows comparisons across all four conditions.

1. To what degree do you believe Frank’s leadership actions matched his leadership beliefs?
2. To what degree do you think Frank was NOT true to his beliefs? (Reverse Coded)
3. To what degree do you believe Frank’s beliefs about leadership guided his actions?
4. To what degree do you believe Frank was true to his beliefs?

The new questions for manipulation checks on the leader behavior manipulation presented below allows for comparison across all four conditions. In these questions, subjects in the ATF condition should respond positively and those in the transactional condition should respond negatively. Furthermore, these new questions allow me to determine if I correctly depicted beliefs and behavior since the hypothesis proposes there should be consistency between the two.

*Answer the following questions according to the way Frank believes a leader should act:*

1. To what degree do you believe Frank thinks a leader should NOT act ethically? (Reverse Coded)

2. To what degree do you believe Frank thinks a leader should be charismatic?

3. To what degree do you think Frank believes a leader should intellectually stimulate his followers?

4. To what degree do you think Frank believes he should be inspirational?

5. To what degree do you think Frank believes a leader should show consideration for others?

*Answer the following questions according to the way Frank actually acted:*

1. To what degree did Frank NOT act ethically? (Reverse Coded)

2. To what degree did Frank act charismatically?

3. To what degree did Frank intellectually stimulate his followers?

4. To what degree was Frank inspirational?

5. To what degree did Frank show consideration for others?
Finally, to control for leader style, additional questions were added to verify that I correctly described transactional beliefs and behaviors so that a poor manipulation would not be suspect as an explanation for results. The following additional questions to assess the transactional leader behavior manipulation were added in the second pilot study.

*Answer the following questions according to the way Frank believes a leader should act:*

1. To what degree do you believe Frank thinks a leader should *NOT* clearly explain duties to new employees? (Reverse Coded)

2. To what degree do you believe Frank thinks a leader should reward new employees for honest efforts?

3. To what degree do you believe Frank thinks a leader should provide assistance to new employees?

4. To what degree do you believe Frank thinks a leader should work toward correcting errors of new employees?

*Answer the following questions according to the way Frank actually acted:*

1. To what degree do you believe Frank explained the new employee’s duties to him?

2. To what degree do you believe Frank rewarded the new employee for his honest efforts?

3. To what degree do you believe Frank *WOULD NOT* provide assistance to the new employee? (Reverse Coded)

4. To what degree do you believe Frank would work toward correcting errors of the new employee?
The second pilot study was necessary to ensure that these changes were valid and reliable. Results guided changes to my dissertation study.

_Hypothesis 2: The relationship between leader authentic transformational leader behaviors and leader effectiveness is influenced by follower implicit leadership theories._

Two scenarios (scenarios 2.1 and 2.2) described authentic transformational leadership behaviors, one of which described congruence between the leader and the follower’s beliefs about leadership (i.e., the follower agrees with the described leader’s leadership style). The second scenario describes non-congruence (i.e., the follower does not necessarily agree with the described leader’s leadership style). The assumption was that opinions on leader behavior reflect ILT content. Subjects were then asked to indicate whether the follower in the scenario would judge the leader to be effective or not. A one-way ANOVA was performed for the ATF conditions to test the hypothesis that subjects believe that if a follower has beliefs about leadership that are in agreement with a leader’s behaviors, then the follower will judge the leader to be effective when he or she exhibits those behaviors. A significant difference was found between the congruence condition for effectiveness measures (mean = 5.61, SD = .51) and the non-congruence condition (mean = 3.77, SD = 1.05) \( F = 27.41, p < .001 \), supporting hypothesis 2 for the ATF conditions.

In order to determine if the effect was specific to authentic transformational leadership, two additional scenarios were constructed. A non-ethical/non-transformational (non-ATF) leader was described in one scenario, and an unethical transactional leader was described in another scenario. In the non-ATF scenario, non-congruence of ILT’s was described, and in the unethical transactional condition,
congruence of ILT’s was described. Unfortunately, in order to properly compare, I should have had two more scenarios that included a non-ATF/congruence and unethical transactional/non-congruence condition. Without these additional scenarios, I was unable to determine whether or not the effect is specific to authentic transformational leadership. Reliabilities for the dependent variable measures in these four scenarios were all acceptable ($\alpha = .82, .77, .81, \text{ and } .75$; see Table 3). The data was checked to ensure it was coded correctly and item analysis did not indicate the need for removal of any of the items.

Changes made: In the second pilot study, two additional scenarios were added to test if the effect was specific to authentic transformational leadership or could be transferred to other types of leadership. One scenario included a description of a non-ethical/non-transformational leader whose follower agrees with his leadership style (congruence). The other scenario included a description of an unethical transactional leader whose follower does not necessarily agree with his leadership style (non-congruence). Then a 3 (leader style) by 2 (congruence) ANOVA was conducted to simultaneously test the effect of congruence between LILT and FILT across the three leader styles. No further changes were made relative to hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3: Feedback on leader effectiveness has an effect on the content of follower implicit leadership theories.

To test this hypothesis, two scenarios were constructed. These scenarios included a description of a follower’s opinion about his leader’s effectiveness; in one case the leader was judged to be effective, and in the other case he was not. An instrument to measure the degree to which subjects believed that perceptions of leader
effectiveness affected the follower’s implicit leadership theory was then administered. A one-way ANOVA indicated significant differences between the effective condition (mean = 3.50, \( SD = .67 \)) and the non-effective condition (mean = 2.76, \( SD = .43 \)) (\( F = 14.010, p < .001 \)).

Reliability for the effectiveness measure across conditions was \( \alpha = .62 \). In an attempt to improve the reliabilities, I explored the separate reliabilities of the effective and ineffective scenarios. Reliability for the effective scenario was acceptable (\( \alpha = .82 \)). Reliability for the non-effective scenario, however, was below acceptable standards (\( \alpha = .19 \)). In reviewing the items, an obvious error was detected. I used questions that asked subjects such things as “To what degree do you think Joe forms his opinions about ideal leadership based on Frank’s behaviors?” My expectation was that subjects would not change their thoughts about ideal leadership when the leader was described as ineffective (i.e., when leaders are viewed as ineffective, followers will not modify their implicit leadership theory). The expectation was in error because effective and ineffective leadership behaviors could affect a follower’s implicit leadership theory. When a follower sees effective leadership, he or she includes that effective behavior in his/her ILT; however when a follower sees an ineffective leadership behavior, the follower could also adjust his or her ILT to exclude that behavior and categorize the behavior as something that ideal leadership is not. Either way, the follower’s ILT is affected. For the second pilot study, I reworded items in the dependent variable measure to account for this potential problem. The following is an item by item analysis of changes made to the measure, removing or re-working wording that is ambiguous.
Changes made:

Item 1 (1st Pilot Study) — To what degree do you think Joe forms his opinions about leadership based on Frank’s behavior? This question is confusing because whether Frank is effective or ineffective, Joe may form his opinions based on either behavior.

Item 1 (2nd Pilot Study) — To what degree would you expect Joe to mimic or use Frank’s leadership behaviors if given the chance?

Item 2 (1st Pilot Study) — To what degree do you think Joe would behave the same as Frank, if he found himself in a similar leadership position?

Item 2 (2nd Pilot Study) — No change

Item 3 (1st Pilot Study) — To what degree do you believe Joe would change his personal theory about ideal leadership based on Frank’s behavior? This question is confusing because whether Frank is effective or ineffective, Joe may change his personal theory based on either behavior.

Item 3 (2nd Pilot Study) — To what degree do you believe Joe would include Frank’s leadership behaviors in his personal theory about ideal leadership?

Item 4 (1st Pilot Study) — To what degree do you think Joe and Frank have the same personal theory about ideal leadership? This question is inappropriate, more of a manipulation check question.

Item 4 (2nd Pilot Study) — REMOVE
Item 5 (1\textsuperscript{st} Pilot Study) — To what degree do you think Joe rejects Frank’s ideas about leadership? (Reverse Coded)

Item 5 (2\textsuperscript{nd} Pilot Study) — No change

With these changes, the dependent variable measure in the second pilot study consisted of four, rather than five, items. Data was collected in a second pilot study to confirm improvement in reliabilities prior to conducting my dissertation study.

Hypothesis 4: Feedback on leader effectiveness influences the content of the leader’s implicit leadership theory.

To test this hypothesis, four scenarios were constructed. Two scenarios described feedback (positive or negative) on behavior that had been recently changed (Scenarios 4.1 and 4.2) and two scenarios described feedback on current behavior (Scenarios 4.3 and 4.4). I was interested in whether feedback had the same influence on modifications to behavior that had been exhibited over time compared to behavior that had just been exhibited six months. An instrument was then administered to evaluate the effect of perceptions of a leader’s own effectiveness on the content of that same leader’s implicit leadership theory.

Results from a two-way ANOVA indicated a significant difference between scenarios with positive evaluations (mean = 4.02, \(SE = .14\)) and negative evaluations (mean = 2.20, \(SE = .19\)) (see Table 5). There was not a significant effect for behavior (mean = 3.10, \(SE = .15\) for current behavior; mean = 3.27, \(SE = .14\) for new behavior) nor was there a significant interaction effect (see Table 5). Results indicate that
subjects believe that leaders will include new behavior/maintain current behavior in their beliefs about leadership after positive feedback, and will not include new behavior/discontinue current behavior in their beliefs about leadership after negative feedback. These results support Hypothesis 4. Reliabilities for these scenarios were acceptable ($\alpha = .78, .65, .71, .86$ for each condition; overall $\alpha = .85$; see Table 5). The data was checked to ensure it was coded correctly and item analysis did not indicate the need for removal of any of the items. The main effect for behavior type and the interaction were not significant. Therefore, I do not need to include both current and new behavior conditions. I maintained the conditions describing feedback on current behavior in the dissertation study. No additional changes were made, and this hypothesis was not re-tested in the second pilot study.

Table 5

Two-Way ANOVA Results for Hypothesis 4 - Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

(Independent Variable: ILTChg)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>40.725$^a$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.575</td>
<td>26.483</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>523.646</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>523.646</td>
<td>1021.552</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BehChg</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>36.089</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.089</td>
<td>70.403</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BehChg * Evaluation</td>
<td>2.885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.885</td>
<td>5.629</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>25.117</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>611.125</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>65.842</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ R Squared = .619 (Adjusted R Squared = .595)
**Hypothesis 5:** The leader-member exchange (LMX) relationship influences the relationship between follower implicit leadership theories and leader implicit leadership theories.

To test this hypothesis, two scenarios were constructed. One scenario described a high quality LMX relationship between leader and follower, and the other described a low quality LMX relationship between leader and follower. An instrument was then administered to measure whether the quality of the LMX relationship affected the degree to which the leader would base his leadership behaviors on a follower’s input. A one way ANOVA found significant differences between the high LMX condition (mean = 3.38, \(SD = .56\)) and the low LMX condition (mean = 2.24, \(SD = .72\)) \((F = 20.83, p < .001)\). These results indicate that subjects believe that leaders will change their leadership behaviors based on input from followers with whom they have a high quality LMX relationship more so than when the quality of the relationship is low. Reliabilities for these scenarios were acceptable \((\alpha = .71, .71); \text{see Table 3})\). The data was checked to ensure it was coded correctly and item analysis did not indicate the need for removal of any of the items. No changes will be made relative to hypothesis 5 for the dissertation study, and this hypothesis was not re-tested in the second pilot study.

**Summary of Changes Made**

In hypothesis 1, only two styles are used in the second pilot study, as opposed to three in first pilot study. ATF and TA styles are used to control for leadership style, as I was unable to control for style in the first study. Scenario sections are more clearly marked, and the dependent variable measure was changed and used in all four scenarios (there were two DV measures in the first study). Additionally, manipulation
checks were added for congruency, behavior, and style. In hypothesis two, two scenarios are added (for a total of six) to control for three types of style. In hypothesis 3, the dependent variable measure was changed to reduce uncertainty and improve reliability. Furthermore, the second pilot study employed a seven-point scale (from 1 Not at All to 7 Absolutely) rather than the five point scale used in the first pilot study. See Appendix D for all changes made for the second pilot study.

Second Pilot Study

In the second pilot study, I re-tested the first three hypotheses and included changes suggested by the first pilot study. The sample consisted of 112 undergraduate students enrolled in online classes, reflecting a 82% response rate. The sample was comprised of primarily juniors and seniors in college; 68 % consisted of males, and mean age was 22.22 years. Ninety-six percent reported having at least one year of full-time work experience. Ninety-two percent had at least one year of leadership experience (as indicated by committee chair experience, club leadership experience, and experience in managing other people in a work setting). Ninety-two percent of subjects had taken a course in ethics. None of the control variables had a significant interaction with the dependent variables (see Table 6). The next section outlines results and suggested changes in the main study for the manipulation checks by hypothesis followed by dependent variable results and suggested changes by hypothesis. These changes can be seen in Appendix D.
Table 6

Correlation Matrix and Reliabilities for Second Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliabilities</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Comm</th>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Mgr</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.80**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV H1&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV H2&lt;sup&gt;k&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVH 3&lt;sup&gt;l&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>* p < .05</sup>  <sup>** p < .01</sup> (two-tailed)  
<sup>a</sup> N=311;  
<sup>b</sup> Gender (Male=1, Female=2);  
<sup>c</sup> Race (1=African American, 2=Asian, 3=Caucasian, 4=Hispanic, 5=Other);  
<sup>d</sup> Full-time work experience in years;  
<sup>e</sup> Part-time work experience in years;  
<sup>f</sup> Committee Chairman experience in years;  
<sup>g</sup> Club President experience in years;  
<sup>h</sup> Manager experience in years;  
<sup>i</sup> Ethics (1=Ethics class, 2= No ethics class)  
<sup>j</sup> DV H1 — Dependent variable for hypothesis 1 is the perception of leader effectiveness based on the consistency between leader implicit leadership theory and authentic transformational leadership behaviors  
<sup>k</sup> DV H2 — Dependent variable for hypothesis 2 is the perception of leader effectiveness based on the congruence between authentic transformational leadership behaviors and follower implicit leadership theory
Manipulation Checks for the Second Pilot Study

Hypothesis 1

Manipulation checks for 1) congruence between beliefs and actions, 2) the leader’s implicit leadership theory (authentic transformational leadership or transactional leadership), and 3) the leader’s actual actions (both for authentic transformational and transactional leadership) were performed, as suggested by the first pilot study (see Appendix D).

Congruence Between Beliefs and Actions Manipulation Check

Congruence between the leader’s beliefs and his actual actions was properly manipulated (congruence mean = 4.79, SD = 1.16; non-congruence mean = 1.62, SD = 0.80) with a significant difference between congruence conditions ($F = 107.74, p < .001$). In addition, the measure was reliable ($\alpha = .97, n = 45$).

Leader’s Implicit Leadership Theory Manipulation Check

The leader’s implicit leadership theory was properly manipulated (authentic transformational leadership mean = 5.87, SD = .62; transactional leadership mean = 4.40, SD = 1.13) with a significant difference between implicit leadership theory conditions ($F = 26.71, p < .001$). In addition, the measure was reliable ($\alpha = .80, n = 41$).

Leader’s Actual Actions Manipulation Check

The leader’s actual actions were properly manipulated for authentic transformational leadership (authentic mean = 4.40, SD = 1.13; inauthentic mean = 1.80, SD = 0.53) and transactional leadership (transactional mean = 3.67, SD = 0.62; non-transactional mean = 1.73, SD = 0.61). Significant differences between conditions
was found (authentic $F = 98.45, p < .001$; transactional $F = 48.59, p < .001$). Both measures were reliable (authentic $\alpha = .89, n = 45$; transactional $\alpha = .81, n = 45$).

Hypothesis 2

Manipulation checks for leadership style and leader/follower implicit leadership theory congruence were performed. Leadership style included three styles; authentic transformational leadership and two other styles (transactional leadership and a non-authentic/non-transformational style) (see Appendix D).

Leadership Style Manipulation Check

The leadership style manipulation was properly performed (authentic mean = 5.22, $SD = .049$; transactional mean = 1.88, $SD = 0.55$; non-authentic mean = 2.68; $SD = 1.22$) with a significant difference between authentic leadership and the two other style conditions ($F = 88.46, p < .001$). The measure was reliable ($\alpha = .95, n = 63$).

Dyadic Congruence Manipulation

The leader/follower implicit leadership theory dyadic congruence manipulation was properly performed (congruence mean = 5.26, $SD = 1.03$; non-congruence mean = 2.38; $SD = 0.99$) with a significant difference between congruence conditions ($F = 121.49, p < .001$) and the measure was reliable ($\alpha = .94, n = 63$).

Hypothesis 3

The leader effectiveness manipulation was properly performed (effective mean = 6.03, $SD = 0.59$; ineffective mean = 2.23, $SD = 0.63$) with a significant difference between effectiveness conditions ($F = 204.56, p < .001$). The measure was reliable ($\alpha = .95, n = 21$) (see Appendix D).
Dependent Variable Results for Second Pilot Study

Hypothesis 1

In hypothesis 1, it was proposed that there is a consistency between a leader’s implicit leadership theory and a leader’s behavior. Two leadership styles were tested, authentic transformational leadership and transactional leadership, across two conditions (congruent and non-congruent). Subjects were asked to read a scenario which described a leader’s implicit leadership theory (one of the two aforementioned leadership styles), which concluded with the description of the same leader’s behavior in a given situation. In one condition, the leader behaved according to his implicit leadership theory; in the second condition, the leader did not behave accordingly (a total of 4 conditions). Subjects were asked whether or not they believed the leader would actually behave in the manner described, given his leadership beliefs ($\alpha = .88$, $n = 45$). Hypothesis 1 was supported (see Table 7). There was no significant interaction. Different leadership styles were tested to make sure the effect was due to consistency between beliefs and behavior, and not style. Because the effect of leadership style was not significant, this manipulation was removed for the main experiment, using only authentic transformational leadership behaviors.
**Table 7**

*Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA Results for Hypothesis 1 - Dependent Variable: Perceptions of Consistency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Congruence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATF</td>
<td>Congrunt</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Congr</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Congrunt</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Congr</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Congrunt</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Congr</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>44.87(^a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>608.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>608.75</td>
<td>430.65</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>29.13</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style * Congruence</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>57.96</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>691.44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>102.83</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) R squared = .436 (adjusted R squared = .395)

**Hypothesis 2**

In hypothesis 2, it was proposed that the relationship between authentic transformational leadership behaviors and leader effectiveness is influenced by the content of a follower's implicit leadership theory. In other words, leaders will not be seen as effective unless the leader's behaviors are contained in the follower's implicit
leadership theory. Subjects were asked to read a scenario describing a leader’s behavior (either authentic transformational leadership, non-authentic/non-transformational leadership, or transactional leadership), which included a passage describing whether or not the follower would behave in a similar manner if given the opportunity (a manipulation of the follower’s implicit leadership theory) with a reliable measure ($\alpha = .95$, $n = 63$). A two-way ANOVA (3 style x 2 congruence) was performed. Means, standard deviations, and ANOVA results are reported in Table 8. Hypothesis 2 was supported. There is no significant interaction, so the effect for congruence does not vary according to style. Subjects do believe that it is necessary for leaders and followers to have similar implicit leadership theories for the leader to be found effective, except in the case of the authentic transformational leader (mean = 4.46, $SD = 1.67$). Because the effect of leadership style was found to be significant ($F = 5.04, p < .01$), it will be re-examined in the main study to see if leadership style has an effect or not.

There was no significant difference ($F = 1.36, p < .263$) between transactional leadership (mean = 3.83, $SD = 1.64$) and the non-authentic/non-transformational leadership style (mean = 3.71, $SD = 1.50$), so the latter style was dropped in the main experiment. The non-ATF style was dropped as it was created for this experiment, and transactional leadership is a known measure (MLQ 5x, Bass & Avolio, 1990).
Table 8

Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA Results for Hypothesis 2 – Dependent Variable: Perceptions of Leader Effectiveness

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Congruence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATF</td>
<td>Congruent</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Congr</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non ATF</td>
<td>Congruent</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Congr</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Congruent</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Congr</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Congruent</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Congr</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>96.96a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>985.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>985.78</td>
<td>886.41</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>87.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87.01</td>
<td>78.24</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style * Congruence</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>63.39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1173.16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>160.35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R squared = .605 (adjusted R squared = .570)

Hypothesis 3

In hypothesis 3, it was proposed that perceptions of leader effectiveness have an influence on a follower’s implicit leadership theory. Subjects were asked to read a scenario describing a follower’s opinion of his leader as either effective or ineffective. Subjects were then asked to answer questions as to whether or not the follower, based
on his opinion of his leader’s effectiveness, would behave the same as the leader if
given the opportunity ($\alpha = .96, n= 21$), indicating that the followers would include those
behaviors into their implicit leadership theory. Hypothesis 3 was supported
(effectiveness mean = 6.03, $SD = 0.59$; ineffectiveness mean = 2.23, $SD = 0.63$) with a
significant difference between effectiveness conditions ($F = 204.56, p < .001$). Based
on this analysis, the modifications made in the second pilot study worked and will be
used in the main experiment.

Main Experiment Methodology

The main experiment used the same procedures as the two pilot studies,
incorporating changes based on analyses from both. Sample information for the main
experiment can be found in chapter 4. See Appendices B and D for measures used in
the main experiment.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this chapter is two-fold. The first purpose is to describe the
experimental design and methodology to assess the hypotheses presented in chapter 2.
The second purpose is to present the results of the pilot studies and any changes made
to the main dissertation study. The next chapter reports the results of the main
experiment.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the main experiment. The chapter begins with a presentation of descriptive statistics and the correlation matrix. Following this is a report of the manipulation checks and an analysis of each hypothesis, using ANOVA in SPSS v15.0.

Descriptive Statistics

The correlation matrix including sample statistics for the demographic variables of age, gender, race, class, work experience (full-time and part-time), leadership experience (through indication of committee chair, club officer, or managerial experience), and whether or not the subjects had taken an ethics course are presented in Table 9. None of the control variables have a significant relationship with the dependent variables, meaning that any effects found were not due to the control variables, as they shared little or no variance with the dependent variables.
Table 9

Correlation Matrix and Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Comm</th>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Mgr</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>24.72</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV H1</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV H2</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV H3</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV H4</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV H5</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  ** p < .01 (two-tailed)

a N=336;  b Gender (Male=1, Female=2);  c Race (1=African American, 2=Asian, 3=Caucasian, 4=Hispanic, 5=Other);  d Full-time work experience in years;  e Part-time work experience in years;  f Committee Chairman experience in years;  g Club President experience in years;  h Manager experience in years;  i Ethics (1=Ethics class, 2= No ethics class)

J DV H1 (n = 64) — Dependent variable for hypothesis 1 is the perception of leader effectiveness based on the consistency between leader implicit leadership theory and authentic transformational leadership behaviors

k DV H2 (n = 102) — Dependent variable for hypothesis 2 is the perception of leader effectiveness based on the congruence between authentic transformational leadership behaviors and follower implicit leadership theory

l DV H3 (n = 56) — Dependent variable for hypothesis 3 is the change of follower implicit leadership theory based on perceptions of leader effectiveness

m DV H4 (n = 59) — Dependent variable for hypothesis 4 is the change in leader implicit leadership theory based on perceptions of leader effectiveness

n DV H5 (n = 55) — Dependent variable for hypothesis 5 is the perception of change in leader implicit leadership theory based on LMX quality
Manipulation Checks

Manipulation checks were performed for all hypotheses. The manipulation checks ensured that the respondent’s interpretation of the manipulations was consistent with the intended description in the scenarios. Appendix D contains manipulation check measures for all hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1

Manipulation checks for 1) congruence between leader beliefs and actions, and 2) the leader’s actual actions were performed. See Appendix D1-A.

**Congruence Manipulation**

Subjects were asked a series of questions to ensure that congruence between the leader’s beliefs and the leader’s actions was properly manipulated, asking to what degree they agreed with the statements ranging from 1 = Not at all, to 7 = Absolutely. The congruence mean (mean = 5.24, SD = 1.95) is higher than the non-congruence mean (mean = 1.47, SD = 0.81) and the difference between the means is significant ($F = 99.27, p < .001; n = 64$). The measure for the manipulation check is reliable ($\alpha = .97$). Results support the manipulation.

**Leader’s Actions Manipulation**

Subjects were asked a series of questions to ensure that the leader’s actions were properly manipulated, asking to what degree they agreed with the statements ranging from 1 = Not at all, to 7 = Absolutely. The authentic actions condition mean is higher (mean = 4.95, SD = 1.90) than the inauthentic action condition mean (mean = 1.80, SD = 1.13), and the difference between conditions is significant ($F = 63.69, p <$
Hypothesis 2

Manipulation checks for 1) leader style (authentic transformational and transactional) and 2) congruence between the leader’s implicit leadership theory and the follower’s implicit leadership theory were performed (see Appendix D1-B).

Leader Style Manipulation

Subjects were asked a series of questions to ensure the leader’s style was properly manipulated, asking to what degree they agreed with the statements ranging from 1 = Not at all, to 7 = Absolutely. The authentic mean (mean = 5.43, SD = 1.39) is higher than the transactional mean (mean = 2.22, SD = 1.34), and the difference is significant in the expected direction ($F = 139.95, p < .001; n = 102$). The measure for the manipulation check is reliable ($\alpha = .95$). Results support the manipulation.

Congruence Manipulation

Subjects were asked a series of questions to ensure that the congruence between the leader’s and follower’s implicit leadership theories was properly manipulated, asking to what degree they agreed with the statements ranging from 1 = Not at all, to 7 = Absolutely. The congruence condition mean (mean = 5.56, SD = 1.64) is higher than the non-congruence mean (mean = 2.30, SD = 1.31), and the difference is significant ($F = 121.25, p < .001; n = 102$). The measure for the manipulation check is reliable ($\alpha = .95$). Results support the manipulation.
Hypothesis 3

**Leader Effectiveness Manipulation**

Subjects were asked a series of questions (see Appendix C-3) to ensure that leader effectiveness was properly manipulated, asking to what degree they agreed with the statements ranging from 1 = Not at all, to 7 = Absolutely. The effective mean (mean = 5.74, SD = 0.69) is higher than the ineffective mean (mean = 2.79, SD = 0.92), and the difference is significant ($F = 187.98, p < .001; n = 56$). The measure for the manipulation check is reliable ($\alpha = .92$). Results support the manipulation.

Hypothesis 4

**Leader Evaluation Manipulation**

Subjects were asked a series of questions (see Appendix C-4) to ensure that leader effectiveness (indicated by a positive or negative leader evaluation) was properly manipulated, asking to what degree they agreed with the statements ranging from 1 = Not at all, to 7 = Absolutely. As expected, the positive evaluation mean (mean = 4.80, SD = 1.14) is higher than the negative evaluation mean (mean = 3.21, SD = .62), and the difference is significant ($t = 27.15, p < .001; n = 59$). The measure for the manipulation check is reliable ($\alpha = .84$). Results support the manipulation.

Hypothesis 5

**LMX Manipulation**

Subjects were asked a series of questions (see Appendix C-5) to ensure that leader-member exchange was properly manipulated, asking to what degree they agreed with the statements ranging from 1 = Not at all, to 7 = Absolutely. As expected, the high LMX mean (mean = 4.80, SD = 1.17) is higher than the low LMX mean (mean = 1.51,
SD = 1.00), and the difference is significant ($F = 119.48$, $p < .001$; $n = 55$). The measure for the manipulation check is reliable ($\alpha = .86$). Results support the manipulation.

Analysis of Research Hypotheses

**Hypothesis 1**

Hypothesis 1 projected a consistency between a leader’s implicit leadership theory and a leader’s behavior. Subjects were asked to read a scenario that first described a leader’s implicit leadership theory, which included authentic transformational leadership behaviors. The scenario concluded with a description of the same leader’s behavior in a given situation. In one condition, the leader behaved consistent with his implicit leadership theory; in the second condition, the leader behaved inconsistent with his implicit leadership theory. Subjects were asked whether or not it was likely that the leader would actually behave in the manner described, given his authentic transformational leadership beliefs ($1 = $Not at All; $7 = $Absolutely). As expected, subjects are more likely to expect the leader to behave in a manner consistent with his beliefs ($mean = 5.48$, $SD = 1.10$) than inconsistent with his beliefs ($mean = 2.28$, $SD = 1.28$), and the difference is significant ($F = 113.97$, $p < .001$; $n = 64$). The measure is reliable ($\alpha = .93$). Thus, hypothesis 1 is supported.

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2 projected that the relationship between authentic transformational leadership behaviors and leader effectiveness is influenced by the content of a follower’s implicit leadership theory. That is, leaders will not be seen as effective unless the leader’s behaviors are contained in the follower’s implicit leadership theory.
Subjects were asked to read a scenario describing a leader’s behavior (either authentic transformational leadership or transactional leadership), which included a passage describing whether or not the follower would behave in a similar manner if given the opportunity (indicative of the follower's implicit leadership theory). Both leadership style and congruence were manipulated across four scenarios. Subjects were asked, based on the scenario, if the follower would find the leader effective (1 = Not at All; 7 = Absolutely). A two-way ANOVA (style x congruence) was performed. Means, standard deviations, and ANOVA results can be found in Table 10.
Table 10

**Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA Results for Hypothesis 2**

Descriptive Statistics: Dependent Variable = Leader Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Congruence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATF</td>
<td>Non-Cong</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cong</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Non-Cong</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cong</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Non-Cong</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cong</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects: Dependent Variable = DepVar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Observed Powera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>241.03b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80.34</td>
<td>80.67</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2007.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2007.02</td>
<td>2015.26</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>224.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>224.38</td>
<td>225.30</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style * Congruence</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>97.59</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2489.60</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>338.63</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Computed using alpha = .05
b  R Squared = .71 (Adjusted R Squared = .70)

Hypothesis 2 is not supported by the results because the hypothesis specifically stipulated that the relationship between authentic transformational leadership behaviors and leader effectiveness is influenced by the follower’s implicit leadership theory. The
main effect for congruence between a follower’s implicit leadership theory and a leader’s behavior is significant. In addition, however, there is a significant main effect for leadership style. Examination of the effectiveness means reveals that authentic transformational leaders (mean = 3.58, \(SD = .94\)) are evaluated as more effective than transactional leaders (mean = 2.35, \(SD = .76\)). Thus, although congruence between a follower’s implicit leadership theory and a leader’s behavior was expected to significantly increase leader effectiveness evaluations, authentic transformational leaders are seen as more effective than transactional leaders, regardless of whether followers contain authentic transformational leader behaviors in their implicit leadership theories. The measure is reliable (\(\alpha = .95\)). Hypothesis 2 is not supported, though the lack of support has interesting implications, further discussed in chapter 5.

**Hypothesis 3**

Hypothesis 3 projected that perceptions of leader effectiveness affect a follower’s implicit leadership theory. Subjects were asked to read a scenario describing a follower’s opinion of his leader as either effective or ineffective. They were then asked to indicate whether they believed the follower would behave the same as the leader if given the opportunity (1 = Not at All; 7 = Absolutely). As hypothesized, subjects have significantly higher expectations for the followers to behave similarly to the leader when the leader is considered effective (mean = 5.94, \(SD = 0.56\)) than when he is considered ineffective (mean = 2.23, \(SD = 0.72\)), and the difference is significant (\(F = 469.18, p < .001; n = 56\)). The measure is reliable (\(\alpha = .94\)). Thus, hypothesis 3 is supported.
Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 projected that perceptions of a leader’s own effectiveness will influence his implicit leadership theory. Subjects were asked to read a scenario in which a leader received either a positive or negative leadership evaluation. They were then asked to indicate whether they believed the leader would change his personal theory about leadership (1 = Not at All; 7 = Absolutely). As hypothesized, subjects have higher expectations for the leaders to maintain their current behaviors with positive feedback (mean = 5.55, SD = .72) than with negative feedback (mean = 2.95, SD = .99), and the difference is significant ($F = 131.67, p < .001; n = 59$). The measure is reliable ($\alpha = .94$). Thus, hypothesis 4 is supported.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 projected that, dependent upon the LMX relationship, a follower’s implicit leadership theory will have an influence on a leader’s implicit leadership theory. That is, a leader will base his behavior on his follower’s input on leadership behavior more in a high-quality LMX relationship than in a low-quality LMX relationship. Subjects were asked to read a scenario describing either a high- or low-quality LMX relationship between a leader and his follower, and indicate whether they expected the leader to base his leadership behavior on the input of the follower (1 = Not at All; 7 = Absolutely). As hypothesized, the high-quality LMX mean (mean = 4.99, SD = .94) is higher than the low-quality LMX mean (mean = 2.91, SD = .95), and the difference is significant ($F = 64.79, p < .001; n = 55$). The measure is reliable ($\alpha = .90$). Thus, hypothesis 5 is supported.
Chapter Summary

This chapter provided a detailed review of the experimental results. First, descriptive statistics and the correlation matrix were presented. An extensive review of the ANOVA results used to test the hypotheses followed. Hypothesis 2 is not supported; all other hypotheses are supported (see Table 11 for a summary of the tests of the hypotheses).

Data was collected using scenarios, with subjects responding to dependent variable measure items based on those scenarios. The interpretation of the results is contingent upon the validity of the scenarios and the subjects' perceptions of the underlying manipulations. A discussion of implications derived from the results is presented in Chapter 5.

Table 11

Summary of Tests of Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Leader implicit leadership theories influence authentic transformational leader behavior</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: The relationship between leader authentic transformational leader behaviors and leader effectiveness is influenced by follower implicit leadership theories.</td>
<td>No Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Feedback on leader effectiveness has an effect on the content of follower implicit leadership theories.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Feedback on leader effectiveness influences the content of the leader’s implicit leadership theory.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: The leader-member (LMX) relationship influences the relationship between follower implicit leadership theories and leader implicit leadership theories.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Overview

In this chapter, I expand upon the results I obtained in the experiment. Theoretical and procedural contributions are included, as are limitations to the experiment. Practical applications and future research directions are also discussed.

Discussion

Hypotheses Results

Hypothesis 1

The results from hypothesis 1 indicate that people expect leaders to behave as they believe. Leaders whose implicit leadership theories include the behaviors of authentic transformational leadership are expected to enact authentic transformational leadership behaviors. The pilot studies show subjects believe transactional leaders will do the same. Because we expect our leaders to act as they believe, the content of a leader’s implicit leadership theory becomes very significant. This is especially relevant when considering leader ethics, a central component of authentic transformational leadership. Because followers think that leaders’ behaviors follow their beliefs, when followers witness the appearance of ethical behavior, they assume that the leader is ethical; however the ethical behavior may be a false presentation of his or her true intent, intended to curry favor with followers. For example, a leader may set forth ethical company policies, and even be seen enforcing said policies, discussing with employees the importance of ethicality in the workplace. A follower observing such behavior associates it with the leader’s intent. The leader appeared to do something
ethical, therefore the leader is ethical. What the follower has not seen is that perhaps the leader simply found a scapegoat to cover up his own unethical actions, hiding behind the appearance of ethicality to fool followers into thinking he is ethical. Consider Eliot Spitzer who resigned his position as New York state governor after admitting to his participation in a prostitution ring. As state attorney general, Spitzer made his reputation prosecuting similar prostitution rings.

We often have to, however, infer ethical intent through the witnessing of ethical actions. We have no concrete way of knowing if our leader’s seemingly ethical actions truly reflect their beliefs about ethics. To ensure ethical intent, we must offer ethical leadership training at the organizational level throughout all levels of the organization. In such a way, we can develop and train ethical leadership, creating ethical organizational cultures (perhaps most importantly) and discovering unethical characters before they reach upper level positions where they can do the most harm.

Unfortunately, top level managers are not always hired from within, especially at the highest levels of management. Therefore, top level managers would not have had the opportunity to go through ethics training. If we have created an ethical organization with an ethical organizational climate, however, unethical leaders hired into the organization will be exposed before they can do much damage.

Results from hypothesis 1 suggest that we expect our leaders to be authentic, regardless of leadership style; specifically, we expect their actions to accurately reflect the content of their implicit leadership theories. In particular, the analysis indicates that authentic transformational leaders’ actions are expected to align with their ethical intent.
Their ethical actions occur because the leader is ethical, not because the leader is trying to appear to be ethical.

_Hypothesis 2_

Leadership perceptions are based on cognitive categorization processes in which perceivers match the perceived attributes of potential leaders they observe to an internal prototype of leadership categories (Foti & Luch, 1992). Expectations and predictions of leadership are developed through these prototypes and categorizations, distinguishing good leaders from bad and effective from ineffective, based on the attributes and behaviors held within the implicit leadership theory of the observer (Lord & Maher, 1991). In effect, leadership is an outcome of cognitive processes in which people label individuals as leaders based on the fit between observed leader behavior and their own implicit theory of leadership. Based on this matching process, hypothesis 2 stated that for followers to see authentic transformational leadership behaviors as effective, those behaviors must reside within followers’ implicit leadership theories.

Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Subjects do not believe that congruence between leaders’ and followers’ implicit leadership theories are necessary for an authentic transformational leader to be seen as effective; they are seen as effective regardless of implicit leadership theory dyadic congruence. However results indicate that dyadic congruence is necessary for transactional leaders; there must be a content match between a transactional leader’s implicit leadership theory and a follower’s implicit leadership theory, as one might expect based on the previously discussed research by Lord and Maher (1991). These data suggest authentic transformational leadership is perceived as effective, regardless of follower implicit leadership theory
content. The implication derived from these results is that elements of authentic transformational leadership may reside in the contents of every follower’s implicit leadership theory. If so, authentic transformational leadership may be perceived as an ideal form of leadership.

Hypotheses 3 and 4

Results from hypotheses 3 and 4 suggest that feedback on leader effectiveness provides a basis for continual adjustment to a person’s implicit leadership theory, for both leaders and followers. The data from these hypotheses indicate that implicit leadership theories may not be as stable as once thought (see Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Bartunek, 1984). Subjects believe that followers and leaders alike, through observations and feedback on leader effectiveness, adjust their implicit leadership theories, supporting Weick and Bougon’s (1986) argument that changes in cognitive structure occur continuously. Development of implicit leadership theories is an ongoing process involving cognitive matches between leader behavior and previous categorizations of ideal leader behavior (Lord & Maher, 1991). In relationship to the results of these hypotheses, new observations of effective (or ineffective) leader behavior influence current categorizations of leadership.

For example, Joe is a follower who believes that a leader should have a firm hand, and be very directive and commanding. Joe’s ideal leader stands in the front, tells the followers what to do, and expects them to obey instruction. Perhaps Joe’s implicit leadership theory developed as it did because he observed a parent or a coach using the same style of leadership effectively. Joe starts a new job, and to his delight, finds he has a boss who acts in Joe’s preferred directive manner. As time passes,
however, he finds a better way to do his job, and meets much resistance from his leader when he suggests changes. He is told to do his job in the prescribed manner without alteration or deviance, and not given the opportunity to further discuss the matter. Joe’s morale drops, and his performance slacks. The leadership behaviors he has always found to be ideal are now working against him. The leader, however, notices the drop in performance and recalls the situation in which he was perhaps too directive with Joe, attributing Joe’s drop in performance to his own leadership behaviors. He takes a new approach with Joe, asking him his opinions with a more supportive attitude. Joe responds well, and his performance picks back up. In this situation, both the follower and the leader observed ineffective and effective styles of leadership. Over time, such observations and feedback of effectiveness serve to alter both of their implicit leadership theories. Both have seen new behaviors as effective that were not included in their implicit leadership theories before, therefore, altering their implicit leadership theories by including these new behaviors.

_Hypothesis 5_

Results from hypothesis 5 suggest that in high-quality LMX situations, leaders take cues from followers as to appropriate leader behaviors. When there is trust, high levels of communication, and reciprocity in the leader-follower relationship, followers are easily able to communicate to their leaders which leader behaviors they prefer, which they find as effective (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). In turn, partially because of the high-quality LMX relationship (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) and a high need for achievement (Bass, 1985), the leaders want to be perceived as effective leaders, so they try to behave in ways that the followers find acceptable. In essence, the followers
communicate the content of their implicit leadership theories to their leaders, who then alter their behaviors to align with the followers’ expectations, in time changing their own implicit leadership theories. Leaders do not immediately alter their implicit leadership theories, because changes in cognitive structure take place incrementally as a process of adaptation with only a partial effect on scripts and maps; cognitive structures are not altered with sweeping changes that cover substantial parts (Bartunek, 1984). In time, the reinforcement of the behaviors will alter the leader’s thoughts towards leadership, a key concept of self-perception theory (Bem, 1972): I do it, so therefore I must believe it; behaviors influence attitudes.

Results from hypothesis 5 lead to some serious ethical considerations. If leaders are willing to change their behaviors to please their followers because they learn from them what they value, their intent becomes a matter of importance. Some leaders may be progressing in their leadership development, working toward becoming an authentic transformational leader, and feedback from their followers aids in this process. Others may see the benefits to authentic transformational leadership and do their best at mimicking these behaviors to get the job done or be perceived as effective (with no unethical motives). It is also possible that unethical and unscrupulous leaders may put on the appearance of an authentic transformational leader; their intentions are not altruistic but self-aggrandizing. Gaining trust in followers (through the enactment of preferred leadership behaviors) for selfish (not organizational) purposes is unethical. This is especially relevant in moderate-quality LMX situations, where followers are close enough to their leaders to communicate their desire for an authentic transformational leader, but not close enough to them to see their selfish and unethical ways. Those
followers in high-quality LMX relationships with such a leader are likely there because they are unethical themselves, and work to protect the image of the leader, as their own reputations and careers are linked to that of the leader.

To illustrate the point, consider the upper level leaders at Enron, Kenneth Lay, former chairman of the board for Enron, Jeffrey Skilling, former chief executive officer for Enron, and Andrew Fastow, former chief financial officer of Enron. These men had such high-quality relationships with each other. Once the seventh-largest company in America, Enron was wiped out in a very short time period. The failure of Enron left 4,000 people jobless, and wiped out savings and pensions. Enron went bankrupt owing creditors $65 billion dollars, because Lay and Skilling aggressively pushed into businesses they did not understand. Fastow then manipulated the company’s public records to mislead investors. Because Enron’s primary businesses in wholesale pipelines, utilities, and retail were all doing extremely well, Fastow was able to show profit in the balance sheets. As long as the balance sheets looked good, profit share increased, and the top executives made more money. Lay made more than $217 million in stock options and $19 million in salary and bonuses in four years. Each of these men behaved unethically. Five weeks before the collapse, Lay told employees that their liquidity was healthy and encouraged them to buy stock. Four months before Enron declared bankruptcy, Skilling unexpectedly resigned and sold large blocks of his shares in the corporation. Fastow “cooked the books.” The unethical actions of these men, men trusted by numerous stakeholders, ruined many lives through the high-quality relationships formed between them based on unethical standards. These leaders knew how to look like exemplary leaders while performing unethical deeds.
Summary of Hypothesis Results

In summary, the results suggest that authentic transformational leadership may be an ideal form of leadership, due to its perceptions of effectiveness regardless of implicit leadership theory content. Authentic transformational leadership behaviors may be universally effective behaviors, elements of which lie in all followers’ implicit leadership theories. This does not necessarily mean that all leaders strive to be authentic transformational leaders; however if their followers communicate a desire for an authentic transformational leader, leaders may enact behaviors associated with authentic transformational leadership, thereby, over time, altering their own implicit leadership theory.

Further, a change in a leader's implicit leadership theory may occur when leaders learn (through high-quality LMX relationships) of their followers' leadership preferences. The effect of a follower’s implicit leadership theory on a leader’s implicit leadership theory is perceived to be influenced by high-quality LMX relationships. When leaders receive feedback on their behavior from their followers, their implicit leadership theory may be affected, pointing towards a follower-centric cause of leader behavior. Furthermore, self-observations of their own effective or ineffective behaviors are believed to affect the leader’s implicit leadership theory. When leaders receive reports of their leader effectiveness, they are perceived to adjust their implicit leadership theories to re-enforce effective behaviors and remove ineffective ones.
Contributions

Procedural

The purpose of this study was to determine what people think about the relationships between leaders and followers, relationships between each one’s thoughts and behaviors, and their influence on one another. In order to do this, several scenarios were created and validated. For each set of scenarios, the proposed relationships between constructs were manipulated and then subjects answered questions that assessed their opinions relative to those proposed relationships. Therefore, the data collected reflected what subjects thought the relationship between constructs should be; they did not provide measures of the constructs themselves.

Measures were created where subjects were asked their opinions of the various manipulated relationships to discern whether their expectations confirmed the hypotheses. For example, in hypothesis 1, data collected reflected subjects’ perceptions of the relationship between a leader’s implicit leadership theory and authentic transformational leadership behaviors (see Appendix D-2). Furthermore, scenarios were created that manipulated different levels of the proposed relationships. The theoretical basis for hypothesis 2 presumes that followers will not find authentic transformational leadership behaviors effective unless those behaviors are included in the follower’s implicit leadership theory. In one condition for this hypothesis, for example, the follower’s implicit leadership theory included components of authentic transformational leadership; whereas, in another condition it did not. Subjects were then asked to identify the degree to which they expected the follower to evaluate the leader as effective.
The development and validation of these scenarios and the measures used to assess the subjects’ perceptions of relationships described represents a significant contribution. The way people perceive the relationships between constructs (i.e., how people think leaders and followers influence each other’s behaviors) may be more important than a statistically significant relationship between constructs (e.g., measuring the content of a leader’s implicit leadership theory and a follower’s leadership theory, then statistically determining the variance shared between the two). What people think will and should happen guides behavior. If I observe an altercation between two people where a large man is verbally abusing a small man, and I perceive the small man to be threatened, I might be motivated to intervene and come to the person’s aid or call the police. However, the large man may be related to the small man and has never struck him or hurt him. Statistically, it is very unlikely he will do so now. However, because I do not know the true relationship between the two, I am motivated to act on my perceptions.

The same is true in leadership situations. Leaders and followers may not know the true statistical relationships between any two constructs, or even that the constructs exist. For example, most people are not familiar with what implicit leadership theories are or their implications for a leader’s behavior. Yet, according to the results of hypothesis 1, they do expect leaders to behave as they believe. They believe that their leaders, regardless of leadership style, act in accordance with their beliefs. The reality may be that the leader is putting on an act and not behaving according to his or her beliefs. Not knowing this, the follower will behave based on this perception of authenticity, giving the leader perhaps undeserved trust and respect. The point is,
behavior is based on perceptions of reality, not on reality itself (unless their perceptions are in line with reality). The world as it is perceived is the world that is behaviorally important. As organizational behavior scientists, we must measure perceptions to understand and predict behavior.

These scenarios and this method of collecting data should be replicated to further examine the validity of the scenarios and measures. It is particularly important in this line of research to study perceptions of implicit leadership theories, as it is difficult to obtain an accurate measurement of a person’s idea of an ideal leader. Offerman, Kennedy, and Wirtz (1994) offer the most popular method of collecting data on implicit leadership theories, using a cognitive categorization perspective to determine the content and structure. Their findings show eight primary dimensions of people’s implicit theories of leadership: sensitivity, dedication, tyranny, charisma, attractiveness, masculinity, intelligence, and strength. Their study was important in that it was consistent with Lord, Foti, and Phillips’ (1982) theory of leadership categorization and showed that implicit leadership theories can be systematically studied. However, such questionnaire measures of implicit leadership theories are likely biased by the researcher (through the suggestion of a broad range of categories) and, therefore, may not reflect the structure of leader/follower interactions or ideals of leadership. Furthermore, only four of the dimensions are characteristic of leadership (dedication, charisma, intelligence, and sensitivity), and these few dimensions do not fully encompass the breadth of leadership traits and behaviors.

Offerman, et. al. (1994) suggested that implicit leadership theories should be studied by linking follower expectations with responses to leader behavior and how
these expectations affect the development of leader/follower exchanges. My research does just that, in viewing the development and adjustment of implicit leadership theories in response to observations of leader effectiveness, and studying the effect of follower implicit leadership theories on the leader’s implicit leadership theory through leader-member exchanges. Implicit leadership theories do not exist in a vacuum, but must be studied through perceptions of leader/follower interactions to fully grasp the content and development of them. If people believe that leaders behave in accordance with their implicit leadership theories, we must identify the influences on their development to truly understand leader and follower behavior.

Simply defining categories of leader traits and behaviors is an unsatisfactory way to determine a person’s implicit leadership theory, or his or her image of an ideal leader. We must first develop descriptions of ideal leaders, and ask people which description they like the best and find most effective. We can then categorize the traits and behaviors in the preferred description that are perceived as most effective, thereby determining the content of a person’s implicit leadership theory. Because results for hypothesis 2 reveal that authentic transformational leadership is perceived to be effective whether it is part of a follower’s implicit leadership theory or not, it may be an ideal form of leadership, elements of which can be found ubiquitously in implicit leadership theories of leaders and followers alike.

*Blackboard/WebCT*

Blackboard, Inc., founded in 1997, provides software applications and services on a licensing basis to primary and secondary schools, higher education, and corporate and government markets. At the higher education level, Blackboard offers a family of
software applications designed to enhance teaching and learning, aiming to improve educational experiences through internet-enabled technologies. Many universities use these applications to deliver online classes or to improve the delivery of classroom instruction by allowing the professor to offer additional online resources, post syllabi, deliver and collect assignments, and use the platform for testing. At over 1200 schools in 46 states, and over 500 international learning institutions, Blackboard is almost ubiquitous. Blackboard’s online learning application, the Blackboard Learning System, is the most widely-adopted course management system among U. S. postsecondary institutions (for more information, see http://www.blackboard.com).

WebCT Vista is one of several applications and licenses available for online course delivery. Using this application, I also was able to collect data from students in a valid and reliable manner. Using the group manager, learning modules, and assessment tools, all of the scenarios were created online and data was collected from twelve separate groups. WebCT provides the controls needed to ensure subjects could only access the survey to which they were assigned, place date and time restrictions, and control the order in which they viewed the various sections of the survey (instructions, instruments, manipulation checks, demographics, and a debriefing) without jumping ahead or returning to earlier portions. WebCT allows ease in running reports and downloading data directly into Excel, and from there to SPSS. Blackboard/WebCT is a valid and reliable tool that can be used in the collection of scientific data. It is available to many researchers using student samples at a large number of universities. At many universities, every student and faculty member has an identification number that allows access to WebCT, though they can only access
The successful use of WebCT as a data collection tool represents a significant contribution to the collection of psychometric data, as WebCT is easy to use and available to a large number of researchers.

**Theoretical Contributions**

This research provides an extension of theory in several ways: (1) by looking at the authentic leadership paradigm through the lens of transformational leadership (including the operationalization of authentic transformational leadership), (2) by viewing perceptions of leader effectiveness as a continuous influence on implicit leadership theories, and (3) by exploring the effect of a follower’s implicit leadership theory on the leader’s.

**The Authentic Leadership Paradigm**

Authentic leadership is presented as a root construct of all positive, effective forms of leadership (Avolio et. al., 2005), including spiritual, ethical, servant, and transformational leadership. Luthans and Avolio (2003) define authentic leadership in organizations as “a process that draws from both psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of leaders and associates, fostering positive self-development” (pg. 243). Through both the organizational and personal perspectives, it is posited that authentic leaders develop higher levels of self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors in leaders and followers, with the result being positive self-development in each (Luthans and Avolio, 2003). Authentic leadership and its outcomes differ little from transformational leadership because genuine behaviors of
each are intrinsically ethical; though transformational leadership has often been attacked for lack of an ethical component (see Bass & Steidlemeier, 1999). Ethicality is inherent in transformational leadership theory, as long as the behaviors enacted are valid. Behaving in a manner true to beliefs about leadership makes such leaders authentically transformational. In such a manner, transformational leaders produce better organizational outcomes than other forms of leadership, and inspire followers to go beyond the call of duty (Bass, 1985).

As theoretically developed, authentic leadership does not explicate the mechanisms to achieve the proposed outcomes for both leaders and followers of positive self-development and positive psychological states (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). I propose such leaders must use the mechanisms of transformational leadership (inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and idealized influence) to achieve said outcomes, as almost all dimensions of authentic leadership have been discussed or studied in relation to transformational leadership (see Table 2, pg. 40).

Authentic leadership, as outlined by its proponents (see Avolio & Gardner, 2005), is ethical in nature. However a description of authentic leaders based on a more accurate definition of authenticity suggests authentic leaders know who they are and what they believe and are transparent and consistent in their values and actions, though not necessarily ethical or altruistic. Authentic transformational leaders, however, are ethical, able to develop positive psychological states such as confidence, hope, optimism, and resilience in themselves and followers, producing positive self-development in each (Luthans and Avolio, 2003). Further research is required to
empirically link the aforementioned proposed outcomes with authentic transformational leadership behaviors.

Authentic leadership is not a paradigm within itself, but must be studied in conjunction with transformational leadership to discover the positive organizational and personal outcomes posited by authentic leadership authors. The theoretical development of this perspective (presented in chapter 2) is a contribution to this stream of research by re-focusing the discussion of authenticity and applying it more appropriately to transformational leadership. Further, authentic transformational leadership is operationalized in scenarios used in the experiment by describing ethical and transformational leadership using items from the MLQ 5x by Bass and Avolio, (1990), and an ethical leadership measure by Brown, Trevino, and Harrison, (2005). This operationalization should be replicated and verified to validate the measure, using alternative testing methods to confirm reliability.

Further, the results from hypothesis 2 indicate that authentic transformational leadership is a form of leadership perceived to be effective, even if followers do not themselves endorse that form of leadership. If authentic transformational leadership is perceived to be a universally accepted form of leadership, the implication is that it may be considered an ideal form of leadership. Additional research is needed to develop the proposition that authentic transformational leadership as an ideal form of leadership.

The Adjustment of Implicit Leadership Theories

Past research has suggested that implicit leadership theories are stable (see Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). The results from my research, however, indicate that perceptions of leader effectiveness will motivate followers and leaders alike to change
their implicit leadership theories. This contributes to implicit leadership theory literature by demonstrating that a person’s implicit leadership theories change as a function of his or her experiences with leaders. However such studies as Epitropaki and Martin (2004) can not be disregarded. Concerning implicit leadership theory change over time, connectionist models (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001) present a possible solution to the question as to whether implicit leadership theories are flexible or stable. Connectionist models emphasize the role of context, arguing that only when context changes occur, are implicit leadership theories altered. If the context remains stable, then implicit leadership theories remain stable. My research supports such a viewpoint by demonstrating that people believe that observations of effectiveness (a change in context) will influence implicit leadership theories. Results from hypothesis 4 support the notion of implicit leadership theories as both flexible and stable. Subjects believe that in response to negative leader evaluations (a change in context), leaders will change their views on leadership; after feedback of positive leader evaluations, subjects believe that leaders will not alter their views on leadership. The use of scenarios in my research allows for context to be introduced to the development of implicit leadership theories, contributing both procedurally and theoretically to implicit leadership theory literature. Further research on the connectionist models of implicit leadership theories is necessary to both validate the method and find more support for connectionist models of implicit theories.

The Relationship Between Leader and Follower Implicit Leadership Theories

Besides indicating that implicit leadership theories are likely both flexible and stable, this research presents a new way in looking at the development of implicit
leadership theories, in that leader and follower theories are separate from one another, distinct entities that have an effect on one another. Results indicate that follower implicit leadership theories may have an influence on the development of leader implicit leadership theories. This research advances the notion that followers are a more integral part of leadership theory than past research would indicate.

Epitropaki and Martin (2005) matched managers’ explicit behavioral profiles to the implicit theories of employees, finding support that dyadic congruence between leader and follower of implicit leadership theories has a positive influence on LMX, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and well-being of followers. This research is the only study to date that empirically demonstrates the importance of the similarities or differences between leader behavior and follower expectations by showing that dyadic congruence between implicit theories of leaders and followers have positive personal and organizational outcomes. My research builds upon their findings, adding a developmental aspect; the results from hypothesis 5 suggest that dyadic congruence of implicit theories may occur through high-quality LMX relationships, with follower implicit leadership theories influencing leader implicit leadership theories. More research is needed to further outline the relationships between follower and leader implicit leadership theories, as there is likely a reciprocal effect; follower and leader implicit leadership theories continually develop, affecting one another.

Furthermore, additional research is necessary to outline the relationship between LMX and implicit leadership theory dyadic congruence. Epitropaki and Martin’s (2005) results suggest that implicit leadership theory dyadic congruence improves the LMX relationship; my research suggests that because of the LMX relationship, leaders and
followers become cognizant of their partner’s implicit leadership theories, thereby allowing for one to influence the other and leading to dyadic congruence. Further research is needed to explain the causal relationship between LMX and dyadic congruence.

In summary, there are several theoretical contributions represented by this research: (1) by looking at the authentic leadership paradigm through the lens of transformational leadership (including the operationalization of authentic transformational leadership), (2) by viewing perceptions of leader effectiveness as a continuous influence on implicit leadership theories, and (3) by exploring the effect of a follower’s implicit leadership theory on the leader’s and the relationship between the two.

A Model of Authentic Transformational Leadership

There are examples through history of leaders that fooled their followers into believing that they (the leader) were something they were not. The model presented in this paper may explain why those inauthentic leaders are able to get away with it. As demonstrated through the results, people expect their leaders to act in ways congruent with their beliefs. It is a two-way street, however. If a leader is enacting authentic transformational behaviors, followers believe the leader must then include those behaviors in his/her implicit leadership theory and, therefore, trust them and judge them to be effective. What if, however, the leader does not believe it, but through leader-member exchanges and his/her own leader effective feedback has learned what behaviors to enact to be seen as effective?
Results of my research suggest that authentic transformational leadership behaviors are seen as an effective form of leadership. In order to be perceived as effective, leaders need only enact or mimic these behaviors, which has serious implications for practice. Leaders may set forth ethical policies and publicly denounce unethical business practices while embezzling money during the same time period. They can espouse universal brotherhood in speeches, while pitting lower level executives against one another. They can advocate the questioning of assumptions, while removing managers who do just that. In such ways, leaders appear to be authentic transformational leaders publicly while serving their own selfish and unethical interests in practice.

It is important to understand the motivations of leaders who may not be what they appear to be, those who merely enact authentic transformational behaviors to be seen as effective. Knowing what a leader should look like and mimicking those behaviors does not make one an authentic transformational leader. Intent is critical, and the inclusion of ethical behavior in the definition of this leadership style precludes the possibility of those leaders who mimic behaviors to be perceived as effective, from actually being authentic transformational leaders. One may argue that the appearance of authentic transformational leadership is enough, as followers that perceive such behaviors react accordingly. This can only be true in the short-term, however, as the true nature of inauthentic leaders will prohibit the long-term positive outcomes stemming from interactions with authentic transformational leaders. Followers of the inauthentic leader may experience temporary positive outcomes, such as increased job satisfaction, performance, and organizational commitment because they think their leader is
authentically transformational. The long-term personal effects, however, of positive psychological capital and positive self-development cannot be realized, as the leader cannot form the deeper relationships needed, for fear of their true nature being realized.

Many leaders are not as they appear. Why do some people attempt to present a false image, and how do they get away with it? Over the last several years, researchers have argued that transformational leaders, and more recently, authentic transformational leaders, are the most effective and liked leaders (Nichols, 2006; Bass & Steidlemeier, 1999). Furthermore, research indicates that people learn most effectively through social learning, the greatest tool of which is mimicry (Bandura, 1971). Because many people have a desire to lead effectively and be liked, leaders may mimic authentic transformational leadership behaviors to obtain these goals. They behave as the followers desire in order to stay in power. These types of leaders are no longer acceptable. A media barrage has awakened the public, focusing attention on bad leaders. The ability to lead is not enough anymore; leaders must have a solid ethical foundation.

Obviously, some leaders have no reason to mimic authentic transformational behaviors. They actually have all the capabilities and qualities necessary for this type of leadership. But what of those who do not? What makes them portray a false image? I propose that there are two basic reasons people do so — they are either ethically deficient or they do not have the capabilities to be a transformational leader. Authentic transformational leaders are both ethical and capable. If one does not have the capability to be such a leader, they may fake it by mimicking behaviors they believe are appropriate. Such people may be ethically developed, but simply are not capable of
being such a leader, perhaps because they have not developed the abilities yet. The mimicry may not even be conscious. Such mimics may understand the outward behaviors required to look like an authentic transformational leader, but have not yet evolved to the point where they have developed the long-term positive outcomes in followers, such as positive psychological capital and positive self-development. Conversely, some people may have the necessary skills to be a leader, but are unethical and self-aggrandizing. They fake consideration, altruism, and ethical behavior to look good in the followers’ eyes. They are able to mask the fact that they are serving their own interests.

In the model presented in Figure 4, I have created nine categories to represent levels of leadership development based on levels of two dimensions — ethical behavior and transformational capability. The nine categories include the imposter, the dishonest director, the skilled deceiver, the limited manager, the leading manager, the limited leader, the ethical manager, the ethical emergent, and the authentic transformational leader. This model provides a basis for discussion of the development of ethical and transformational leadership, and includes authentic transformational leadership as representative of a fully developed leader.
1. The Imposter category represents leaders who are unethical and do not have the ability to be a transformational leader. These leaders may have not ever developed leadership skills or ethicality, but are now working towards those aims. They are in an initial learning stage and need to develop the skills necessary to be an effective and ethical leader. Others in this category may be knowingly unethical with no desire or ability to be a transformational leader. If in a position of leadership, they will either self-select themselves out of the position or fake behaviors necessary to hold onto the position. They may become Limited Managers or Dishonest directors, depending on their ethical and transformational development.

2. The Dishonest Director category represents people who are unethical with some transformational capability. They understand that the behaviors of an authentic

---

**Figure 3.** Leader/manager model of ethical behavior and transformational capability.
transformational leader are desired by followers, and attempt to enact those behaviors, perhaps developing into Skilled Deceivers or Leading Managers, depending on their ethical and transformational development.

3. The Skilled Deceiver category represents leaders who may very well have all the necessary leadership skills to get the job done, but they are unethical and self-aggrandizing. They have personalized power motives, desiring power for selfish and not positive social purposes. They have the ability to appear transformational, but are non-altruistic, having no group orientation. Since overtly unethical leaders cannot stay in power, they fake ethical behavior and subvert the dimensions of transformational leadership (for an example of this subversion, refer to the Inauthentic Transformational column in Table 1, pg. 38).

4. The Limited Manager category represents managers who will sometimes employ unethical means to achieve their ends, and have no transformational capability. They are labeled as managers, not leaders, as they have no transformational capability, likely using transactional behaviors to interact with others. Their primary goal is self-advancement, and will use political behavior to advance themselves in the organization. They may become Ethical Managers or Leading Managers, depending on their ethical and transformational development.

5. The Leading Manager category represents people who are likely effective managers who have some transformational leadership capability. They are managers who attempt to be leaders. They are not completely ethically developed, however, and may employ unethical tactics. These people may turn either into Ethical Emergents on
the path to becoming an Authentic Transformational Leader, or Limited Leaders, depending on their ethical and transformational development.

6. The Limited Leader category represents leaders who are transformational, having a vision for the future and the ability to lead the organization through times of crisis and change. They have the organization’s interests at heart to the point of sometimes acting unethically to achieve organizational success, perhaps Machiavellian in orientation. These leaders may develop into Authentic Transformational Leaders depending on their ethical development.

7. The Ethical Manager category represents people who are ethical but do not have the capabilities to be a transformational leader. While they are altruistic and ethical with a socialized need for power (the desire for power to achieve organizational success, not personal), they do not have the necessary transformational leadership skills. Through observation, however, they know what a transformational leader looks like and may mimic those behaviors, perhaps learning the behaviors and becoming an Ethical Emergent, depending on their transformational development. They may also be completely transactional in their dealings with subordinates, being an ethical transactional leader.

8. The Ethical Emergent category represents leaders who are ethical, and have some transformational capability. This type of leader is likely developing into an Authentic Transformational Leader, with further transformational development. They have a socialized need for power and consciously work on gaining transformational leadership skills.
9. The Authentic Transformational Leader category represents leaders who are both ethical and capable, with all elements of authentic transformational leadership. They enact all the behaviors typically associated with a transformational leader, they are altruistic, ethical, are emotionally intelligent, and they have a socialized need for power. These leaders are perceived to be the most effective type of leader.

Leaders in categories 6, 7, and 8 (the Limited Leader, the Ethical Manager and the Ethical Emergent) are the most likely to develop into Authentic Transformational Leaders. Ethical Managers and Ethical Emergents are already ethically developed, and can develop transformational leadership skills through training and choosing transformational mentors to assist them in their development. Limited Leaders already have transformational capability, and may become more ethical with a positive organizational context and the development of positive psychological capacities (Luthans and Avolio, 2003). The leaders in categories 4 and 5 (the Limited Manager and the Leading Manager) may possibly develop into Authentic Transformational Leaders, though they are not as likely to do so as those in categories 6, 7 and 8, needing improvement in both the dimensions of ethicality and transformational capability. Leaders in categories 1, 2, and 3 (the Imposter, the Dishonest Director, and the Skilled Deceiver) are not likely to develop into Authentic Transformational Leaders, having the farthest to go in ethical development. Having reached adulthood and a position of authority, their unethical behavior is likely part of their innate disposition, and they have no desire to behave more ethically, finding benefit in unethical behaviors that serve only their self-interests. The Skilled Deceiver, in particular, is the least likely to develop into an Authentic Transformational Leader. Though they have the capability to
be a transformational leader, these leaders have made a conscious decision not to act
transformationally or ethically. They purposely deceive followers into believing that they
are ethical and transformational for selfish or harmful reasons.

Two questions were posed earlier, “Why do some people attempt to put on a
false image and how do they get away with it?” The first question was addressed by
suggesting that they are either unethical or incapable with a desire to lead; if they are
incapable, however, they may be developing into better leaders through
transformational development. They understand that followers desire an ethical and
capable leader. Followers’ implicit ideas of leadership likely include not only capability,
but ethics as well, as the results from hypothesis 2 suggest.

The second question can be answered through leader distance. Leaders are
either close to or distant from their followers in varying degrees, depending on three
factors. 1) physical distance 2) perceived social distance and 3) perceived task
interaction frequency (Antonakis & Atwater, 2002). Unethical leaders require distant
leadership to maintain their false image. Those subordinates who are close to their
leaders know their true nature, but may allow the leaders to stay in power because
either they owe their position to the leader or because the close followers themselves
are like the leader and fear their own exposure. Leaders in categories 1-3 definitely
require leader distance to maintain their position of power. Leaders in categories 4-6,
however, may not require such distance, depending on their ethical intent. Not being
completely unethical, they are likely able to sufficiently mask unethical behaviors
through behaving ethically most of the time. Their intent is also important; leaders who
are developing ethically have less need for distance than leaders who are set in their
ethics and consciously rely on unethical behaviors to achieve their desired ends. Leaders in categories 7-9 have no need for leader distance, as their actions are ethical and transparent; they have nothing to hide.

It is important to note that a leader’s purpose distinguishes good leaders from bad leaders. Intention is important. The Ethical Emergent leader, for example, may represent a developmental stage in the process of becoming an Authentic Transformational Leader. These leaders may not be in the top ranks of leadership, as they recognize their own inabilities and will not step on other people to get what they want. The intentions of the unethical forms of leadership, particularly the Skilled Deceiver, are what distinguish them. While having the capability to lead, they are self-serving. Having a distant relationship with their followers, however, allows them to stay in power. Leader distance is particularly important to these leaders because followers who are distant may perceive them to be good leaders. Those followers who are close, however, may know the truth and will be able to see through the deception.

It is important to be able to identify those leaders who are using deception to fulfill personal goals at the cost of the organization and its members. Scandals in recent history have shown the pain and destruction caused by such false leaders. Understanding what makes people authentic or false leaders and how they deceive is an essential step towards being able to identify such leaders. If a leader’s ethics and capability are able to define a leader as authentic, it will be much simpler not only to identify such leaders, but to educate people in early development stages as to what may lead people down false leadership paths. Such education will be able to potentially keep people from becoming false themselves, and will enable managers to
make better promotion decisions. The understanding that people ideally expect ethical behavior and capability in their leaders (i.e., authentic transformational leadership) should influence leadership development programs to include both components.

Limitations

Any research effort is going to be subject to limitations, as it is not possible to maximize all possible dimensions of design and methodology (Mitchell, 1985). Any conclusions drawn must take into consideration these limitations before interpretation. Methodological limitations can affect the validity of conclusions made from the data and theoretical limitations may result in possible problems within the research model. Following is a discussion of both methodological and theoretical limitations of this study.

Methodological and Theoretical Limitations

Cook and Campbell (1979) suggested four concerns for validity of the inferences made from study data, and identified distinct potential threats for each. These are internal validity, statistical conclusion validity, construct validity, and external validity. It is important to investigate each type of threat to validity and discuss if and how each affects this research and what safeguards were put in place to avoid or minimize such threats to validity.

Internal Validity

Internal validity is concerned with the truth about the inferences drawn regarding causal relationships and whether or not these relationships actually exist. Data collected in this study were from subjects’ perceptions, and did not infer causality between constructs. Most of the threats to internal validity (Campbell & Stanly, 1963)
were controlled for in the experimental design requiring subjects to be randomly assigned into only one of twelve different conditions to read a scenario and answer questions. History, instrumentation, statistical regression, experimental mortality, and selection-maturation interaction threats are eliminated in such a design.

One testing effect was possible. Subjects who finished the experiment may have had the opportunity to speak to participants who had not yet participated, thereby influencing their answers. The use of online students minimized this effect because they typically have very little interaction with each other. In addition, there were twelve groups of subjects randomly assigned to condition from three different classes. The subjects did not know the identity of those in their group and interaction between participants was highly unlikely.

**Statistical Conclusion Validity**

Statistical conclusion validity deals with the ability to draw conclusions based on statistical procedures; random error variance from unreliability and instability of the measures or the use of unsuitable statistical tests can impair the researcher’s ability to draw accurate conclusions. All measures used in this study were highly reliable, exceeding Cronbach’s alphas of .90 in the main experiment. Measurement instability can be a problem due to lack of control over instrument administration. The environment in which subjects participated was likely different since the experiment took place online. They could have been at home, their office, at school, the library, or any number of places. The scenarios and measures themselves, however, were all administered online in the same manner for each subject. While they all participated at different times, it is likely that these times were all times that were convenient to the
subject in a comfortable environment, reducing outside stress and uncertainties possibly associated with participation in an experiment.

**Construct Validity**

Construct validity is an assessment of how well theoretical constructs relate to the measures used. The construct and the operational procedure used to measure that construct must correspond (Schwab, 1980). Campbell and Cook (1979) outline several threats to construct validity, which will be discussed when pertinent in the following paragraphs.

Inadequate pre-operational explication of constructs is a threat when discussing authentic transformational leadership. Authentic transformational leadership has not been previously operationalized. Further research is needed to advance the development of the construct, and to test the operationalization used in this experiment. Through careful theoretical development and the use of experts who analyzed each scenario, this threat is not likely a significant limiting factor.

Mono-operation bias pertains to using a single version of the manipulation in the study, and mono-method bias refers to using a single version of the dependent variable measure in the study (Cook and Campbell, 1979). This experiment is subject to both because only one version of each the manipulation and the dependent measure variable in each hypothesis was used. I may not have captured the full breadth of the independent variables or have fully measured the dependent variables by using only one version. For example, leader effectiveness, in different hypotheses, was used as both manipulated and used as in a dependent variable measure, using the same single four item measure for each.
External Validity

External validity is the ability to extend inferences drawn from the study to, or across, different times, settings, and populations (Cook and Campbell, 1979). The goal of this experiment was not to establish external validity, but to find out the perceptions of the subjects concerning the hypothesized relationships. The purpose of this experiment was to verify the existence of these relationships. Because the focus was on specific relationships, I needed a controlled experimental setting to assure there were no outside influences to mitigate the results, further strengthening internal validity. However these results are still generalizable to other settings as all participants in the study are adults with both leader and follower experience. Their perceptions about the hypothesized relationships are as valid as those of people in any organizational setting.

Directions for Future Research

Relationships in a model of authentic transformational behavior and implicit leadership theories were examined in this study. Findings suggest that authentic transformational leadership may be an ideal form of leadership, desirable by both leaders and followers. Additionally, perceptions of leader effectiveness may have a strong influence on both a leader’s and a follower’s implicit leadership theories, through continual adjustment based on observations of leader effectiveness. Results of this study also indicate that it is likely that leaders take cues from followers as to which leader behaviors are preferable through leader-member exchange relationships.

Future research should further explicate components of authentic transformational leadership, testing the proposition that authentic leadership is not its own paradigm, but an extension of transformational leadership. This research should
include consideration of the antecedents, components, and outcomes of authentic transformational leadership behaviors. In addition, research is needed regarding the content of implicit leadership theories with specific reference to components of authentic transformational leadership. Is authentic transformational leadership a universal ideal form of leadership whose components are found in everyone’s implicit leadership theory?

The effect of leader effectiveness on implicit leadership theories also requires further study. Longitudinal quasi-experimental field research with leader effective and ineffective treatments are needed to ascertain the true effect of leader effectiveness on the content of implicit leadership theories. This research must include methods to effectively determine implicit leadership theory content and evaluate changes in these implicit theories for both leaders and followers. In addition, future research should examine whether the content of follower and leader implicit leadership theories are different and if each affects the other similarly. The answers to these questions will assist in the understanding of implicit leadership development through organizational and relational contexts.

Individuals likely become authentic transformational leaders through a developmental process, based on ethical and moral development, and transformational capability. If authentic transformational leadership is seen as an ideal form of leadership, it is likely that followers express a desire for those behaviors to their leaders and their leaders attempt to enact those behaviors. Further elucidation is needed of the relationship between a follower’s and a leader’s implicit leadership theory, including mechanisms for the communication of one to the other that go beyond leader-member
exchange. Becoming an authentic transformational leader is likely a developmental process, with leaders going through such states as the Ethical Emergent or Limited Leader categories, as suggested earlier. If it is a developmental process, further research is needed to clarify the steps along the way, mechanisms for learning these behaviors, why some leaders cannot develop fully into Authentic Transformational Leaders, and follower and organizational consequences for leaders who are unable to become authentic transformational leaders. In addition, the model of ethical and transformational leadership presented in Figure 4 requires further consideration and development, based upon results of additional theoretical development of Authentic Transformational Leadership and empirical results from research.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter provided an evaluation of the results of this experiment. A discussion of both procedural and theoretical contributions and the limitations specific to this study were reviewed. The chapter ended with suggestions for future research.

The goal of this experiment was to contribute to authentic and transformational leadership literature as well as explore the nature of follower-leader relationships with specific investigation of implicit leadership theories and leader effectiveness. Perceptions were purposely a key factor in this study, as both leader and follower behaviors are derived from perceptions — we act based on what we perceive. Further study of leader behaviors based on what people think will happen between leaders and followers is needed, because behavior is founded on perceptions.

Results from this research add to the existing literature and produced several avenues for future research. All hypotheses, with the exception of hypothesis 2, were
supported. The lack of support for hypothesis 2 points to authentic transformational leadership perceived as an universally effective, possibly ideal, form of leadership, which is a more interesting result than the proposed hypothesis. This research represents a valuable addition to leadership theory, both procedurally and theoretically.
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Instructions for the Pilot Study and Informed Consent

Welcome!
Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. It is greatly appreciated and will assist in furthering our knowledge in the field of Management. If at any time you have problems completing the survey, please do not hesitate to contact Thomas Nichols at 817-846-5946 or e-mail him at nicholst@unt.edu. You will have every opportunity to complete each section of this survey. Please do not contact the professor through whose class you gained access to this survey, if you have problems. E-mail or call Thomas Nichols with the above contact information. Your professor does not have any information concerning the survey that will be able to assist you.

Instructions

The survey consists of 5 sections, including this one. Though you only see 3 sections right now, two more will eventually appear as you complete certain portions of the survey. Each section is a different document you will need to open. If you look to the left of this screen, you will see a table of contents. After you complete the ‘Welcome’ section, move on to ‘Survey.’ When you complete the ‘Survey’ section, the ‘A Few More Questions’ section will appear. After completing that, move on the ‘Need Some Info’ section, and then the ‘Thanks for Helping’ section, which will have appeared by then. Just click on the link in the table of contents, and then begin the assessment.

When answering the questions, check the box that precedes the answer. Also, it may help to maximize the page for ease of reading. As you are answering the questions,
save each one and click the “Finish” button when you are through with that portion. The questions simply ask your perception of a situation, so there are no right or wrong answers, only your opinion. Please read the scenario very carefully, and make sure you have answered every question.

Please continue reading the Information Notice portion of this document. If you proceed with the survey, it indicates your voluntary willingness to do so.

*The last paragraph informs the subjects that their continuation of the survey implies their consent. This implication is also stated under “Research Participants’ Rights” in the following pages.
University of North Texas Institutional Review Board

Information Notice

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose and benefits of the study and how it will be conducted.

Title of Study: Authentic Transformational Leadership and Implicit Leadership Theories
Principal Investigator: Thomas W. Nichols, University of North Texas (UNT)
Department of Management.

Purpose of the Study: You are being asked to participate in a research study which involves your perceptions of leaders, followers, and how they interact.

Study Procedures: You will be asked to read a scenario and answer questions about it. It should take no more than 25 minutes of your time.

Foreseeable Risks:
No foreseeable risks are involved with this study.

Benefits to the Subjects or Others:
This study is not expected to be of any direct benefit to you, though it will aid researchers in the understanding of how people think about leadership, and the importance of the interactions between leaders and followers.
Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records: Your responses to this survey will remain completely confidential, the results being separately coded and stored anonymously. The confidentiality of your individual information will be maintained in any publications or presentations regarding this study.

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Thomas W. Nichols, Department of Management, at telephone number 817-846-5946, or e-mail at nicholst@unt.edu. You may also contact Dr. Vicki Goodwin, Department of Management, at 940-565-4766, or e-mail at Goodwin@unt.edu.

Review for the Protection of Participants: This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

Research Participants’ Rights: Proceeding with this survey indicates that you have read all of the above and that you confirm all of the following:

- You understand this study, having read the above, and have been told the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to take part in this study, and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw will involve
no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.

- You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.

- You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent to participate in this study.
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Demographic Survey Questions

1. How old are you in years?

2. What is your gender?
   (1) Male (2) Female

3. What is your classification?
   (1) Freshman (2) Sophomore (3) Junior (4) Senior (5) Graduate

4. What is your race?
   (1) African American (2) Asian (3) Caucasian (4) Hispanic (5) Other

4. How many more years of full time work experience have you had (40 hours a week or more)?

5. How many years of part-time work experience have you had (Less than 40 hours per week)?

6. Have you ever been a committee chair person? If so, how long (in years)?

7. Have you ever been the president of a club or organization? If so, how long?
8. Have you ever managed others in a business setting (1 or more employees)? If so, how long (in years)?)
   
9. Have you ever taken a course in ethics?
   
   (1) Yes (2) No

10. Please enter any other leader experience you have had in the box below:
DEBRIEF

Thank you for your participation in this study. The survey you have just completed was one of several surveys. Together, these surveys will tell me about ideal forms of leadership, relationships between leaders and followers, and people’s basic beliefs about leadership.

I am using this study to test out my surveys in a preliminary fashion. I am very interested in any comments you might have, concerning any matter. Was the scenario easy to understand? Was the format easy to use? Any comments you think that may help me improve my survey would be greatly appreciated. Please post your comments in the space provided below.

Again, thank you for the time you spent today in assisting me with this project.
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Scenarios to Test Hypothesis 1

Scenario 1.1

Condition: Congruence between LILT content and authentic transformational behaviors

Frank is a leader in Average American Company. Frank believes that a leader should conduct his life in an ethical manner. He believes one should define success not just by results, but also the way those results are obtained. He thinks a leader should listen to what employees have to say, and discipline those employees who violate ethical standards. He thinks a leader should make fair and balanced decisions, and should always be able to be trusted. He believes in discussing business ethics or values with employees, and wants to set an example of how to do things the right way, in terms of ethics. He believes a leader should have the interests of employees in mind, and when making decisions, ask “what is the right thing to do?”

Additionally, Frank believes a leader should make personal sacrifices for the benefit of others, and should remain calm during crisis situations. He thinks a leader should be able to instill pride in those he leads, just for being associated with him. He thinks a leader should go beyond his own self-interest for the good of the group, and provide reassurance that obstacles will be overcome. He thinks a leader should display extraordinary talent and competence in whatever he undertakes. He wants his actions to garner respect from his followers, hopefully displaying a sense of power and confidence.
Frank believes a leader should set high standards, and envision exciting new possibilities. He thinks a leader should talk optimistically of the future, expressing confidence that he and his followers will achieve their goals. His belief is that leaders should provide continuous encouragement to those he leads, focusing the attention of his followers on “what it takes” to be successful. He thinks leaders should speak enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished, and arouse an awareness of what is essential to consider in those he leads. He believes in articulating a compelling vision of the future, and showing determination to accomplish whatever he sets out to do.

Frank also thinks a leader should emphasize the value of questioning assumptions. He thinks one should re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate, and one should encourage those he leads to rethink ideas which had never been questioned before, including the traditional ways of doing things. He believes in seeking differing perspectives when solving problems, and suggesting new ways of looking at how they do their jobs. He believes a leader should encourage those he leads to express their ideas and opinions, and get those he leads to look at problems from many different angles. He thinks a leader should encourage non-traditional thinking to deal with traditional problems, and encourage addressing problems by using reasoning and evidence, rather than unsupported opinion.
Frank also believes it is important to treat those he leads as individuals, rather than just members of a group. He thinks a leader should listen attentively to the concerns of those he leads, and provide useful advice for their development. He thinks a leader should focus on developing his followers’ strengths, and spend time teaching and coaching them. Also important, he believes, is treating each of those he leads as individuals with different needs, abilities, and aspirations. He thinks a leader should teach those he leads how to identify the needs and capabilities of others, and should promote self-development among his followers, giving personal attention to those who seem neglected.

Having read Frank’s beliefs about leadership, consider the following scenario describing Frank’s behavior.

Frank discovers that a member of his department has engaged in insider trading, leaking private company information to a friend for personal gain, an illegal and unethical practice. Once discovered, the culprit offers a large bribe to Frank, offering him a share of the profits.

Frank immediately reports the situation to his supervisor and to human resources. He remains calm during the crisis, and calls a meeting of the rest of his staff to have an open discussion concerning ethical behavior, coming in on his day off to do so. He invites his staff to address the problem, and asks their advice on how to keep something like this from happening again, encouraging innovative solutions. He takes time to
listen to each employee carefully, valuing each of their opinions. After the meeting, Frank expresses his vision of high standards and a bright future. He lets them know that he believes that as a team they will be successful in whatever they do, giving them praise and encouragement.
Scenario 1.2

Condition: Non-congruence between LILT content and ATF

Frank is a leader in Average American Company. Frank believes that a leader should conduct his life in an ethical manner. He believes one should define success not just by results, but also the way those results are obtained. He thinks a leader should listen to what employees have to say, and discipline those employees who violate ethical standards. He thinks a leader should make fair and balanced decisions, and should always be able to be trusted. He believes in discussing business ethics or values with employees, and wants to set an example of how to do things the right way, in terms of ethics. He believes a leader should have the interests of employees in mind, and when making decisions, ask “what is the right thing to do?”

Additionally, Frank believes a leader should make personal sacrifices for the benefit of others, and should remain calm during crisis situations. He thinks a leader should be able to instill pride in those he leads, just for being associated with him. He thinks a leader should go beyond his own self-interest for the good of the group, and provide reassurance that obstacles will be overcome. He thinks a leader should display extraordinary talent and competence in whatever he undertakes. He wants his actions to garner respect from his followers, hopefully displaying a sense of power and confidence.
Frank believes a leader should set high standards, and envision exciting new possibilities. He thinks a leader should talk optimistically of the future, expressing confidence that he and his followers will achieve their goals. His belief is that leaders should provide continuous encouragement to those he leads, focusing the attention of his followers on “what it takes” to be successful. He thinks leaders should speak enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished, and arouse an awareness of what is essential to consider in those he leads. He believes inarticulating a compelling vision of the future, and showing determination to accomplish whatever he sets out to do.

Frank also thinks a leader should emphasize the value of questioning assumptions. He thinks one should re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate, and one should encourage those he leads to rethink ideas which had never been questioned before, including the traditional ways of doing things. He believes in seeking differing perspectives when solving problems, and suggesting new ways of looking at how they do their jobs. He believes a leader should encourage those he leads to express their ideas and opinions, and get those he leads to look at problems from many different angles. He thinks a leader should encourage non-traditional thinking to deal with traditional problems, and encourage addressing problems by using reasoning and evidence, rather than unsupported opinion.

Frank also believes it is important to treat those he leads as individuals, rather than just members of a group. He thinks a leader should listen attentively to the concerns of
those he leads, and provide useful advice for their development. He thinks a leader should focus on developing his followers’ strengths, and spend time teaching and coaching them. Also important, he believes, is treating each of those he leads as individuals with different needs, abilities, and aspirations. He thinks a leader should teach those he leads how to identify the needs and capabilities of others, and should promote self-development among his followers, giving personal attention to those who seem neglected.

Having read Frank’s beliefs about leadership, consider the following scenario describing Frank’s behavior.

Frank discovers that a member of his department has engaged in insider trading, leaking private company information to a friend for personal gain, an illegal and unethical practice. Once discovered, the culprit offers a large bribe to Frank, offering him a share of the profits.

Frank immediately accepts the bribe and begins an earnest discussion with the lawbreaker on how to further increase their ill-gained profits. He describes how they can become personally wealthy, only hurting a few people along the way. He makes sure his co-conspirator understands the importance of secrecy, and how they must put their own interests above the good of the group to make sure they don’t get caught. When asked questions, Frank immediately shuts his new partner up, suppressing any ideas or opinions he may have.
Scenario 1.3

Condition: Congruence between LILT content and transactional leader behavior

Frank is the type of person who believes in giving those he leads what they want in exchange for their support. He believes he should make it clear to his subordinates what they can expect to receive, if their performance meets standards. He thinks a leader should work out agreements with those he leads on what they will receive if they do what needs to be done, and negotiate with them about what they can expect to receive for what they accomplish. He also thinks a leader should provide assistance to his followers in exchange for their effort, and make sure to tell those he leads what to do to be rewarded for their efforts, making sure they receive appropriate rewards for achieving performance targets. He wants his subordinates to be able to earn credit with him by doing their tasks well, and thinks he should express satisfaction when those he leads do a good job.

Frank believes a leader’s attention should be on correcting irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards. He believes that at certain times, a leader should wait for the work of his subordinates to fall below minimum standards before he should step in and make improvements. He believes a leader should ascribe to the belief that “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” At other times, he believes a leader should actively look for problems, monitoring subordinates’ performance for errors, “putting out fires,” keeping track of their mistakes, and enforcing rules to avoid mistakes. When problems become serious, Frank believes a leader should focus more on what his subordinates have done wrong rather than what they have done right.
Having read Frank’s beliefs about leadership, consider the following scenario describing Frank’s behavior.

Frank is training a new employee in the company. He explains very clearly the subordinate’s duties and the payment and bonus structures of the company. As the new employee embarks on his duties, Frank provides assistance as long as he sees the new employee putting forth effort. If Frank was present when the new employee made a mistake, he would correct it immediately. However, if he discovered the mistake later, Frank simply waited until his performance review to comment on his performance, not bothering to correct the mistake until then. At the end of the training period, Frank rewards the new employee appropriately, appreciating his hard work. The new employee has worked hard, and Frank has a high opinion of him, which he expresses to the new employee.
Scenario 1.4
Condition: Non-congruence between LILT content and transactional leader behavior

Frank is the type of person who believes in giving those he leads what they want in exchange for their support. He believes he should make it clear to his subordinates what they can expect to receive, if their performance meets standards. He thinks a leader should work out agreements with those he leads on what they will receive if they do what needs to be done, and negotiate with them about what they can expect to receive for what they accomplish. He also thinks a leader should provide assistance to his followers in exchange for their effort, and make sure to tell those he leads what to do to be rewarded for their efforts, making sure they receive appropriate rewards for achieving performance targets. He wants his subordinates to be able to earn credit with him by doing their tasks well, and thinks he should express satisfaction when those he leads do a good job.

Frank believes a leader’s attention should be on correcting irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards. He believes that at certain times, a leader should wait for the work of his subordinates to fall below minimum standards before he should step in and make improvements. He believes a leader should ascribe to the belief that “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” At other times, he believes a leader should actively look for problems, monitoring subordinates’ performance for errors, “putting out fires,” keeping track of their mistakes, and enforcing rules to avoid mistakes. When problems become serious, Frank believes a leader should focus more on what his subordinates have done wrong rather than what they have done right.
Having read Frank’s beliefs about leadership, consider the following scenario describing Frank’s behavior.

Frank is assigned to train a new employee in the company. He gives the new employee a training manual without actually explaining the duties, and doesn’t bother with explaining the payment structure, as he thinks that is the job of human resources. As the new employee embarks on his duties, Frank simply watches the new employee, not helping him at all in his efforts. When the new employee makes a mistake, Frank never bothers correcting him, figuring someone else will eventually tell him. At the end of the training period, Frank provides no real feedback to the new employee, shuffling him directly into the hustle of the daily business.
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Measure to Test Hypothesis 1, Scenarios 1.1 and 1.2

Perceptual measure: Consistency between leader beliefs (ILT) and behavior

1. Given Frank’s beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you believe Frank actually
would behave as described in the above scenario?

2. Given Frank’s beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you believe that Frank
actually would take such a bribe?

3. Given Frank’s beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you believe that Frank
actually would report the situation?

4. Given Frank’s beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you think that Frank’s
behaviors are based on his beliefs?

1 (Not at All)  2 (A Little)  3 (A Fair Amount)  4 (Quite a Bit)  5 (A Great Deal)
Appendix B1-C

Measure to Test Hypothesis 1, Scenarios 1.3 and 1.4

Perceptual measure: Consistency between leader beliefs (ILT) and behavior

1. Given Frank's beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you think Frank actually would behave as described in the above scenario?

2. Given Frank's beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you think Frank actually would explain the duties to the new employee?

3. Given Frank's beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you think Frank actually would reward the new employee for his efforts?

4. Given Frank's beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you think Frank's behaviors are based on his beliefs.

1(Not at All)   2 (A Little)   3(A Fair Amount)   4(Quite a Bit)   5(A Great Deal)
Appendix B2-A
Scenarios to Test Hypothesis 2

Scenario 2.1

Condition: Non-congruence between LILT and FILT content (ATF)

Frank is a leader in Average American Company. If asked, those around Frank would say that he conducts his life in an ethical manner. He defines success not just by results, but also the way those results are obtained. He listens to what employees have to say, and disciplines those employees who violate ethical standards. He is known for making fair and balanced decisions, and can always be trusted. He often discusses business ethics or values with employees, and sets an example of how to do things the right way, in terms of ethics. He has the best interests of employees in mind, and when making decisions, asks “what is the right thing to do?”

Additionally, Frank makes personal sacrifices for the benefit of others. He is known for remaining calm during crisis situations. He instills pride in those he leads, just for being associated with him. He goes beyond his own self-interest for the good of the group, and provides reassurance that obstacles will be overcome. He displays extraordinary talent and competence in whatever he undertakes. His actions garner respect from his followers, and he displays a sense of power and confidence.

Frank is known to set high standards, and envisions exciting new possibilities. He talks optimistically of the future, expressing confidence that he and his followers will achieve their goals. He provides continuous encouragement to those he leads, focusing the attention of his followers on “what it takes” to be successful. He talks enthusiastically
about what needs to be accomplished, and arouses an awareness of what is essential to consider in those he leads. He articulates a compelling vision of the future, and shows determination to accomplish whatever he sets out to do.

Frank also emphasizes the value of questioning assumptions. He re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate, and encourages those he leads to rethink ideas which had never been questioned before, including the traditional ways of doing things. He seeks differing perspectives when solving problems, and suggests new ways of looking at how they do their jobs. He encourages those he leads to express their ideas and opinions, and gets those he leads to look at problems from many different angles. He encourages non-traditional thinking to deal with traditional problems, and encourages addressing problems by using reasoning and evidence, rather than unsupported opinion.

Frank also treats those he leads as individuals, rather than just members of a group. He listens attentively to the concerns of those he leads, and provides useful advice for their development. He focuses on developing his followers’ strengths, and spends time teaching and coaching them. He treats each of those he leads as individuals with different needs, abilities, and aspirations. He also teaches those he leads how to identify the needs and capabilities of others. He promotes self-development among his followers, and gives personal attention to those who seem neglected.

Joe is one of Frank’s followers. He has observed all of the above behaviors in Frank, and does not necessarily agree with Frank’s leadership style. Whereas he acknowledges that leaders may behave as Frank does, Joe believes there are other
behaviors that may more appropriately represent good leadership. He might not necessarily act the same way Frank does if he were in a similar leadership position.
Scenario 2.2
Condition: Congruence between LILT and FILT content (ATF)

Frank is a leader in Average American Company. If asked, those around Frank would say that he conducts his life in an ethical manner. He defines success not just by results, but also the way those results are obtained. He listens to what employees have to say, and disciplines those employees who violate ethical standards. He is known for making fair and balanced decisions, and can always be trusted. He often discusses business ethics or values with employees, and sets an example of how to do things the right way, in terms of ethics. He has the best interests of employees in mind, and when making decisions, asks “what is the right thing to do?”

Additionally, Frank makes personal sacrifices for the benefit of others. He is known for remaining calm during crisis situations. He instills pride in those he leads, just for being associated with him. He goes beyond his own self-interest for the good of the group, and provides reassurance that obstacles will be overcome. He displays extraordinary talent and competence in whatever he undertakes. His actions garner respect from his followers, and he displays a sense of power and confidence.

Frank is known to set high standards, and envisions exciting new possibilities. He talks optimistically of the future, expressing confidence that he and his followers will achieve their goals. He provides continuous encouragement to those he leads, focusing the attention of his followers on “what it takes” to be successful. He talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished, and arouses an awareness of what is essential
to consider in those he leads. He articulates a compelling vision of the future, and shows determination to accomplish whatever he sets out to do.

Frank also emphasizes the value of questioning assumptions. He re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate, and encourages those he leads to rethink ideas which had never been questioned before, including the traditional ways of doing things. He seeks differing perspectives when solving problems, and suggests new ways of looking at how they do their jobs. He encourages those he leads to express their ideas and opinions, and gets those he leads to look at problems from many different angles. He encourages non-traditional thinking to deal with traditional problems, and encourages addressing problems by using reasoning and evidence, rather than unsupported opinion.

Frank also treats those he leads as individuals, rather than just members of a group. He listens attentively to the concerns of those he leads, and provides useful advice for their development. He focuses on developing his followers’ strengths, and spends time teaching and coaching them. He treats each of those he leads as individuals with different needs, abilities, and aspirations. He also teaches those he leads how to identify the needs and capabilities of others. He promotes self-development among his followers, and gives personal attention to those who seem neglected.

Joe is one of Frank’s followers, and has observed Frank’s leadership behaviors. Joe agrees with Frank’s leadership style and would probably act the same way Frank does if he were in a similar leadership position.
Scenario 2.3

Condition: Non-congruence between LILT and FILT content (non-ATF)

Frank is a leader in Average American Company. If asked, those around Frank would say that he does not conduct his life in an ethical manner. He measures success by the end result, with no regard for how the results were obtained. He has no interest in the thoughts of his employees, and looks the other way when his employees violate ethical standards. His decisions tend to show favoritism, and many find it hard to trust him. He has no interest in the discussion of business ethics, nor is he interested in setting a good example. He has his own interests at heart and is more interested in getting things done right, rather than doing the right thing.

Frank is one who would willingly sacrifice others to benefit himself. He tends to be excitable during crisis situations, often exacerbating the situation with his behavior. Those around him have little respect for him, seeing little talent, competence, or confidence.

Frank tends to set low standards, and seems to have no vision for the future. He expects those around him to motivate themselves, never offering encouragement. He shows little determination to accomplish the tasks set before him.

Frank never questions assumptions, assuming that what has gone before is appropriate, not wanting to rock the boat. He has a traditional mindset, and believes that old solutions to problems are perfectly valid now. He encourages traditional thinking to deal with problems, and often offers unsupported opinions as logical proof.
Frank also treats everyone the same. He believes he should stand above those he leads, developing the group as a whole, with no regard for individual needs.

Joe is one of Frank’s followers. He has observed all of the above behaviors in Frank, and does not necessarily agree with Frank’s leadership style. Whereas he acknowledges that leaders may behave as Frank does, Joe believes there are other behaviors that may more appropriately represent good leadership. He might not necessarily act the same way Frank does if he were in a similar leadership position.
Scenario 2.4

Condition: Congruence between LILT and FILT content (unethical transactional)

Frank is a leader in Average American Company. If asked, those around Frank would say that he does not conduct his life in an ethical manner. He measures success by the end result, with no regard for how the results were obtained. He has no interest in the thoughts of his employees, and looks the other way when his employees violate ethical standards. His decisions tend to show favoritism, and many find it hard to trust him. He has no interest in the discussion of business ethics, nor is he interested in setting a good example. He has his own interests at heart and is more interested in getting things done right, rather than doing the right thing.

Frank is the type of person who believes in giving those he leads what they want in exchange for their support. He makes it clear to his subordinates what they can expect to receive, if their performance meets standards. He works out agreements with those he leads on what they will receive if they do what needs to be done, negotiating with them about what they can expect to receive for what they accomplish. He also provides assistance to his followers in exchange for their effort. He makes sure to tell those he leads what to do to be rewarded for their efforts, making sure they receive appropriate rewards for achieving performance targets. His subordinates can earn credit with him by doing their tasks well, and he expresses satisfaction when those he leads do a good job.
Frank’s attention is on correcting irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards. At times, he waits for the work of his subordinates to fall below minimum standards before he tries to make improvements. He often ascribes to the belief that “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” Consequently, problems must become chronic before he takes action. At other times, he may actively look for these problems, monitoring his subordinates’ performance for errors, “putting out fires,” keeping track of their mistakes, and enforcing rules to avoid mistakes. When problems become serious, Frank tends to focus more on what his subordinates have done wrong rather than what they have done right.

Joe is one of Frank’s followers, and has observed Frank’s leadership behaviors. Joe agrees with Frank’s leadership style and would probably act the same way Frank does if he were in a similar leadership position.
Appendix B2-B

Measure to Test Hypothesis 2

Perceptual Measure: Leader effectiveness

To what degree do you agree with the following statements?

1. Joe places trust in Frank.
2. Joe believes Frank is an excellent supervisor.
3. Joe believes Frank is a good leader.
4. Joe believes Frank is a very effective leader.
5. Joe does not believe Frank is a successful leader.

1 (Not at All) 2 (A Little) 3 (A Fair Amount) 4 (Quite a Bit) 5 (A Great Deal)
Appendix B3-A

Scenarios to Test Hypothesis 3

Scenario 3.1

Condition: Effective leader

Joe is an employee in Average American Company. Frank is Joe’s leader in the company. Joe completely trusts Frank, and has been heard to comment that Frank is an “excellent” supervisor. If asked, Joe would say that Frank is a good and very effective leader.
Scenario 3.2

Condition: Ineffective leader

Joe is an employee at Average American Company. Frank is Joe’s boss in the company. Joe, however, does not trust Frank, and has been heard to comment that Frank is a terrible supervisor. If asked, Joe would say that Frank is a bad and very ineffective leader.
Appendix B3-B

Measure to Test Hypothesis 3

Perceptual Measure: Incorporation of leader behavior into FILT content

1. To what degree do you believe Joe will incorporate Frank's behaviors into his idea of ideal leadership?

2. To what degree do you think Joe forms his opinions about leadership based on Frank's behavior?

3. To what degree do you think Joe would behave the same as Frank if he found himself in a similar leadership position?

4. To what degree do you think Joe would change his personal theory about ideal leadership based on Frank's behaviors?

5. To what degree do you think Joe and Frank have the same personal theory about ideal leadership?

6. To what degree do you think Joe rejects Frank's ideas about leadership?

1(Not at All)  2 (A Little)  3(A Fair Amount)  4(Quite a Bit)  5(A Great Deal)
Scenario 4.1

Condition: Negative feedback on new behavior

Frank is a leader in Average American Company. He decides to try out some new leader behaviors to increase his effectiveness. After a six month period, Frank receives a leadership evaluation that is negative, indicating he has not been an effective leader. Having observed his lack of effectiveness himself, he then thinks about the changes he made in his leadership behaviors over the past six-month period.
Scenario 4.2

Condition: Positive feedback on new behavior

Frank is a leader in Average American Company. He decides to try out some new leader behaviors to increase his effectiveness. After a six-month period, Frank receives a leadership evaluation that is positive, indicating that he has been effective as a leader. He then thinks about the changes he made in his leadership behaviors over the past six-month period.
Scenario 4.3

Condition: Negative feedback on current behavior

Frank is a leader in Average American Company. After a six-month period of behaving like he normally does, Frank receives a leadership evaluation that is negative. He then thinks about his behavior over the past six-month period.
Scenario 4.4

Condition: Positive feedback on current behavior

Frank is a leader in Average American Company. After a six-month period of behaving like he normally does, Frank receives a leadership evaluation that is positive. He then evaluates his behavior over the past-six month period.
Appendix B4-B

Measure to Test Hypothesis 4

Perceptual Measure: LILT content

1. To what degree do you think Frank would behave the same as he has over the last six-months during the next six-month period?

2. To what degree do you think Frank will maintain his leadership behaviors of the last six months?

3. To what degree do you think Frank will continue acting as he has over the last six months?

4. To what degree do you think Frank’s personal theory about leadership will remain the same?

1(Not at All)  2 (A Little)  3(A Fair Amount)  4(Quite a Bit)  5(A Great Deal)
Appendix B5-A

Scenarios to Test Hypothesis 5

Scenario 5.1

Condition: High LMX

Joe has worked for Average American Company for several years. His leader, Frank, has also worked there for several years. They always know where they stand with each other, and how satisfied they are with each other’s job performance. Frank knows a great deal about Joe’s job problems and needs, and fully recognizes his potential. Frank would use his power as a leader in the organization to assist Joe in his work-related problems and bail him out at his own expense if need be, which Joe understands very well. When the occasions have arisen, both have been known to defend and justify decisions made by the other in their absence. If asked, both would characterize their working relationship as extremely effective.
Scenario 5.2

Condition: Low LMX

Joe has worked for Average American Company for several years. His boss, Frank, has also worked there for several years. They rarely know where they stand with each other, and do not know how satisfied the other is with their job performance. Frank doesn't know about Joe’s job problems and needs or his potential. Given the opportunity, Frank would not use his power as a leader to assist Joe in his work-related problems, or bail him out of problems at his own expense. They would not defend or justify decisions made in the other’s absence. If asked, both would characterize their working relationship as extremely ineffective.
Appendix B5-B
Measure to Test Hypothesis 5

Perceptual Measure: LILT Content

1. To what degree do you believe that Frank bases his leadership behavior on Joe’s input as a follower?

2. To what degree do you think that Frank would change the way he behaves based on comments made by Joe?

3. To what degree do you think that Frank would engage in self-evaluation of his own behaviors based on feedback given by Joe?

4. To what degree do you think Frank forms his opinions about leadership based on Joe’s input?

5. To what degree do you think Frank would alter his personal ideas about leadership based on feedback given by Joe?

6. To what degree do you Frank’s leadership behavior has nothing to do with Joe’s input?

7. To what degree do you think Frank does not listen to Joe’s advice?

8. To what degree do you think Frank would not use Joe’s input about leadership?

1(Not at All) 2 (A Little) 3(A Fair Amount) 4(Quite a Bit) 5(A Great Deal)
APPENDIX C

MANIPULATION CHECKS
Appendix C-1

Manipulation Checks for Scenarios 1.1 and 1.2

Authentic Transformational Leader Behavior

Scenarios 1.1 and 1.2

1. To what degree do you believe that Frank acted ethically?
2. To what degree did Frank give individual consideration to his employees?
3. To what degree was Frank intellectually stimulating?
4. To what degree did Frank show vision for the future?

Scenarios 1.3 and 1.4

1. To what degree do you think Frank rewarded the new employee for his efforts?
2. To what degree do you think Frank provided feedback to the new employee?
3. To what degree do you think Frank gave rewards to the new employee for work accomplished?
4. To what degree do you think Frank provided assistance to the new employee in exchange for his effort?
5. To what degree do you think Frank corrected the new employee's performance when he found mistakes?
6. To what degree do you think Frank corrected the new employee's mistakes during the performance review?

1(Not at All) 2 (A Little) 3(A Fair Amount) 4(Quite a Bit) 5(A Great Deal)
Appendix C-2

Manipulation Checks for Hypothesis 2

Questions to assess ATF manipulation

1. To what degree do you believe Frank is an ethical person?
2. To what degree do you believe Frank is charismatic?
3. To what degree do you think Frank intellectually stimulates those around him?
4. To what degree do you think Frank inspires others?
5. To what degree do you think Frank shows consideration for others?

Question to assess congruence between LILT and FILT

1. To what degree do you think Joe believes a leader should behave the same way Frank does?

1(Not at All) 2 (A Little) 3(A Fair Amount) 4(Quite a Bit) 5(A Great Deal)
Appendix C-3

Manipulation Checks for Hypothesis 3

1. To what degree do you believe Frank is ineffective as a leader? (Reverse scored)
2. To what degree do you believe Frank is an excellent leader?
3. To what degree do you believe Joe trusts Frank?
4. To what degree do you believe Frank is a bad leader? (Reverse scored)

1 (Not at All)  2 (A Little)  3 (A Fair Amount)  4 (Quite a Bit)  5 (A Great Deal)
Appendix C-4

Manipulation Checks for Hypothesis 4

1. To what degree do you believe Frank is ineffective as a leader? (Reverse scored)

2. To what degree do you believe Frank is an excellent leader?

3. To what degree do you believe Frank is a bad leader? (Reverse scored)

1 (Not at All)  2 (A Little)  3 (A Fair Amount)  4 (Quite a Bit)  5 (A Great Deal)
Appendix C-5

Manipulation Checks for Hypothesis 5

1. To what degree do you believe Joe and Frank have a good relationship?
2. To what degree do you think Joe and Frank are friends?
3. To what degree do you think Joe and Frank rely on each other for advice?
4. To what degree do you think Joe and Frank have the same ideas about leadership?

1 (Not at All) 2 (A Little) 3 (A Fair Amount) 4 (Quite a Bit) 5 (A Great Deal)
APPENDIX D

CHANGES MADE FOR SECOND PILOT STUDY
Appendix D1-A

Manipulation Checks for Hypothesis 1

**Congruence Manipulation**

Please answer the following questions comparing Frank's beliefs to his actual actions. To what degree do you believe Frank's leadership actions matched his leadership beliefs?

1. To what degree do you think Frank was NOT true to his beliefs?

2. To what degree do you believe Frank's beliefs about leadership guided his actions?

3. To what degree do you believe Frank was true to his beliefs?

**Action Manipulation**

Please answer the following questions according to the way Frank actually behaved.

1. To what degree did Frank NOT act ethically?

2. To what degree did Frank act charismatically?

3. To what degree did Frank intellectually stimulate his followers?

4. To what degree was Frank inspirational?

5. To what degree did Frank show consideration for others?

1(Not at All)  2 (Hardly at All)  3(A Little Bit)  4(A Fair Amount)  5(Quite a Bit)  6(A Great Deal)  7(Absolutely)
Appendix D1-B

Manipulation Checks for Hypothesis 2

*Style Manipulation*

Please answer the following questions according to Frank's (the leader) leadership style, regardless of Joe's opinion.

1. To what degree do you believe Frank is an ethical person?
2. To what degree do you think Frank is charismatic?
3. To what degree do you believe that Frank intellectually stimulates his followers?
4. To what degree do you think Frank inspires his followers?
5. To what degree do you think Frank shows consideration to his followers?

*Congruency Manipulation*

Please answer the following questions referring to the ways that both Frank (the leader) and Joe (the follower) think.

1. To what degree do you think Joe thinks a leader should act the same way Frank does?
2. To what degree do you believe Frank and Joe have similar thoughts about leadership?
3. To what degree do you believe Frank and Joe DO NOT agree on the way a leader should behave?

1 (Not at All)  2 (Hardly at All)  3 (A Little Bit)  4 (A Fair Amount)  5 (Quite a Bit)  
6 (A Great Deal)  7 (Absolutely)
Appendix D2

Measure to Test Hypothesis 1

1. Given Frank’s beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you believe Frank actually would behave as described in the above scenario?

2. Given Frank’s beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you think the situation describing Frank’s actions is NOT true?

3. Given Frank’s beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you believe the scenario describes Frank’s actions as they might actually have occurred?

4. Given Frank’s beliefs about leadership, to what degree do you think the situation described above is representative of the way Frank would typically act?

1 (Not at All)  2 (Hardly at All)  3 (A Little Bit)  4 (A Fair Amount)  5 (Quite a Bit)  6 (A Great Deal)  7 (Absolutely)
Appendix D3

Additional Scenarios to Test Hypothesis 2

Non-ATF/Congruent Scenario

Please read the following passage. The first several paragraphs describe a leader's style of leading. The last paragraph describes a follower's opinion of that leadership style. You will then be asked a series of questions regarding the leader (Frank) and his follower (Joe).

Frank's Leadership Style

Frank is a leader in Average American Company. If asked, those around Frank would say that he does not conduct his life in an ethical manner. He measures success by the end result, with no regard for how the results were obtained. He has no interest in the thoughts of his employees, and looks the other way when his employees violate ethical standards. His decisions tend to show favoritism, and many find it hard to trust him. He has no interest in the discussion of business ethics, nor is he interested in setting a good example. He has his own interests at heart and is more interested in getting things done right, rather than doing the right thing.

Frank is the type of person who believes in giving those he leads what they want in exchange for their support. He makes it clear to his subordinates what they can expect to receive, if their performance meets standards. He works out agreements with those he leads on what they will receive if they do what needs to be done, negotiating with them about what they can expect to receive for what they accomplish. He also provides assistance to his followers in exchange for their effort. He makes sure to tell those he leads what to do to be rewarded for their efforts, making sure they receive appropriate rewards for achieving performance targets. His subordinates can earn credit with him by doing their tasks well, and he expresses satisfaction when those he leads do a good job.

Frank’s attention is on correcting irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards. At times, he waits for the work of his subordinates to fall below minimum standards before he tries to make improvements. He often ascribes to the belief that "if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it." Consequently, problems must become chronic before he takes action. At other times, he may actively look for these problems, monitoring his subordinates’ performance for errors, "putting out fires," keeping track of their mistakes, and enforcing rules to avoid mistakes. When problems become serious, Frank tends to focus more on what his subordinates have done wrong rather than what they have done right.

Joe’s Opinion of Frank’s Leadership Style

Joe is one of Frank’s followers, and has observed Frank’s leadership behaviors. Joe agrees with Frank’s leadership style and would probably act the same way Frank does if he were in a similar leadership position.
Unethical Transactional/Non-Congruent Scenario

Please read the following passage. The first several paragraphs describe a leader's style of leading. The last paragraph describes a follower's opinion of that leadership style. You will then be asked a series of questions regarding the leader (Frank) and his follower (Joe).

Frank's Leadership Style

Frank is a leader in Average American Company. If asked, those around Frank would say that he does not conduct his life in an ethical manner. He measures success by the end result, with no regard for how the results were obtained. He has no interest in the thoughts of his employees, and looks the other way when his employees violate ethical standards. His decisions tend to show favoritism, and many find it hard to trust him. He has no interest in the discussion of business ethics, nor is he interested in setting a good example. He has his own interests at heart and is more interested in getting things done right, rather than doing the right thing.

Frank is the type of person who believes in giving those he leads what they want in exchange for their support. He makes it clear to his subordinates what they can expect to receive, if their performance meets standards. He works out agreements with those he leads on what they will receive if they do what needs to be done, negotiating with them about what they can expect to receive for what they accomplish. He also provides assistance to his followers in exchange for their effort. He makes sure to tell those he leads what to do to be rewarded for their efforts, making sure they receive appropriate rewards for achieving performance targets. His subordinates can earn credit with him by doing their tasks well, and he expresses satisfaction when those he leads do a good job.

Frank’s attention is on correcting irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards. At times, he waits for the work of his subordinates to fall below minimum standards before he tries to make improvements. He often ascribes to the belief that “if it ain't broke, don’t fix it.” Consequently, problems must become chronic before he takes action. At other times, he may actively look for these problems, monitoring his subordinates’ performance for errors, “putting out fires,” keeping track of their mistakes, and enforcing rules to avoid mistakes. When problems become serious, Frank tends to focus more on what his subordinates have done wrong rather than what they have done right.

Joe's Opinion of Frank's Leadership Style

Joe is one of Frank’s followers. He has observed all of the above behaviors in Frank, and does not necessarily agree with Frank’s leadership style. Whereas he acknowledges that leaders may behave as Frank does, Joe believes there are other behaviors that may more appropriately represent good leadership. He might not necessarily act the same way Frank does if he were in a similar leadership position.
Measure to Test Hypothesis 3

1. To what degree would you expect Joe to mimic or use Frank's leadership behaviors if given the chance?

2. To what degree do you think Joe would behave the same as Frank, if he found himself in a similar leadership position?

3. To what degree do you think Joe rejects Frank's ideas about leadership?

4. To what degree do you believe Joe would include Frank's leadership behaviors in his personal theory about leadership?

1 (Not at All)  2 (Hardly at All)  3 (A Little Bit)  4 (A Fair Amount)  5 (Quite a Bit)  6 (A Great Deal)  7 (Absolutely)
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