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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Leadership, with its importance for achieving organizational goals, has become an essential concept in organizational research. More specifically, researchers have emphasized the study of leadership styles. Due to a leader’s impact on employee performance, attitudes, and satisfaction, leadership has become a topic of increasing interest (Kuchinke, 1999). Furthermore, leaders employ varying styles of leadership, which has led researchers to explore the effectiveness of numerous leadership styles. For instance, some studies have found transformational leadership to be more effective than transactional leadership (Bass, 1996; House & Shamir, 1993). Accordingly, some studies have indicated subordinates who are under transformational leaders have higher job performance and more positive attitudes (Aldoory & Toth, 2004; Bass, 1996; House & Shamir, 1993). Due to these differences, it is critical to further explore leadership styles.

One issue with the current body of literature is that most leadership research has been conducted in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe (Yukl, 1998). This is an issue because a leadership style, such as transformational leadership, found to be effective in the United States might not be as effective in another country or culture due to distinct cultural values. Namely, people generally employ leadership styles that align with major cultural values (e.g., individualism or collectivism). In order to successfully collaborate with persons in diverse cultures, organizational members must understand which leadership styles are considered effective in those cultures. Further, it is imperative to understand the cultural differences in leadership because of the increasingly diverse
workforce in the United States and increasing mergers between organizations in different countries. As a result of the diversity of the U.S. workforce, people from different cultures are continually required to work together. Additionally, organizations, more than ever, are operating at an international level and organizational members are constantly exposed to individuals from other countries and diverse cultures. Subsequently, individuals and organizations are frequently exposed to a wide variety of culturally-based management and leadership styles (Aimar & Stough, 2007).

Some researchers have used Hofstede’s cultural dimensions (individualism-collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity-femininity, and future orientation) to study the relationship between leadership and culture. In a study investigating the impact of transformational and transactional leadership styles on individualistic and collectivistic people, Jung and Avolio (1999) found collectivists performed better under a transformational leader than a transactional leader. Results also indicated individualistic people performed better under a transactional leader than a transformational leader. That study suggests that the cultural values of collectivists, such as the willingness to subside their individual goals for group goals, coincide with the values of transformational leadership. Additionally, the study supports the idea that a leadership style found to be effective in one culture will not necessarily be effective in another culture due to distinct cultural values.

In addition, whether the leader is male or female can also impact leadership style. Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and Van Engen (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of 45 studies of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles, in which
they found female leaders to be more transformational than male leaders. These results are supported by role congruity theory; role congruity theory suggests men and women must employ leadership styles that are congruent with their gender roles in order to be considered effective leaders. For instance, women who exhibit feminine leadership traits are considered more effective leaders than women who exhibit masculine leadership traits. Therefore, women are more likely to employ a transformational leadership style because characteristics of transformational leadership (e.g., individualized consideration, idealized influence, and inspirational motivation) align with characteristics of the female gender role (e.g., thoughtfulness, supportiveness, and considerateness).

Many studies have investigated sex differences in relation to leadership; however, few have studied the relationship between gender roles and leadership. Poddar and Krishnan (2004) examined the impact of gender roles on transformational leadership using Bem’s Sex Role Inventory to classify individuals as feminine, masculine, androgynous, or undifferentiated. They found that regardless of sex, managers who scored high on the femininity factor were viewed as more transformational by their subordinates. Specifically, managers who scored high on the femininity factor were more compassionate, considerate, and affectionate which align with the characteristics of transformational leadership.

Given that study, which demonstrates that gender roles impact the type of leadership style an individual employs, it is essential to explore whether an individual’s gender role attitudes will also have a similar impact. It is important to note the difference between gender roles, as Poddar and Krishnan (2004) defined them, and gender role
attitudes. Poddar and Krishnan (2004) used the term gender role to describe an individual’s level of masculinity and femininity, whereas gender role attitudes refer to an individual’s expectations of how men and women should behave. Gender egalitarianism is the gender role attitude that men and women are equal. Although research has not explored the notion that people who have egalitarian gender role attitudes are more likely to be transformational leaders, the characteristics of egalitarianism and transformational leadership suggest such a relationship, such that both egalitarianism and transformational leadership support equal relationships.

Thus, the purpose of this study is to add to the current body of literature on leadership by investigating gender and cultural factors in relation to leadership style. More specifically, this study, in parallel with Jung and Avolio (1999), will further examine the relationship between transformational leadership and collectivism. In addition, this study will explore the relationship between an individual’s sex and leadership style. Although previous studies (Avolio & Jung, 1999; Eagly, 2003) have examined these cultural and sex differences, it is crucial to explore these relationships as a basis for the study of culture and gender role attitudes in relation to leadership style. Recent studies have alluded to a possible relationship between gender role attitudes and leadership style; thus, this study will also examine individuals’ level of egalitarianism in relation to their leadership style. Furthermore, due to inconsistent support for the relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership, this study will take into account level of egalitarianism when examining the relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership.
Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership

Interest in leadership rose during World War II due to numerous widely-known leaders (e.g., Mussolini, Hitler, and Roosevelt) and the social scientist involvement with the military (Day & Zaccaro, 2007); however, its relevance around the globe has made it a commonly examined topic. Despite the abundance of leadership literature (Chow, 2005; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Den Hartog, 1999; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha 2007), leadership still lacks a universal definition. It has been said that “there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are leadership theories—and there are almost as many theories of leadership as there are psychologists working in the field” (Fiedler, 1971 as cited in Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004, p. 5). McWhinney (1997) has defined leadership as the “the process by which influencers and change makers affect a population” (Aldoory & Toth, 2004, p. 158). Although this definition lacks universal agreement, most researchers would agree that leadership can be broadly defined as the “influencing process” (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004, p. 5).

Eagly, Johannsen-Schmidt, and Van Engen (2003) have defined leadership styles as the “relatively stable patterns of behavior displayed by leaders” (p. 569). Eagly (2007) has further described leadership styles as consistent patterns that can vary “within the boundaries of their style” (p. 2). That is, a leader will have a particular leadership style that is subject to change during an emergency situation in order to more effectively resolve the situation. Leadership theory is based on the identification of leadership style,
and consequently, leadership style should be used as a measurement of effective leadership (Aldoory & Toth, 2004).

Just as there are many definitions of leadership, there are also numerous methods to measure leadership effectiveness. A researcher’s definition of leadership usually influences the way in which leadership is measured. Leadership effectiveness is commonly measured by the followers’ task performance and goal achievement (e.g., productivity in the unit). Other measures of leadership effectiveness include superior, peer, or follower ratings of the leader’s effectiveness. As there are a variety of ways to measure leadership effectiveness, the best way to measure leadership effectiveness will depend on the situation (Yukl, 1998).

**Transformational Leadership**

One of the most widely researched leadership styles in the U.S., Canada, and Western Europe is transformational leadership (Aldoory & Toth, 2004; Den Hartog et al., 1999). Weber first introduced the characteristics of transformational leadership in 1924. Burns (1978) included some of Weber’s ideas in his development of transformational leadership theory and defined a transformational leader as a leader who:

…looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result... is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents. (p.173)

Although Burns was not the first to use Weber’s theory, he is most often credited with its development because his research generated interest in transformational leadership
theory. Other researchers alluded to the notion of transformational leadership, such as Downton (1973) who classified transactional, charismatic and inspirational leadership styles, and House (1977) who developed a charismatic leadership theory.

There are several approaches to transformational leadership theory in addition to Burns. Bass (1985) was one of the first researchers to more thoroughly examine Burns’ transformational leadership theory. Bass suspected that transformational leadership and transactional leadership were actually two separate dimensions of leadership. A transactional leader, also referred to as an authoritative leader, is characterized by an exchange relationship in which followers are rewarded for their work or corrected when their performance does not meet expectations. It is a more passive style of leadership, as the leader only intervenes when employees are not meeting organizational standards (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, & Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1999). This is a more traditional style of leadership that is characterized by “certainty, clear direction, personal oversight, and perceptions of ‘just’ treatment” (Aldoory & Toth, 2004, p. 159).

Further, Avolio and Bass proposed the “full-range leadership theory” (FRLT), which describes a wide-range of leadership styles (Avolio & Bass, 2004). This model incorporates Burns (1978) and Bass’ (1985) transformational leadership theories by including transformational and transactional styles and adding the non-transactional laissez-faire style. The laissez-faire leadership style is denoted by the lack of transaction, such that the leader “avoids making decisions, abdicates responsibility, and does not use their authority” (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003, p. 265). Using the FRLT as a basis, Bass developed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).
The MLQ aims at evaluating a broad range of leadership behaviors in order to more accurately assess leadership styles and still differentiate between effective and ineffective leaders. It examines transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles as well as outcomes of leadership. To examine transformational leadership, it measures several dimensions deemed critical to the effectiveness of transformational leaders, including Idealized Influence (Attributes and Behaviors), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. Transformational leaders are distinguished for their consideration of followers’ needs over their own; subsequently, followers admire, trust, and respect such leaders and view them in an idealized way—this is a leader’s Idealized Influence. Idealized Influence can be further defined as Idealized Attributes and Idealized Behaviors, where Idealized Attributes refer to a leader’s moral purpose, power and confidence, and Idealized Behaviors refer to a leader’s values, beliefs, and purpose. One of the main differences between the original MLQ and the current version is this division of Idealized Influence into attributes and behaviors. An additional characteristic of transformational leaders is their Inspirational Motivation, which refers to the articulation of a vision, as well as their optimism and confidence in the actualization of that vision. In addition, transformational leaders are responsible for intellectually stimulating followers, such that followers are able to creatively and innovatively resolve issues and present alternative solutions—this is a leader’s Intellectual Stimulation. Lastly, Individualized Consideration refers to transformational leaders’ attentiveness and consideration for their followers’ needs for achievement and growth (Antonakis et al., 2004; Avolio & Bass, 2004).
In order to examine transactional leadership, the MLQ assesses Contingent Reward and Management-by-Exception. Contingent reward refers to the manner in which a leader rewards followers for satisfactory performance. Management-by-Exception is divided into two forms, active and passive. Management-by-Exception (Active) refers to a leader’s close monitoring of followers’ behaviors and quick action in correcting any mistakes and errors. Management-by-Exception (Passive) is similar to laissez-faire leadership styles, such that the leader does not interfere with followers until there are severe problems. The MLQ examines laissez-faire leadership, which is a style of leadership in which there is “no leadership.” Lastly, the MLQ assesses Outcomes of Leadership, which includes the measurement of the leaders’ extra effort and effectiveness, as well as the followers’ satisfaction with the leadership.

Kouzes and Posner (1987) examined transformational leadership in a different manner. Kouzes and Posner developed a leadership questionnaire by analyzing managers’ detailed descriptions of their best leadership experiences. The questionnaire was administered to managers who were asked to describe the best leader they had encountered. Factor analysis indicated five leadership behavior factors: Challenging the Process, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Enabling Others to Act, Modeling the Way, and Encouraging the Heart. Challenging the Process refers to risk-taking in order to advance the organization. Inspiring a Shared Vision is a behavior factor in which the leader helps to create a vision and gains follower support for that vision. Enabling Others to Act deals with the actions leaders take to encourage followers’ growth. Modeling the Way concerns the examples that leaders set and the leaders’ ability to make goals more attainable.
Lastly, Encouraging the Heart refers to the recognition of each follower and his or her contribution (Kouzes & Posner, 1987).

Some studies have found transformational leaders to be more effective when compared to other leadership styles, such that subordinates under transformational leaders demonstrate higher job performance and more positive attitudes (Aldoory & Toth, 2004; Bass, 1996; House & Shamir, 1993). Fiol, Harris, and House (1999) have found that leadership styles described as transformational, charismatic, or visionary are positively related to organizational performance (effect sizes ranging from .35 to .50) as well as follower satisfaction, commitment, and organizational identification (effect sizes ranging from .40 to .80). In a meta-analysis of the MLQ, Lowe et al. (1996) found that transformational leadership behaviors were more strongly correlated with leader effectiveness than transactional leadership behavior. Results further indicated a .81 corrected correlation between leaders’ charisma and the followers’ ratings of leader effectiveness (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasbaramaniam, 1996). Transformational leadership allows leaders to gain their followers’ trust, subsequently becoming role models for their followers. Further, they motivate and encourage their followers to achieve individual and organizational goals (Eagly et al., 2003).

**Culture and Transformational Leadership**

Countries differ in many ways, including their customs, characteristics, principles, and values. These differences “distinguish[es] the members of one group or society from those of another” (Hofstede, 1984, p.82), and are usually referred to as culture. Differences in leadership practices are essentially a reflection of cultural values as
organizations are based on certain values, which tend to be a reflection of the major cultural values (Hofstede, 1984).

Hofstede originally defined culture using four dimensions, which include: individualism-collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity-femininity. Individualism and collectivism have been commonly used in the literature to describe cultures. Individualism describes a culture in which people care only for themselves, whereas collectivism describes a culture in which people are part of a team and worry about the team’s best interest, not the individual’s best interest. Power distance, another dimension of culture, is described as the degree to which persons in a society are willing to accept the distribution of power in an organization. Small power distance is characterized as a society in which there is a more equal distribution of power and people seek justification when inequalities occur, whereas large power distance is characterized by a society in which the order of power is accepted without justification.

An additional dimension includes the willingness of a society to accept ambiguousness, and this is referred to as uncertainty avoidance. This dimension suggests that some cultures are more accepting of ambiguity than other cultures. Lastly, cultures can also be characterized using the masculinity dimension; in masculine cultures, individuals will be more tolerant of strong leaders, whereas in feminine cultures individuals will tend to have more nurturing and considerate leaders. Masculine cultures are characterized by “achievement, heroism, assertiveness, and material success,” and feminine cultures are characterized by a “preference for relationships, modesty, caring for the weak, and the quality of life” (Hofstede, 1984, p. 84). Additionally, masculine
cultures are cultures that endorse differences between the sexes and feminine cultures are cultures that endorse equality of the sexes.

Although Hofstede (1984) and others have noted that there are many differences among cultures, most leadership research has either been conducted in North America or demonstrates North American bias; this is particularly true of the majority of literature on transformational leaders. Most leadership research uses theories or models developed in the United States, which are not necessarily effective in other countries and cultures.

House (1995) has noted some of the assumptions of North American leadership theories:

…individualistic rather than collectivistic; emphasizing assumptions of rationality rather than ascetics, religion, or superstition; stated in terms of individual rather than group incentives; stressing follower responsibilities rather than rights; assuming hedonistic rather than altruistic motivation and assuming centrality of work and democratic value orientation. (p. 443)

Leadership theories based on these assumptions would not necessarily be applicable to other cultures because these assumptions are characteristic of North American culture. Consequently, results suggesting that transformational leadership is most effective may not be generalizable to other cultures (Den Hartog et al., 1999).

Some researchers have suggested some aspects of transformational leadership are universally endorsed as effective leadership behaviors (Den Hartog et al., 1999; Zagorsek, Jaklic, & Stough, 2004). Den Hartog et al. (1999) investigated culture specific and universal leadership styles, and found characteristics of transformational leadership to be universally endorsed as effective leadership, and non-cooperativeness and
dictatorial characteristics to be universally endorsed as leading to ineffective leadership. Den Hartog et. al (1999) also demonstrated that cultures differ in the leadership practices they employ and value, thus leading to culturally endorsed leadership practices. These findings are congruent with Triandis (1993) who stated that leadership “is somewhat similar across countries, but there are shifts in emphasis” (Gibson, 1995, p. 259). That is, although there may be some similar characteristics of effective leadership, cultures will place varying emphases on leadership behaviors based on their cultural values. Thus, a leader must understand which behaviors and practices are considered effective by their followers in order to act in a culturally accepted manner. For instance, in a culture where an authoritarian style of leadership is endorsed, leader sensitivity will be considered an ineffective form of leadership. Another issue that should be considered is the negative connotation that may be associated with certain leadership styles. For instance, some European countries react negatively to the term charismatic or transformational leadership because they relate that style of leadership to leaders such as Hitler (Den Hartog et. al, 1999).

The influence of culture on the employment and perception of leadership styles has been explained by implicit leadership theories. Implicit leadership theories suggest “that individuals have implicit and tacit beliefs, stereotypes, and assumptions about leadership” (Javidan & Carl, 2004, p. 668). An individual’s implicit leadership theory refers to the way they think a leader should act. Likewise, followers’ will use their implicit leadership theory to rate their leaders’ effectiveness (Javidan & Carl, 2004). Culture plays a major role in an individual’s implicit leadership theory, as culture will
shape the way an individual views effective leadership and consequently the leadership style employed.

Moreover, research on the idea of self-construals also supports the notion that culture will influence an individual’s leadership style. Singelis and Brown (1995) suggest cultures shape individuals’ “attitudes, values, and concepts of self” (p. 356), which inevitably influences their behaviors. In regard to collectivism and individualism, cultures may emphasize either collectivism or individualism, but not both. Through socialization and other educational practices, a culture’s individualism-collectivism can influence an individual’s self-construal. Markus and Kitayuma (1991) described two construals of the self, independent and interdependent. Individuals with an independent self-construal are most likely to exhibit behavior that “is organized and made meaningful primarily by reference to one’s own internal repertoire of thoughts, feelings, and action, rather than by reference to the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others” (Markus & Kitayuma, 1991, p. 226). Further, individuals with independent self-construals have been characterized as individualists. Conversely, individuals with an interdependent self-construal are more likely to see themselves “as part of an encompassing social relationship and recognizing that one’s behavior is determined, contingent on, and, to a large extent organized by what the actor [individual] perceived to be the thoughts, feelings and actions of others in the relationship” (Markus & Kitayuma, 1991, p. 227). People with an interdependent self are most likely to be characterized as collectivistic. Thus, as the self-construal affects behaviors, research has indicated that the self-construal affects those behaviors that are
key to judging leadership effectiveness (Van Knippenberg, Van Knippenberg, Cremer, & Hogg, 2004).

There are many cultural factors that can influence the leadership style an individual will employ. However, the current study will focus exclusively on Hofstede’s cultural dimensions of individualism and collectivism, as previous research (Jung, Bass, & Sosik, 1995) has noted the similarities between the characteristics of collectivism and transformational leadership. For instance, collectivism refers to “societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive ingroups, which throughout their lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty” (Hofstede, 1997, p. 51 as cited in Walumba & Lawler, 2003, p. 1087). Likewise, transformational leaders create a cohesive group among their followers and expect their followers “to sublimate their self-interests for the overall benefit of the group” (Muchinsky, 2006, p. 434). Further, transformational leaders deem their followers’ needs as more important than their own, and subsequently, followers not only identify with their leaders, but also want to emulate them (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Additionally, collectivism focuses on the group rather than on the individual, such that people “transcend their own self-interests and work towards group goals” (Walumba & Lawler, 2003, p. 1087). Similarly, transformational leaders encourage followers to transcend their own self-interests and focus on the importance and the value of group products or results (Walumba & Lawler, 2003). Additionally, both transformational leaders and leaders in collectivistic cultures create a shared vision and goals for the organization, as well as caring for and helping their followers.
Furthermore, research has indicated a relationship between transformational leadership and collectivism. For instance, Jung and Avolio (1999) examined the effects of leadership styles on collectivists and individualists working on a brainstorming task, and they found that collectivists brainstormed more ideas under a transformational leader, whereas individualists brainstormed more ideas under a transactional leader. Additionally, Walumba and Lawler (2003) examined transformational leadership in relation to collectivism in China, India, and Kenya and found transformational leadership to be positively and significantly correlated with collectivism. Further, Javidan and Carl (2004) illustrated that individualistic cultures place a higher emphasis on job freedom and challenge, while collectivistic cultures place a higher emphasis on job security, obedience, and group harmony; these results support the notion that collectivistic individuals are more likely to employ a transformational leadership style as those values align with the values of transformational leadership.

As previous research has demonstrated a relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership, the present study will add to the current body of literature by further exploring this relationship at an individual level. That is, the current study will focus on culture at an individual level rather than a national level and will use Markus and Kitayuma’s (1991) notion of self-construals, independent and interdependent, to examine people’s individualism and collectivism levels in relation to the leadership style they would employ. In this study, the term “collectivism” is used interchangeably with “interdependent self construals” and “individualism” is interchangeable with “independent self-construals.”
Given the above-mentioned research connecting collectivism with transformational leadership, it makes sense to hypothesize as follows:

**Hypothesis 1:** Individuals who have high collectivism (interdependent) scores will be more likely to endorse a transformational leadership style.

**Sex Differences in Transformational Leadership**

Just as there is increasing cultural diversity, there is also a rising number of women in the workforce and in leadership positions. This has led to an abundance of research on sex differences in leadership (Aldoory & Toth, 2004; Carless, 1998; Chow, 2005; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly, Johannesen-Shmidt, & Van Engen, 2003; Gibson, 1995; Stelter, 2002). There have been mixed findings, but most studies have indicated that women and men exhibit different leadership styles (Aldoory & Toth, 2004; Carless, 1998; Eagly, Johannesen-Shmidt, & Van Engen, 2003). In 1990, Eagly and Johnson conducted a meta-analysis of gender and leadership studies and found sex differences were prevalent in laboratory studies, in that women most often displayed interpersonally-related and democratic styles and men most often displayed task-oriented and autocratic leadership styles. Their research also indicated that sex differences were not as pronounced in the organizational setting. Women were still more likely to have a more democratic and less autocratic style than men, but no sex differences were found among the use of interpersonally related leadership styles. Additionally, it has been suggested that sex differences are less prevalent now than they were before (Komives, 1999).
Eagly (1987) has suggested that sex differences can be explained in two types of qualities, communal and agentic. The communal dimension is associated with females, and can be represented by “a concern with the welfare of other people” (Gibson, 1995, p. 256). The agentic dimension is associated with males and is explained by behavior that is “assertive, goal directed, and controlling tendency” (Gibson, 1995, p. 256). It is suggested that the division of these qualities can be traced back to domestic chores, such that females tend to engage in more chores in the home and need more communal qualities to do so. On the contrary, males are still more likely to work outside the home and must use more agentic qualities. The development of certain qualities (male- agentic, female- communal) will lead to their use in other areas, such as leadership. In other words, these qualities help form the leadership styles of men and women (Gibson, 1995).

Several theories (e.g., role congruity theory, social role theory) have been used to explain sex differences in leadership styles. Social role theory implies that people will conform to social roles, where social roles encompass the many norms that define a role. Social roles vary as cultures vary, but people will most often attempt to conform to the social roles set out by their society or culture (Eagly, 1987). This theory posits that men and women will conform to their culture’s gender roles. Thus, to the extent that cultures support differences in gender roles, men and women who are in the same leadership role will employ different leadership styles because they must act in accordance to their gender roles (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003).

Beyond simple sex differences, role congruity theory may help explain why men and women employ different leadership styles. Role congruity theory, which is based on
social role theory, suggests that men and women must employ leadership styles that are congruent with their gender roles to be considered effective leaders. Role incongruity occurs when a leader’s gender and leadership characteristics are incongruent, such as a female leader displaying autocratic characteristics. Female leaders must commonly deal with role incongruity; as women, they are expected to demonstrate communal qualities, but as leaders they are expected to demonstrate agentic qualities. Because women are faced with two dissimilar roles, they may not as easily fit into the leadership role. Men’s gender roles tend to be more congruent with leadership roles, hence they are often seen as more effective leaders (Eagly, 2002).

According to role congruity theory, incongruent behavior between a female leader’s role and gender role may lead to two types of biases: descriptive and prescriptive (Eagly, 2002). The descriptive bias is due to the differences between a female’s gender role and the leader role, such that a female who follows her gender role will not be perceived as having the necessary characteristics to be a leader. Prescriptive bias is a result of a female adopting more masculine characteristics in her leadership role, in which case she would violate her gender role. Essentially, these biases suggest women will be viewed negatively when employing a leadership style incongruent with their expected gender role.

Researchers (Aldoory & Toth, 2004; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Sczesny, Bosak, Neff, & Schyns, 2004) have suggested that women who exhibit feminine leadership traits are considered more effective leaders; conversely, women who do not exhibit such traits are rated as ineffective leaders. This is more often the case with people who have more
traditional gender role attitudes. The majority of this research has been conducted in the United States, but studies in other countries and cultures may yield different results. For instance, in some cultures, female leaders may be forced to take on leadership styles that are incongruent with their gender roles in order to be considered effective (Poddar & Krishnan, 2004). Such cultures endorse autocratic leadership styles that are associated with male qualities, regardless of the gender of the leader.

In Western cultures, where research has indicated that women will be perceived as more effective leaders if they employ a leadership style congruent with the female gender role, women may be more likely to employ a transformational leadership style because it allows them to overcome role incongruity. Loden (as cited in Eagly & Johnson, 1990) has argued that female leadership styles can be characterized by “cooperativeness, collaboration of managers and subordinates, lower control for the leader, and problem solving based on intuition and empathy as well as rationality” (Eagly & Johnson, 1990, p. 233). Moreover, females are characterized by communal qualities that include the “ability to devote self to others, eagerness to soothe hurt feelings, helpfulness, sympathy, [and] awareness of the feelings of others” (Gibson, 1995, p. 256). These female characteristics are similar to characteristics of transformational leadership, including idealized influence and individualized consideration. Transformational leaders are attentive to their followers, understand their followers’ needs, provide emotional appeal, and ultimately have a more personal relationship with them (Walumbra & Lawler, 2003).
Eagly et al. (2003) conducted a meta-analysis in which female leaders were found to be more transformational than male leaders. Females scored higher on Charisma, Idealized Influence (Attributes), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. Further, Zagorsek, Jaklic, and Stough (2004) analyzed sex differences in the five dimensions of leadership proposed by Kouzes and Posner (1987) (Challenging the Process, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Enabling Others to Act, Modeling the Way, and Encouraging Heart) and found that women in the U.S. were more likely to engage in enabling others to act and encouraging the heart. The present study will further explore the relationship between sex and transformational leadership using Avolio and Bass’ MLQ.

Hypothesis 2: Women are more likely to endorse a transformational leadership style than men.

**Gender Role Attitudes and Transformational Leadership**

Previous studies have implied that sex differences in leadership are a result of developmental processes and early childhood expectations of men and women (Bartol et al., 2003, Gibson, 1995); yet, few studies (Poddar & Krishnan, 2004) have explored gender (e.g., gender roles, gender role attitudes) differences beyond simple sex differences. Poddar and Krishnan (2004) explored the impact of gender roles on transformational leadership and found that followers perceived leaders who scored high on the femininity factor as more transformational, regardless of the leader’s sex. Although gender roles and gender role attitudes are distinct concepts, Poddar and
Krishnan’s (2004) research adds support to the notion that people with varying gender role attitudes will employ different leadership styles.

Gender role attitudes have been defined as “beliefs about the appropriate role activities for women and men” (McHugh & Frieze, 1997, p. 4), and have been present since the primitive environments, where men were hunters and women were gatherers. Gender roles are not as clearly defined as they were in the past, but culture has been found to influence gender role expectations and subsequently, different cultures have varying perceptions of gender roles (Zagorsek, Jaklic, & Stough, 2004). Gender role attitudes are sometimes described as traditional versus non-traditional, where traditional gender role attitudes are associated with the superiority of men over women and consequently greater sex differences. Non-traditional gender role attitudes are associated with high egalitarianism, suggesting both sexes are mostly equal (Thornton, Alwin, & Camburn, 1983).

Gender egalitarianism is the notion that men and women are equal, thus men and women are not required to conform to their traditional gender roles. One of the main themes of gender egalitarianism is the fluidity of gender roles, such that gender roles are not clearly defined. Because there is not a clear distinction in gender roles, individuals do not need to conform to a particular role and may partake in a variety (both masculine and feminine) of activities. Individuals who are considered more egalitarian would support the idea that women can enter the labor force and perform jobs typically viewed as masculine jobs, and that men can care for children and conduct other household tasks. In cultures high in egalitarianism, the labor force is not divided by gender, such that jobs are
not stereotypically held by one gender. On the contrary, low egalitarianism is identified by gender inequality. Individuals who are low on egalitarianism believe in differences among gender roles, such that men and women should conform to their traditional gender roles.

There are some similarities between egalitarianism and transformational leadership as egalitarianism promotes equality among genders and the fluidity of gender roles. Transformational leadership is a more nurturing style of leadership that is focused on a more equal or personal relationship between the leader and the follower. Additionally, research has indicated that aspects of transformational leadership are feminine or androgynous, but not masculine (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003). People who are low in egalitarianism are less likely to endorse a leadership style that employs feminine characteristics, as feminine characteristics are not congruent with the traditional conception of a leader’s role (e.g., autocratic leadership).

Hypothesis 3: Individuals who score high on egalitarianism will be more likely to endorse a transformational leadership style.

Walumba and Lawler (2003) indicated that individuals high in collectivism are more likely to employ transformational leadership styles than individuals low in collectivism. However, countries high in collectivism, such as China, have been found to be less likely to employ transformational leadership styles (Shao & Webber, 2006). Additionally, the United States, which is low in collectivism, has been found to widely employ transformational leadership styles (Ergeneli, Gohar, & Temirbekova, 2007). One of the main differences between these countries is the prevalent gender role attitudes, that
is, the typical levels of egalitarianism found in these countries. Specifically, people in the U.S. generally endorse egalitarianism, whereas they are less likely to do so in China. The current study suggests that the level of egalitarianism will moderate the relationship between an individual’s level of collectivism and employment of transformational leadership.

Hypothesis 4: Individuals high in egalitarianism will show a stronger relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership styles than individuals low in egalitarianism.
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METHODS

Participants

Participants in the study were 107 students (21 male, 86 female) enrolled in an Organizational Psychology course at California State University, Sacramento. The participants’ age ranged from 19 to 56 years old ($M = 24.08$, $SD = 5.32$). The majority of the participants classified themselves as White/European Americans (46.7 %), but also included Asian/Pacific Islander (24.3%), Black/African-American (8.4%), Multi-Ethnic (7.5%), Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin (6.5%), Middle-Eastern (5.6%), and other (.9%). The participants reported working an average of 18 hours a week in the following job types: 8.4% had a professional/technical positions, 12.1% had managerial or administrative positions, 18.7% had sales positions, 19.6% had clerical positions, 1.9% had manual labor positions, and 37.4% other job types. Additionally, 57.9% of the participants were currently in or had previously worked in a supervisory position where they supervised more than one employee. Those participants that had supervisory experience supervised an average of 6.58 employees, ranging from 1 to 60 employees.

Materials

Self-Construal Scale (SCS). The SCS consists of 30 items and is designed to assess an individual’s independent (individualism) and interdependent (collectivism) self. A 7-point Likert-type scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree) is used to measure the two separate factors—-independent and interdependent. Each factor is measured by 15 items. Although the full measure was administered, only responses on the interdependent
scale were used in the present study. Examples of interdependent items are “Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument” and “I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact” (Singelis, 1994).

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X Short). The MLQ (5X) is a full range assessment of leadership that consists of 45 items. Items on the MLQ are answered on a five-point Likert-type scale (none of the time to all of the time) and are designed to measure Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Laissez-Faire Leadership, and Outcomes of Leadership. Additionally, the following factors are measured in order to describe transformational leadership: Idealized Influence (Attributes), Idealized Influence (Behaviors), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration. Sample items for the factors, respectively, include “I instill pride in others for being associated with me,” “I talk about my most important values and beliefs,” “I talk optimistically about the future,” “I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate,” and “I spend time teaching and coaching.” Only the “Leader Form,” which asks participants to describe their leadership style as they perceive it, was administered. Additionally, although the complete measure was administered, only responses to items measuring transformational leadership were used in the present study.

Sex Role Egalitarianism Scale (SRES). The SRES consists of 25 self-report items, which are designed to assess attitudes about sex-role egalitarianism. The five domains are: marital roles, parental roles, employment roles, social-interpersonal-heterosexual roles, and educational roles. The items measure the domains using a 5-point-Likert-type
scale (*strongly agree to strongly disagree*) (King & King, 1997). Sample items include “Clubs for students in nursing should admit only women” and “Women can handle job pressures as well as men can.”

Procedure

The participants were recruited in Organizational Behavioral Psychology courses at California State University, Sacramento. During a class session, participants were asked to participate in a voluntary leadership study that would have no impact on their course grade. Additionally, it was explained that their responses would be completely confidential, such that their professor would not see their individual responses. The participants were then given the consent form. It was explained that their participation would include filling out a survey about leadership in relation to other personal characteristics. The experimenter was present throughout the entire session. Each participant was administered a survey packet containing demographic questions, the SCS, the MLQ, and the SRES. Upon completing their survey packets, participants placed them in a collection box located on a table in the front of the room. Each participant was then thanked and provided with a debriefing form.
Chapter 4

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Reliability analyses were conducted on the MLQ, SCS, and SRES scales. The scales were examined for their internal consistency, Cronbach’s alpha level if items were deleted, and item-total correlation. The reliability analysis of the MLQ revealed a relatively high internal consistency reliability coefficient, $\alpha = .89$. Additionally, none of the items were deleted, as the item-total correlations did not indicate any low correlations and the analysis did not indicate an improvement in the Cronbach’s alpha level if items were deleted. Further, the reliability analysis on the SCS indicated an adequate internal consistency reliability coefficient, $\alpha = .74$, and the analysis did not support the deletion of any of the items. Lastly, the reliability analysis of the SRES indicated a high internal consistency reliability, $\alpha = .95$. Based on the analysis, none of the items were removed from the scale.

Descriptive statistics for the variables in this study were computed. Table 1 displays the means and standard deviations among the study variables. Additionally, a series of one-way ANOVAs were performed to explore differences among a few of the demographic variables and determine which variables to include as predictors in the planned regression analyses. The demographic variables examined were supervisory status, ethnicity, and job type using transformational leadership, collectivism, and
egalitarianism as dependent variables. First, one-way ANOVAs were conducted with supervisory status as the independent variable; results indicated that supervisory status did not significantly affect transformational leadership, collectivism, or egalitarianism.

Next, one-way ANOVAs were conducted with ethnicity as the independent variable. These results found that ethnicity significantly affected collectivism \( F(5, 101) = 3.53, p < .01 \) and egalitarianism \( F(5, 101) = 2.33, p < .05 \); means and standard deviations among ethnicities for collectivism and egalitarianism are displayed in Table 2 and Table 3. Lastly, one-way ANOVAs were conducted with job type as the independent variable;

### Table 1

**Means and Standard Deviations among Study Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Attributes)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
<td>102.97</td>
<td>18.99</td>
<td>94.00</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Male = 1, Females = 2)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Experience (Yes = 1, No = 2)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
job type did not significantly affect transformational leadership, collectivism, or egalitarianism. Based on these analyses, supervisory status and job type were not included as predictor variables in the regression analyses. Ethnicity was included as a predictor variable for collectivism and egalitarianism.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations among Ethnicities for Collectivism Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish Origin</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/ European American</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations among Ethnicities for Egalitarianism Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>93.23</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>102.78</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish Origin</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>102.67</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/ European American</td>
<td>106.76</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planned Analyses

The correlation coefficients between transformational leadership, collectivism, gender, egalitarianism, age, supervisory experience, employees supervised, and hours worked per week were examined. As illustrated in Table 4, the initial analysis of the essential correlations (i.e., per hypotheses) demonstrated very low correlations between the variables of interest. However, the analysis did indicate a negative relationship between age and collectivism ($r = -.26, p < .05$). Due to the significant correlation between age and collectivism, the partial correlation between collectivism and transformational leadership, with age covaried, was computed. While controlling for age, collectivism was positively related to transformational leadership ($r_{ct,a} = .20, p < .05$), thus supporting hypothesis 1.

In order to further explore the relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership (hypothesis 1), a standard multiple regression was performed. Transformational leadership was the criterion variable; age, gender, ethnicity, and collectivism were the predictor variables. Prior to entering ethnicity into the regression model, it was renamed as minority and dummy coded such that “White/European American” was equal to 0 and all other ethnicities were equal to 1. This created more equally sized subgroups for the basis of comparison. The results of the standard regression analysis are indicated in Table 5. The results indicated that the overall regression model is significant, $F (4, 100) = 2.88, p < .05, R^2 = .10$. As illustrated in the
Table 4

*Correlation Coefficient Matrix of Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transformational</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collectivism</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>-0.26*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Egalitarianism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisory Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Employees Supervised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hours Worked per Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: n = 107. *p < .05, two-tailed. **p < .01, two-tailed.*
table, age significantly predicted transformational leadership (β = .23, p < .05). Further, as the proposed relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership was directional, a one-tailed test was used. Results indicated that collectivism significantly predicted transformational leadership (β = .17, p < .05), which adds further support to hypothesis 1.

Additionally, exploratory post-hoc analyses were conducted to further explore the relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership. The correlations between the individual dimensions of transformational leadership [i.e., Idealized Influence (Attributes), Idealized Influence (Behaviors), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration] and collectivism were analyzed. The correlations are presented in Table 6. As noted in the table, Idealized Influence (Attributes) was strongly correlated with collectivism, \( r(105) = .23, p < .05 \). Further, Idealized Influence (Behaviors) was strongly correlated with collectivism, \( r(105) = .24, p < .05 \). Lastly, the correlation between Individual Consideration and collectivism approached significance, \( r(105) = .16, p < .10 \). These correlations also lend support to hypothesis 1.

In order to assess the relationship between sex and transformational leadership (hypothesis 2), an independent-samples t-test was conducted. There was a significant difference in the scores for men (\( M = 3.13, SD = .51 \)) and women (\( M = 2.89, SD = .49 \)); \( t(105) = 1.98, p = 0.05 \). These results indicate that in this sample, contrary to expectations, men were more likely to endorse a transformational leadership style than women. Based on these data, hypothesis 2 was not supported.
Table 5

Summary of Standard Multiple Regression for Predictors of Transformational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.08**</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td>.13†</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 105. *p < .05, two-tailed. **p < .01, two-tailed. † p < .05, one-tailed.

Table 6

Correlation Coefficient Matrix within Transformational Leadership and Collectivism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</th>
<th>Inspirational Motivation</th>
<th>Intellectual Stimulation</th>
<th>Individual Consideration</th>
<th>Collectivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Attributes)</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 107. *p < .05, two-tailed.
This study also explored the relationship between egalitarianism and transformational leadership (hypothesis 3). A standard multiple regression was performed in order to explore that relationship. Transformational leadership was the criterion variable; age, gender, minority and egalitarianism were the predictor variables. The results, as illustrated in Table 7, indicated that the overall regression model approached significance, $F(4, 100) = 2.38, p < .10, R^2 = .09$. However, egalitarianism was not a significant predictor of transformational leadership. As illustrated in the table, only age significantly predicted transformational leadership ($\beta = .21, p < .05$). Thus, hypothesis 3 was not supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE_B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.07**</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 105$. *$p < .05$, two-tailed. **$p < .01$, two-tailed.

Lastly, a hierarchical multiple regression was performed to explore the relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership with egalitarianism as a moderator variable. The analysis was performed using gender, age, minority, and collectivism as
predictor variables. Age, gender, and minority were entered in one step into the regression analyses. Then, collectivism was entered. In the third step, the potential moderator, egalitarianism, was entered into the regression analyses. In the last step, the interaction between collectivism and egalitarianism was entered into the regression analyses. As illustrated in Table 8, the overall regression model approached significance, $F (6, 98) = 2.00, p < .10, R^2 = .10$. However, the interaction term of collectivism and egalitarianism was non-significant, thus hypothesis 4 was not supported.

| Table 8 |

**Hierarchical Multiple Regression**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE B$</th>
<th>$ß$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarianism x Collectivism</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: $n = 105$. *$p < .05$, two-tailed.*
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DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between several individual level factors (i.e., collectivism, sex, egalitarianism) and the employment of a transformational leadership style. The notion that a leadership style found to be effective in one culture will not necessarily be effective in another culture has been widely supported in the literature. However, there is still a somewhat limited amount of research investigating the relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership; thus, the current study aimed at providing additional support for this relationship.

Furthermore, there has been a great deal of research on the relationship between sex and transformational leadership suggesting that women are more likely to employ a transformational leadership style than men. The present study aimed to further explore this notion, not only by examining the direct relationship between sex and transformational leadership, but also by introducing egalitarianism—a rather new factor that has not received much attention in the transformational leadership literature. This study proposed that individuals higher in egalitarianism would be more likely to employ a transformational leadership style. Further, this study proposed that egalitarianism would moderate the relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership. The goals of this study were to further explore these relationships and address these gaps in the transformational leadership literature.
The results of this study support the first hypothesis that people high in collectivism are more likely to endorse a transformational leadership style than people low in collectivism. This suggests that similarities between collectivism and transformational leadership do exist, and subsequently, collectivistic individuals will be more likely to engage in transformational leadership. This may be because it is congruent with their cultural values.

Many studies have alluded to the relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership; however, few studies have actually examined this relationship. Findings in this study are congruent with findings from Walumba and Lawler (2003) who found that people in China, India, and Kenya who were high in collectivism were more likely to endorse a transformational leadership style. Findings in this study run parallel to Walumba and Lawler (2003), which found a significant correlation between transformational leadership and collectivism of $r = .20$. This study replicated Walumba and Lawler’s (2003) findings in a new cultural context, thus suggesting that this relationship may be universally endorsed. Additionally, these findings suggest that people will be more likely to endorse leadership styles that have similar characteristics to their cultural values.

Further, this study found that people who were more collectivistic were more likely to endorse the transformational leadership dimensions of Individualized Influence (Attributes) and Individualized Influence (Behaviors). The findings further suggest a trend for people high in collectivism to engage in Individualized Consideration. Idealized Influence, both attributes and behaviors, refer to a leader’s ability to gain their follower’s
admiration, trust, and respect, as well as their ability to create a shared vision for the
group. Additionally, Individualized Consideration refers to a leader’s consideration for
their followers. As these are core characteristics of a transformational leader,
collectivistic individuals may be more likely to naturally employ these characteristics
because their culture has emphasized the importance of such characteristics.

These results also provide some support for the idea that some dimensions of
transformational leadership are universally endorsed. Findings from Zagorsek et. al
(2004) indicated that individuals from the US, Nigeria and Slovenia were just as likely to
endorse Kouzes and Posner’s transformational leadership dimensions of Challenging the
Process, Inspiring the Shared Vision, and Encouraging the Hearth. Moreover, Den
Hartog’s (1999) illustrated that several dimensions of transformational leadership are
universally endorsed as contributors of outstanding leadership, these include “motive
arouser, foresight, encouraging, communicative, trustworthy, dynamic, positive,
confidence builder, and motivational” (p. 250). Thus, although some aspects of
transformational leadership are more frequently employed by collectivists, there are also
some aspects (e.g., Intellectual Stimulation, Inspirational Motivation), which are
endorsed cross-culturally.

Contrary to hypothesis 2, the present study found that men were significantly
more likely to employ a transformational leadership style than women. Eagly et. al
(2003), in a meta-analysis, indicated that studies have consistently found women to be
more likely to employ a transformational leadership style than men. Few studies have
indicated that there are no significant differences among men and women in their
transformational leadership styles (Komives, 1991; Maher, 1997; Thompson, 2000).

Further, there is a lack of research supporting the notion that men are more likely to endorse a transformational leadership style than women. In reference to the multitude of studies that have indicated women to be more transformational than women, Van Engen and Willemsen (2004) stated that this area of research “has only been defined and studied as such for a relatively short period, it remains to be seen how stable this gender difference will turn out to be” (p.13). Thus, this study could indicate the possibility of a new trend in the gender and transformational leadership research. An alternate explanation may be that the relatively small size of the male sample contributed to an unstable mean for men.

This study failed to support the hypothesis that people with more egalitarian gender role attitudes would be more like likely to employ a transformational leadership style. Most studies have leaned toward examining gender differences in transformational leadership using only biological sex rather than gender roles or gender role attitudes. Moreover, prior to this study, egalitarianism itself had not been examined in relation to transformational leadership. Because the regression analyses were not significant, nor close to approaching significance, these results suggest that there is not a relationship between egalitarianism and transformational leadership. It is possible that egalitarianism is a difficult construct to capture in this context, and there are other factors affecting this relationship that were not explored in the present study.

Lastly, the hypothesis that egalitarianism would moderate the relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership was not supported. This
relationship has not been addressed in previous literature, thus it is difficult to determine if there was an issue with the sample or another issue with the procedure. However, based on the analyses, it seems that there is no relationship between these variables.

Further, in the given sample, age significantly predicted transformational leadership. These findings suggest that age is an important variable in predicting transformational leadership. There may be some generational factors (e.g., widely-known leaders who exhibit transformational leadership styles) leading older individuals to employ transformational leadership styles more often than younger individuals. However, it should also be noted that this relationship could be a result of work experience. That is, older individuals are likely to have more work experience, which could subsequently influence their likelihood to employ a transformational leadership style. Because data were only collected in regard to the number of hours individuals work per week, and not the amount of work experience the individuals have, the present study could not further explore this relationship.

**Limitations**

The sample size of 107 participants may have unfavorably influenced the data. That is, because of the relatively small sample size, it is possible that this study lacked the power to detect differences given the number of variables involved. Additionally, although it was a relatively diverse sample of participants, in regards to ethnicity, it may be more appropriate to address these research questions using people from distinct countries. That is, individual levels of collectivism and egalitarianism may be stronger if people are from distinct countries. In this study, it was not known whether participants
were born and/or raised in a country other than the U.S., or were simply descendants of people from other countries, but socialized in the U.S. culture.

Another limitation of the sample is the lack of supervisory experience; nearly 60% of the participants had supervisory experience, however, it would be more beneficial to conduct this study using a population consisting only of persons in leadership positions. Furthermore, the participants only worked an average of 18 hours a week, suggesting that some of the participants may not have had work experience extensive enough to adequately answer the survey measures. Moreover, the sample was composed of four times as many women than men. As sex and gender role attitudes were some of the main factors examined in this study, it would have been beneficial to have an equal sample of men and women. Due to the sample restrictions, these results may not be generalizable to the population.

In addition, though the SRES showed adequate reliability, it may not have been the optimal scale for measuring the notion of egalitarianism as put forth by Hofstede in regard to cultural values. Mancheno-Smoak (2008) recently used the Masculinity/Femininity scale from Dorfman and Howell’s (1988) Cultural Dimensions to capture egalitarianism as a more culturally-bound construct. That study demonstrated that masculinity was negatively correlated with transformational leadership. A culture found to have a high masculinity factor would be characterized by distinct male and female gender roles, where men are more assertive and competitive and women are more interested in personal relationships and nurturing others. Mancheno-Smoak’s (2008) findings also imply that people with lower levels of masculinity (e.g., more accepting of
equal gender roles) were more likely to employ transformational leadership. Given the limited research in this area and the non-significant findings in this study, the use of that scale to measure egalitarianism is recommended as a way of further untangling this relationship.

Furthermore, it is important to note that this study only used the leader form of the MLQ. Ideally, the MLQ should be administered to the leader’s associates. A leader’s associates can rate the leader using the rater form of the MLQ. Because the present study only used the leader’s ratings, it is important to note that the transformational leadership scores were individual perceptions of their leadership style. It would be advantageous to utilize the rater forms of the MLQ as well as the self-ratings. The use of only the self-ratings may have influenced the present findings; that is, an individual’s perception of their own leadership style may be different from raters’ perceptions of their leadership style. Sixty-four percent of the studies in Eagly et. al’s (2003) meta-analysis incorporated ratings from the leader’s associates, such as followers and peers. Thus, incorporating multiple raters in the study may yield different results.

*Future Implications*

Future research should further examine the relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership, as there are still gaps in this literature. Research should explore this relationship using people from various countries; specifically, using cultures classified as collectivistic or individualistic. Future research could address both the national and individual level of culture. For instance, this relationship could be explored at the national level utilizing countries recognized as having distinct cultural values.
Additionally, the relationship could be further explored by measuring the cultural dimensions at an individual level. Further, research should address additional aspects of culture, other than egalitarianism, that may moderate the relationship between collectivism and transformational leadership, e.g., power distance.

The current findings with regard to gender, although contrary to most previous research, raise new questions regarding sex differences and transformational leadership. Future research should further examine these differences to add support to the current findings. Additionally, research should address questions regarding role incongruity for men, as men’s gender roles are incongruent with transformational leadership. If men experience role incongruity with regard to performing the transformational leadership attitudes or behaviors, it may be that they are also exposed to the same prejudices as women who experience role incongruity. Furthermore, future studies should examine the effectiveness of male transformational leaders versus male transactional leaders.
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