

Paper presented at
Asia Academy of Management meeting
Hong Kong, December 1998

**TRANSACTIONAL AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP:
AN EXAMINATION OF BASS'S (1985) CONCEPTUALIZATION
IN THE INDIAN CONTEXT**

Venkat R. Krishnan and Ekkirala S. Srinivas
Xavier Labour Relations Institute, Jamshedpur, India

Title: Transactional and Transformational Leadership: An Examination of Bass's (1985) Conceptualization in the Indian Context

ABSTRACT

Bass (1985) proposed a five-factor model of transactional and transformational leadership. A study of 337 managers revealed that a different set of six factors forms the basis of transactional and transformational leadership in the Indian context. The relationship between the six factors and certain outcome variables was also studied.

Key Words: Leadership, Transformational, India.

TRANSACTIONAL AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP: AN EXAMINATION OF BASS'S (1985) CONCEPTUALIZATION IN THE INDIAN CONTEXT

In an age of complexity, change, large enterprises and nation states, leaders are more important than ever (House, Spangler & Woycke, 1991). Burns (1978) wrote that leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth and that we know a lot about leaders while knowing very little about leadership. He defined leadership as inducing followers to pursue common or at least joint purposes that represent the values and motivations of both leaders and followers. He also distinguished between two types of leadership—transactional leadership, and transforming leadership (subsequently referred to as transformational leadership by researchers). Transactional leadership involves an exchange of benefits and is based on current values and motivations of both leaders and followers. Transformational leadership on the other hand, does not take the current values and motivations to be fixed, but rather seeks to change them. Bass (1985) found that transactional leadership consisted of two factors—contingent reward and management-by-exception, and transformational leadership consisted of three factors—charismatic leadership, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration.

According to Burns (1978), “the result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents” (page 4). Superior performance is possible only by transforming followers’ values, attitudes and motives from a lower to a higher plane of arousal and maturity (Bass, 1985). Studies have found significant and positive relationships between transformational leadership and the amount of effort followers are willing to exert, satisfaction with the leader, ratings of job performance, and perceived effectiveness (Avolio, Waldman & Einstein, 1988; Bass, Waldman, Avolio & Bebb, 1987; Bycio, Hackett & Allen, 1995; Hater & Bass, 1988; Waldman, Bass & Einstein, 1987).

Conceptualizations of effective leadership in the Indian context reflect both culture-specific and universal features (Sinha, 1997). Leader's nurturance and paternalism and subordinate's dependency and deference are culture-specific aspects of leadership in India, while the emphasis on task is universal. Singh and Bhandarker (1990) tried to give the theory of transformational leadership an Indian spirit. No systematic attempt has however been made to verify whether Bass’s (1985) five-factor model of transactional and transformational leadership is valid in the Indian context. This study attempts to identify the factors underlying transactional and transformational leadership behaviors in India, and compare the identified factor structure with the five-factor model of Bass.

INTRODUCTION

Burns (1978) defined transformational leadership as occurring “when one or more persons *engage* with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (page 20). The purposes of leaders and followers that might have started out as separate but related, as in the case of transactional leadership, become fused. Transactional leaders take the values, needs, motivations and purposes of followers as given and unchanging, but transformational leaders do not.

Components of Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) claimed that intellectual leadership is transforming leadership. “The concept of intellectual leadership brings in the role of conscious purpose drawn from values” (Burns, 1978: page 142). Intellectual leaders deal with both analytical and normative ideas and they bring both to bear on their environment. They typically seek to change their environment. The ultimate test of leaders’ effectiveness is in achieving purpose in the form of real and intended social change. Burns distinguished between the heroic and ideological aspects of transforming leadership. Heroic leadership is a type of relationship between leader and led that is characterized by follower’s belief in leader because of the leader’s personage alone. Ideological leadership, on the other hand, involves leaders' dedication to explicit goals that require substantial change.

Bass (1985) defined a transformational leader as one who motivates followers to do more than they originally expected to do. Transformational leaders broaden and change the interests of their followers, and generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group. They stir their followers to look beyond their self-interest for the good of the group (Bass, 1990). Bass (1985) found that transformational leadership consisted of three factors—charismatic leadership, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Bass (1985) found that followers had complete faith in charismatic leaders, felt proud to be associated with them, and trusted their capacity to overcome any obstacle. Moreover, charisma is not something that is exclusively the province of world-class leaders, but is something that is seen to some degree in industrial and military leaders throughout organizations. He also found charisma to be the most important component in the larger concept of transformational leadership, and inspirational leadership to be a sub-factor of charismatic leadership. Intellectual stimulation arouses in followers the awareness of problems and how they may be solved, and stirs the imagination and generates thoughts and insights. Individualized consideration involves giving personal attention to followers who seem neglected, treating each follower individually, and helping each follower get what he or she wants (Bass).

Components of Transactional Leadership

Burns (1978) defined transactional leadership as occurring when one person takes the initiative in reaching others to exchange valued things, like a swap of goods for money or a trading of votes between candidate and citizen. The purposes of leader and follower could be separate but are related, at least insofar as the purposes stand within the exchange process and can be advanced by maintaining that process or transaction. Leaders and followers may exchange goods or services to realize independent objectives. Burns argued that the objective of transactions is not necessarily to further the collective interests of followers, but to aid the individual interests of persons going their separate ways.

Bass (1985), building upon the idea of Burns (1978), defined a transactional leader as one who “(a) recognizes what it is we want to get from our work and tries to see that we get what we want if our performance warrants it, (b) exchanges rewards and promises of reward for our effort, (c) is responsive to our immediate self-interests if they can be met by our getting the work done” (page 11); the focus here is on transaction between the leader and the follower. Bass found that transactional leadership consisted of two distinct factors—contingent reward, and management-by-exception. Contingent reward refers to rewarding subordinates for their effort, support and doing

what needs to be done. Transactional leaders clarify the roles followers must play and the task requirements followers must complete to reach their personal goals while fulfilling the mission of the organization (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). Management-by-exception refers to taking corrective action only when subordinates deviate from expectations or fail to meet goals. Transactional leadership that relies heavily on passive management-by-exception is a prescription for mediocrity (Bass, 1990).

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was developed to measure the factors in transactional and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985). Several studies (Bycio et al., 1995; Hater & Bass, 1988; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Keller, 1992) have revealed high validity for the MLQ. The relationship of high transformational leadership scores on MLQ with effective leadership was found to be significant across many settings (Bass, 1990). There seems to be a basic assumption however, regarding the universality of the five factors measured by the MLQ. Authors have also, at the same time, questioned the universality of application of leadership theories (Hofstede, 1980; 1993). This study therefore is aimed at empirically verifying whether the same set of five factors of transactional and transformational leadership emerges in the Indian context also.

METHODS

We collected data for this study from 337 managerial level employees of three large manufacturing organizations situated in an industrial town of eastern India. Of the 330 respondents who reported their gender, 293 were men and 37 were women. Respondents ranged in age from 21 to 58 years, with a median age of 30 years. A majority of the respondents had been with the present organization for at least six years. Most respondents had been working with the leader they rated, for not less than two years. Of the 331 respondents who reported the gender of their leader, 310 were working with male leader and 21 with a female leader.

Measurement of Leadership Variables

We used the 41-item subset of MLQ Form 1 that defined transactional and transformational factors in Bass's (1985: page 209-212) first-order exploratory analysis. The Questionnaire had 28 transformational leadership items—18 for Charismatic Leadership (CL), 3 for Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and 7 for Individualized Consideration (IC). It had 13 transactional leadership items—7 for Contingent Reward (CR) and 6 for Management-by-Exception (ME). All the 41 items used, along with the original item numbers of Bass (1985) and the name of the corresponding factor (CL, IS, IC, CR or ME), are included in the Appendix. Respondents were requested to answer the questionnaire by rating how frequently their current immediate supervisors have displayed the behaviors described, using a five-point scale (1=Not at all; 2=Once in a while; 3=Sometimes; 4=Fairly often; 5=Frequently, if not always).

Measurement of Outcome Variables

We assessed extra effort put in by subordinates as a result of leadership behaviors (three items), subordinate's satisfaction with leader (two items), and subordinates' assessment of their leader and work unit effectiveness (four items), by using the scales within the MLQ Form 1 of Bass (1985). Subordinates were requested to answer the three items on extra effort by rating how frequently their current immediate supervisors have displayed the behaviors described, using a five-point scale (1=Not at all; 2=Once in a while; 3=Sometimes; 4=Fairly often; 5=Frequently, if not always).

The subordinates' responses to the two items on satisfaction with leader were recorded on a five-point scale (1=Very dissatisfied; 2=Somewhat dissatisfied; 3=Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 4=Fairly satisfied; 5=Very satisfied). Subordinates gave their responses to the four items on effectiveness, on a five-point scale (1=Not effective; 2=Only slightly effective; 3=Effective; 4=Very effective; 5=Extremely effective). We measured organizational commitment using the affective commitment scale developed by Allen and Meyer (1990). Evidence for the construct validity of this measure is provided by Allen and Meyer (1996). We used the revised six-item version of the scale (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993). Respondents gave their responses to the six items on commitment, on a five-point scale (1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neither agree nor disagree; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly agree).. The mean score on the items in each of the four scales (extra effort, satisfaction, effectiveness, commitment) was taken as the measure of that variable.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis to examine the dimensions underlying the 41 items of MLQ Form 1. In the common factor analysis, only 2 factors had latent root or eigenvalue greater than 1. Since the latent root criterion generally results in a conservative estimate of the number of factors to be extracted in the case of a common factor analysis as compared to a principal component analysis, we did a scree test (Harman, 1976). The scree test is a procedure by which latent roots are plotted against the number of factors in their order of extraction, and the point at which the curve first begins to straighten out gives the maximum number of factors to extract (Cattell, 1978). The scree test resulted in fixing 7 as the maximum number of factors to extract. We therefore had the common factor analysis extract 7 factors out of the 41 items.

The transactional and transformational leadership factors are highly correlated to each other, with the correlation coefficients among the transformational leadership factors reported in earlier studies being not less than 0.75 (Bycio et al., 1995). We therefore used oblique rotation of factors. While the orthogonal rotation assumes that each factor is independent of all other factors, the oblique solution does not assume the underlying dimensions to be unrelated to each other. Factor loadings of all the 41 items are included in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

An absolute value of 0.30 is generally considered to be the minimum factor loading for interpretation (Gorsuch, 1983). Of the 41 items, 40 items had a factor loading greater than 0.30 on at least one factor. Item 43 had the maximum loading on factor 7, and it was the only item included in factor 7 by the common factor analysis. Since item 43 had loadings of less than 0.16 on the other six factors, the item was excluded from analysis, and a six-factor solution with 40 items was retained for confirmatory factor analysis.

After the oblique rotation, the dimensions that emerged were labeled based on the content analysis of the items. The first factor consisted of items measuring charisma, inspiration and ideologue, and was termed heroic-visionary leadership. The second and fifth factors, which consisted of some transformational leadership items, were termed appreciative recognition and empowerment respectively. Contingent reward items emerged as third and sixth factors, which were respectively named attaining exchange outcome and building contingency belief. The focus of building contingency

belief was on the cause of contingent reward, and that of attaining exchange outcome was on the effect of contingent reward. Management-by-exception items emerged as the fourth factor.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

We did a confirmatory factor analysis of the 40 leadership items to test whether the six-factor design that emerged from the exploratory factor analysis best explained the underlying dimensions of transactional and transformational leadership (Floyd & Widaman, 1995). The item-level correlation matrix was analyzed using maximum likelihood estimation (Mulaik, 1975) to determine if the data were best represented by (a) one general factor, (b) two factors—transactional leadership and transformational leadership as defined by Bass (1985), (c) five correlated factors—CL, IS and IC comprising transformational leadership, and CR and ME comprising transactional leadership, as defined by Bass (1985), or (d) six correlated factors that emerged from the exploratory factor analysis—Heroic-Visionary Leadership, Appreciative Recognition, Attaining Exchange Outcome, Management-by-Exception, Empowerment, Building Contingency Belief.

To assess the relative fit of the models, we used the normed chi-square (ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom) and the six indices used by Bycio et al. (1995)—(a) Bentler and Bonett’s (1980) Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI), (b) Bentler’s (1990) Comparative Fit Index (CFI), (c) James, Mulaik and Brett’s (1982) Parsimonious Fit Index (PFI), (d) Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), (e) Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), and (f) Root Mean Square Residual (RMSR). The indices for the models tested are provided in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

RESULTS

The confirmatory factor analysis indices suggested that the six-factor model is a better fit than the five-factor model. Bentler and Bonett (1980) suggested that a NNFI of at least 0.90 indicates a good overall fit. It is the six-factor model that came closest to reaching a NNFI of 0.90 (NNFI=0.89); the five-factor model, the two-factor model and the one-factor general model scored lower on this criterion of overall fit. There was also a decrease in normed chi-square and an improvement in AGFI—which control for increases in the number of parameters estimated and thus avoid an automatic improvement because of greater number of free parameters—as one progressed from the most restricted model with one general factor to the six-factor model. Further, the normed chi-square was below the recommended level of 2.0 only in the case of six-factor model.

The correlations between variables are included in Table 3. All the six leadership factors were significantly ($p < 0.05$) correlated with each other, with the only exception of management-by-exception that was significantly correlated only to attaining exchange outcome, and building contingency belief. Similarly, factors other than management-by-exception were significantly positively correlated to all the four outcome variables—extra effort, satisfaction, perceived effectiveness, and commitment. Also, of the leadership factors, heroic-visionary leadership had the highest correlation with each of the four outcome variables.

Insert Table 3 about here

DISCUSSION

The results of confirmatory factor analysis support the claim that the 40 items used to measure transactional and transformational leadership capture the 6 underlying dimensions—Heroic-Visionary Leadership, Appreciative Recognition, Attaining Exchange Outcome, Management-by-Exception, Empowerment, Building Contingency Belief. The six-factor model provides a better explanation of transactional and transformational leadership dimensions in the Indian context, as compared to the five-factor model of Bass (1985).

Burns (1978) claimed that most leaders combine both ideological and charismatic qualities, and felt that great leaders combine them creatively. The transformational leader would therefore be someone in whom both these components blend perfectly and cannot be isolated. The factor of heroic-visionary leadership that has emerged in this study could be seen as forming the vital essence of transformational leadership. The only other leadership factor to which heroic-visionary leadership is not significantly related is management-by-exception. Heroic-visionary leadership challenges the status quo, while management-by exception lets the present state of affairs to continue.

The results of this study provide some support for the active-passive model suggested by Bycio et al. (1995). Bycio et al. found that management-by-exception stood alone, while contingent reward and the factors of transformational leadership were all significantly positively correlated to each other. In this study also, the two contingent reward factors of building contingency belief and attaining exchange outcome are significantly correlated to heroic-visionary leadership, appreciative recognition, and empowerment. Thus management-by-exception represents the passive leadership style of maintaining the status quo, while the remaining factors represent the active leadership styles of doing something to achieve present and future goals.

Leadership factors and outcome variables. The three transformational factors of heroic-visionary leadership, appreciative recognition and empowerment have higher correlations with all the four outcome variables, as compared to the three transactional factors of attaining exchange outcome, building contingency belief, and management-by-exception. These findings support prior research on augmentation effect of transformational leadership over transactional leadership (Bycio et al., 1995). Commitment has the lowest correlation among the four outcome variables, with all the six leadership factors. This could be because effectiveness and satisfaction are directly concerned about the leader, and therefore subordinates who rate a leader highly are also likely to perceive the leader to be effective and feel more satisfied. Similarly, extra effort was measured directly based on the frequency of leader behaviors.

Conclusion

Limitations of study. Participation in the study was voluntary and so there might have been some self-selection bias. Both leadership and outcome variables were measured by surveying the subordinate, which could have created common-method variance. Moreover, the use of correlation design does not answer the question of causality between the leadership factors and the outcome variables. Data for this study was collected only from organizations situated in one industrial town in India, and the sample consisted of well-educated employees. The generalizability and external validity of the results are therefore limited. This study included only the 41 transactional and transformational items of Bass (1985), and therefore limited the possibility of getting a totally different factor structure underlying transactional and transformational leadership.

Directions for future research. This research represents some helpful first steps toward understanding transactional and transformational leadership dimensions in the Indian context, and it also gives some pointers for future research. Further effort to identify leadership dimensions in the Indian context could possibly start with all the 72 items of the MLQ Form 1 instead of only with the 41 transactional and transformational items identified by Bass (1985). Factor analyses of all 72 items might be a better means of testing Bass's five-factor model in a different culture. Some culture-specific items like those on nurturant-task leadership could also be included. Using a wider bunch of outcome variables would help in lending some greater validity to resulting factors. Outcomes that focus separately on subordinate's purpose remaining constant, and on the purpose becoming changed because of leadership, might help in distinguishing more clearly between transactional and transformational leadership.

The multiple changes occurring in society and the business world have created a greater need for transformational leadership (Pawar & Eastman, 1997). This study presents a new six-factor model of transactional and transformational leadership in the Indian context. When further research with a wider sample provides greater support, this culture-specific model of leadership could make it easier to identify and train transformational leaders in the Indian context.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J.P. 1990. The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63(3): 1-18.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J.P. 1996. Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49: 252-276.
- Avolio, B.J., Waldman, D.A., & Einstein, W.O. 1988. Transformational leadership in a management game simulation: Impacting the bottom line. Group and Organization Studies, 13: 59-80.
- Bass, B.M. 1985. Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. 1990. Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B.M., Waldman, D.A., Avolio, B.J., & Bebb, M. 1987. Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. Group and Organization Studies, 12: 73-87.
- Bentler, P.M. 1990. Comparative fit indices in structural models. Psychological Bulletin, 107: 238-246.
- Bentler, P.M., & Bonett, D.G. 1980. Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. Psychological Bulletin, 88: 588-606.
- Burns, J.M. 1978. Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bycio, P., Hackett, R.D., & Allen, J.S. 1995. Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 80(4): 468-478.
- Cattell, R.B. 1978. The scientific use of factor analysis in behavioral and life sciences. New York: Plenum Press.
- Floyd, F.J., & Widaman, K.F. 1995. Factor analysis in the development and refinement of clinical assessment instruments. Psychological Assessment, 7(3): 286-299.
- Gorsuch, R.L. 1983. Factor analysis. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Harman, H.H. 1976. Modern factor analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hater, J.J., & Bass, B.M. 1988. Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73: 695-702.
- Hofstede, G. 1980. Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? Organizational Dynamics, 9(1) Summer: 42-62
- Hofstede, G. 1993. Cultural constraints in management theories. Academy of Management Executive, 7(1): 81-94.
- House, R.J., Spangler, W.D., & Woycke, J. 1991. Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 36: 364-396.
- Howell, J.M., & Avolio, B.J. 1993. Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78(6):891-902.
- James, L.R., Mulaik, S.A., & Brett, J.M. 1982. Causal analysis: Assumptions, models, and data. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Keller, R.T. 1992. Transformational leadership and the performance of research and development project groups. Journal of Management, 18(3): 489-501.
- Kuhnert, K.W., & Lewis, P. 1987. Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. Academy of Management Review, 12(4): 648-657.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C.A. 1993. Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63(3): 1-18.

- Mulaik, S.A. 1975. Confirmatory factor analysis. In D.J. Amick, & H.J. Walberg (Eds.), Introductory multivariate analysis: For educational, psychological and social research, 170-207. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Pawar, B.S., & Eastman, K.K. 1997. The nature and implications of contextual influences on transformational leadership: A conceptual examination. Academy of Management Review, 22(1): 80-109.
- Singh, P., & Bhandarker, A. 1990. Corporate success and transformational leadership. New Delhi: Wiley Eastern.
- Sinha, J.B.P. 1997. A cultural perspective on organizational behavior in India. In P.C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology, 53-74. San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.
- Waldman, D.A., Bass, B.M., & Einstein, W.O. 1987. Effort, performance, and transformational leadership in industrial and military settings. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 60: 177-186.

APPENDIX
MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

- CL 1 Makes me feel good to be around him/her.
- IC 3 Is satisfied when I meet the agreed-upon standards for good work.
- IC 5 Makes me feel we can reach our goals without him/her if we have to.
- IC 6 I earn credit with him/her by doing my job well.
- CR 7 Assures me I can get what I personally want in exchange for my efforts.
- IC 10 Finds out what I want and tries to help me get it.
- IC 11 You can count on him/her to express his/her appreciation when you do a good job.
- CL 12 Commands respect from everyone.
- IC 15 Gives personal attention to members who seem neglected.
- CL 17 Is a model to me to follow.
- CL 18 In my mind; he/she is a symbol of success and accomplishment.
- IS 19 Has provided me with new ways of looking at things which used to be a puzzle for me.
- CR 21 Talks a lot about special commendations and promotions for good work.
- CL 22 I am ready to trust his capacity and judgment to overcome any obstacle.
- ME 25 Is content to let me continue doing my job in the same way as always.
- CL 26 Is an inspiration to us.
- CL 27 Makes me proud to be associated with him/her.
- CL 29 Has a special gift of seeing what it is that really is important for me to consider.
- IS 30 His/her ideas have forced me to rethink some of my own ideas which I had never questioned before.
- IS 32 Enables me to think about old problems in new ways.
- CL 36 Inspires loyalty to him/her.
- CL 38 Increases my optimism for the future.
- CL 40 Inspires loyalty to the organization.
- CL 41 I have complete faith in him/her.
- CL 42 Excites us with his/her visions of what we may be able to accomplish if we work together.
- IC 43 Treats each subordinate individually.
- CR 48 I decide what I want; he/she shows me how to get it.
- CL 50 Encourages me to express my ideas and opinions.
- CR 53 Whenever I feel it necessary, I can negotiate with him/her about what I can get for what I accomplish.
- ME 54 Asks no more of me than what is absolutely essential to get the work done.
- ME 58 Only tells me what I have to know to do my job.
- CL 60 Encourages understanding of points of view of other members.
- ME 61 As long as things are going all right he/she does not try to change anything.
- CL 62 Gives me a sense of overall purpose.
- CR 63 Tells me what I should do if I want to be rewarded for my efforts.
- CR 65 Gives me what I want in exchange for showing my support for him/her.
- CL 66 Has a sense of mission which he/she transmits to me.
- CL 68 Makes everyone around him/her enthusiastic about assignments.
- ME 69 As long as the old ways work, he/she is satisfied with my performance.
- ME 71 It is all right if I take initiatives but he/she does not encourage me to do so.

CR 72 There is a close agreement between what I am expected to put into the group effort and what I can get out of it.

TABLE 1
Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis of Leadership Items^a

| Item # ^b | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | Factor 5 | Factor 6 | Factor 7 |
|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 26 | .90 | -.01 | -.11 | .03 | .01 | .04 | -.01 |
| 18 | .88 | -.04 | -.03 | .05 | -.05 | -.07 | -.02 |
| 27 | .86 | .03 | -.10 | -.08 | .04 | -.01 | .10 |
| 19 | .80 | -.13 | -.00 | -.07 | -.01 | .16 | .07 |
| 17 | .80 | .03 | .07 | -.10 | -.11 | .03 | .00 |
| 41 | .69 | .16 | -.05 | .06 | .16 | -.18 | .02 |
| 22 | .69 | .22 | -.04 | .13 | -.00 | -.00 | .04 |
| 32 | .67 | -.11 | .04 | .06 | .10 | .05 | -.01 |
| 38 | .61 | .10 | .10 | .01 | .05 | .05 | -.11 |
| 12 | .60 | .26 | -.13 | .03 | -.10 | .02 | -.05 |
| 30 | .60 | -.23 | .02 | .05 | .16 | .19 | .06 |
| 29 | .57 | -.08 | .01 | .01 | .15 | .25 | .01 |
| 15 | .56 | .18 | -.03 | -.01 | .04 | .19 | .03 |
| 42 | .55 | .09 | .15 | -.02 | .13 | -.03 | .07 |
| 36 | .54 | .18 | .07 | -.03 | .06 | -.12 | .10 |
| 68 | .52 | .04 | .12 | -.07 | .19 | .04 | -.03 |
| 48 | .43 | -.10 | .19 | .03 | .26 | .08 | .01 |
| 40 | .38 | .19 | .20 | -.08 | .26 | -.19 | .06 |
| 66 | .37 | -.01 | .24 | .01 | .30 | -.04 | -.15 |
| 10 | .34 | .22 | .14 | -.00 | .03 | .20 | -.09 |
| 3 | .08 | .58 | -.06 | .13 | .12 | .01 | .00 |
| 11 | .18 | .46 | .29 | -.14 | -.01 | .14 | .06 |
| 1 | .44 | .39 | -.09 | -.04 | .07 | .12 | .00 |
| 6 | .38 | .36 | .09 | .08 | -.08 | .08 | -.00 |
| 65 | .01 | -.01 | .63 | .08 | -.08 | .07 | .17 |
| 72 | -.07 | -.01 | .58 | .05 | .15 | .10 | .40 |
| 53 | .18 | .03 | .36 | .22 | .10 | .06 | -.19 |
| 69 | -.01 | .21 | -.01 | .58 | -.06 | .06 | -.03 |
| 54 | .07 | -.05 | .18 | .47 | .04 | -.13 | -.00 |
| 61 | -.18 | .17 | -.12 | .45 | .24 | .08 | .19 |
| 71 | -.13 | -.07 | .21 | .42 | -.06 | .03 | .13 |
| 25 | .20 | -.02 | -.04 | .41 | -.03 | .09 | -.11 |
| 58 | .10 | -.10 | .17 | .39 | -.20 | -.08 | .36 |
| 60 | .42 | -.00 | -.02 | -.02 | .49 | .03 | .07 |
| 50 | .35 | .18 | -.09 | .03 | .49 | .05 | .08 |
| 62 | .40 | .04 | .08 | -.01 | .42 | .02 | .02 |
| 5 | .19 | .02 | -.01 | -.00 | .26 | .04 | .11 |
| 21 | .23 | .11 | .05 | .07 | .11 | .43 | -.03 |
| 7 | .18 | .19 | .38 | -.03 | -.14 | .42 | .09 |
| 63 | .13 | .01 | .32 | .02 | .12 | .37 | -.20 |
| 43 | .15 | .06 | .12 | .01 | .12 | -.04 | .48 |

^a Items which load on each factor are grouped together.

^b Item numbers correspond to the numbers given in Bass (1985, page 201-204).

TABLE 2
Overall Fit Indices for the 40 Leadership Items^a

| Model | Chi-Square | df | NNFI | CFI | PFI | GFI | AGFI | RMSR |
|----------|------------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Null | 7272.70 | 780 | | | | | | |
| 1-Factor | 1834.35 | 740 | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.71 | 0.75 | 0.72 | 0.06 |
| 2-Factor | 1709.22 | 739 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.75 | 0.07 |
| 5-Factor | 1485.32 | 730 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.74 | 0.81 | 0.78 | 0.06 |
| 6-Factor | 1400.52 | 725 | 0.89 | 0.90 | 0.75 | 0.82 | 0.79 | 0.06 |

^a N=337. NNFI=Non-Normed Fit Index; CFI=Comparative Fit Index; PFI=Parsimonious Fit Index; GFI=Goodness of Fit Index; AGFI=Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; RMSR=Root Mean Square Residual.

TABLE 3
Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities and Correlations for Variables^a

| Sl. | Variables | Mean | S.D. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|-----|------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. | Heroic-Visionary Leadership | 3.23 | .85 | (.95) | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. | Appreciative Recognition | 3.53 | .83 | .72** | (.77) | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Attaining Exchange Outcomes | 2.89 | .87 | .49** | .39** | (.62) | | | | | | | |
| 4. | Management-by-Exception | 3.08 | .69 | .08 | .05 | .39** | (.63) | | | | | | |
| 5. | Empowerment | 3.45 | .84 | .76** | .59** | .44** | .10 | (.76) | | | | | |
| 6. | Building Contingency Beliefs | 2.99 | .97 | .65** | .55** | .52** | .15* | .51** | (.72) | | | | |
| 7. | Leader Effectiveness | 3.44 | .76 | .70** | .57** | .25** | .07 | .57** | .43** | (.82) | | | |
| 8. | Satisfaction with the Leader | 3.51 | .98 | .77** | .60** | .35** | .00 | .63** | .52** | .69** | (.86) | | |
| 9. | Organizational Commitment | 3.39 | .81 | .45** | .38** | .26** | .02 | .44** | .33** | .44** | .47** | (.80) | |
| 10. | Extra Effort | 3.32 | .95 | .80** | .62** | .42** | .04 | .68** | .59** | .61** | .66** | .41** | (.78) |

^a Cronbach alpha reliabilities are reported in parentheses along the diagonal.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$.