Transformational Leadership in India
Developing and Validating a New Scale Using Grounded Theory Approach

Niti Singh

Gallup Organization, Mumbai, India

Venkat R. Krishnan

Great Lakes Institute of Management, Chennai, India

ABSTRACT   This article reports on three studies that used a combination of methods to develop a measure of transformational leadership in India. The grounded theory approach was followed for generating the initial item-pool ($n = 250$). In the second study ($n = 379$), an exploratory factor analysis was conducted, followed by a confirmatory factor analysis, which resulted in a six-factor model. The factors show support for both universal as well as unique cultural dimensions. In the third study ($n = 202$; 101 manager–subordinate dyads) survey data were collected and support was found for sound psychometric properties of the new scale, including incremental, discriminant, convergent, and predictive validity. The new scale explained significant variance over and above the variance explained by the currently existing scale for measuring transformational leadership.

KEY WORDS • Indian culture • scale development • transformational leadership

Leadership has been a popular theme for both the managerial and the academic world for a long time. This interest was further energized after Burns (1978) introduced the model of transformational leadership in his seminal work. According to him, transformational leadership engages everyone in such a way that both leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality (p. 20). According to Dumdum et al. (2002), the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which was first developed by Bass (1985), has been used most frequently for assessing transformational leadership.

However, many writers have expressed concern along cultural lines about the generalizability of findings using the MLQ (Hunt and Conger, 1999; Hunt and Peterson, 1997; Triandis, 2002). This apprehension about the cross cultural validity of MLQ makes development of a new scale for the Indian context essential. This article attempts to meet this need by developing a new scale using grounded theory methodology. It is structured as follows. The next section discusses the topics of culture and transformational leadership – the differences in manifestations of transformational leadership in different cultures, the consequent need for culture-specific studies on transformational leadership, and the importance of developing a new scale for measuring transformational leadership in India. This is followed by an outline of the data collection process, method and results. The last section discusses the implications of the study and includes suggestions for future research.

Culture and Transformational Leadership

Culture is a set of underlying assumptions, norms, and beliefs shared by members of a group. It denotes a set of common theories and behaviors or mental programs that are shared by a group of individuals (Earley and Erez, 1997). Jaeger (1990) said that culture is a system of shared meaning where members of the same culture have a common way of viewing events and objects, and therefore are likely to interpret and evaluate situations and management practices in a consistent fashion. Kejriwal and Krishnan (2004) found in an experimental study conducted in India that the worldview of leaders affected their transformational leadership. Culture becomes important in understanding leadership because leadership is essentially a social phenomenon. By understanding the culture to which the followers belong, leaders can understand the underlying assumptions, beliefs, and values of

their followers, and thereby develop greater awareness about the followers. In the case of transformational leadership, culture is especially significant because leaders will not be able to understand the true needs of followers if they do not understand their values, norms, and beliefs.

Need for Culture-specific Studies on Leadership

Leadership theories are full of assumptions that might hold primarily in North America, such as being individualistic rather than collectivistic, hedonistic rather than altruistic, emphasizing rights rather than duties, rationality rather than tradition, and so on (Beyer, 1999; House et al., 1997). Cross cultural studies have shown that these assumptions are not shared by all the cultures of the world (Hofstede, 2001; Pillai et al., 1999; Smith and Peterson, 2002). Though a particular leadership style might have been effective in the USA, when it was imported in full to different countries, it was found that it did not deliver to its full potential, and, in fact, sometimes proved to be counterproductive (Beyer, 1999; Conger, 1999; Dickson et al., 2003; Pillai et al., 1999; Smith and Peterson, 2002). Robert et al. (2000) found that ratings of supervisors were negatively related to empowerment in India, while they were positively related in the USA, Mexico, and Poland. Therefore, it is worthwhile giving some attention to effective leadership behaviors in the Indian context.

India is one of the fastest growing economies in Asia. Several organizations outside India have been evincing interest in the country, but not much research has been done so far to throw light on effective management practices in the Indian context. Uncritical transfer of management theories and techniques based on western ideologies and value systems has contributed in many ways to organizational inefficiencies and ineffectiveness in cultures such as India (Kanungo and Jaeger, 1990). Personal relations are very

important in India, and so businesses settling there must learn to adapt to local conditions (Budhwar, 2001). Unique internal labor markets exist in Indian organizations, based on social relations, political contacts, caste, religion, and economic power (Budhwar and Boyne, 2004). Budhwar and Debrah (2001) questioned the universal applicability of Anglo-Saxon models of human resource management (HRM) and argued that national factors such as culture, legal set-up, economic environment, and ownership patterns influence HRM strategies and HRM practices. Budhwar and Sparrow (2002) found that HRM strategies, when considered in a cross-national context, varied a lot. Different logic led to the adoption of similar HR strategies, and similar strategies in turn were perceived as producing different outcomes. The thinking of managers about apparently similar concepts can be different across different cultures. Hence, transformational leadership may not manifest itself in the same set of behaviors in India as it does in the western world.

Cultural Differences in Manifestations of Transformational Leadership

Bass (1997) proposed that a leader might need to act in different ways within differing cultural contexts, in order to be transformational. This is because there are cultural differences in the way the components of transformational leadership are manifested in behavior. An example of this is shown by the study conducted by Ardichvili and Gasparishvili (2001), which found that although transformational leadership was the most prevalent style of leadership in the four former USSR countries under study, individualized consideration and charisma were reported to be least effective in increasing followers' performance. Another characteristic – the means of communicating a vision (which is one of the factors of transformational leadership) – has been shown to be

culturally contingent, ranging from the use of exceptional public oratory skills in the USA to quietly demonstrating exemplary personal service by people like Mother Teresa in India (Smith and Peterson, 2002).

Khandwalla (1990) argued that countries such as India are most conducive for the emergence of transformational leadership because of realities such as social stratification and kinship orientation. Only transformational leaders could address these realities and that too only through addressing the unique cultural requirements. Duty orientation, and not hedonism or individual rights, is the basic motivational fabric of Indian society. A scale based on assumptions of hedonism or individual rights may not capture all the nuances of transformational leadership in a culture based on assumptions of duty orientation.

Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) contended that for transformational leadership to be authentic, it must incorporate a central core of moral values whose ordering and importance are culturally relative. It is required of a transformational leader to bridge ethical relativism by forging a platform of common values and congruence of interests. Bass (1985: 154) argued that there is scope for contingency analysis to assess the effects of culture on operationalization of transformational leadership. Thus, we see that even though the general definition of transformational leadership is applicable globally (Den Hartog et al., 1997), its effective operationalization is culturally contingent since each culture has its own unique characteristics.

Need for a New Scale for Measuring Transformational Leadership

Even though there are a number of scales available for measuring transformational leadership, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 1995) is the most widely used. While many studies have provided support for the

basic model (Avolio et al., 1999; Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999), a number of cultural studies point to the fact that there are important cultural dimensions that could add more reliability and validity to the MLQ (Den Hartog et al., 1997). Yukl (1999) accepted that transformational leadership theories provide important insights, but claimed that some serious conceptual weaknesses need to be corrected to make the theories more useful. The theories do not describe the underlying influence processes clearly, nor do they specify how the leader behaviors are related to these processes. Yammarino et al. (1998) showed that leaders and followers did not link in dyadic or group-based relationships as suggested by transformational leadership theory. Khatri (2005) proposed an alternative model of transformational leadership that addresses the problems in Bass's (1985) model. Specifically, he suggested that the four transformational components proposed by Bass and his colleagues should be replaced by two of the most central constructs in 'new leadership' research – charisma and vision.

Many authors have contended that the applicability of leadership concepts and ways to measure these in diverse cultural contexts should not be taken for granted (Boyacigiller and Adler, 1991). Some studies that have been conducted in the non-US context clearly show the difference in operationalization. Den Hartog et al. (1997) did a study with a Dutch sample and found that although the basic three-factor structure given in the MLQ came out clearly, separate dimensions within transformational and transactional leadership were not observed. The study by Carless (1998) with an Australian sample led to the conclusion that although the overall distinction with the three-factor model does exist, its behavioral components differed across cultures. Alimo-Metcalf and Alban-Metcalf (2001) developed a culture-specific transformational leadership scale for the United Kingdom's public sector units. Hwang et al. (2005) developed an instrument to iden-

tify leadership charisma and vision in Singapore and validated it in New Zealand and India. Results from the Singapore sample showed that charisma and vision were made up of two charismatic factors (social sensitivity, and persuasive personality traits) and two visionary factors (expert and analytical, and visionary and futuristic). Tests across three countries showed that the two visionary factors influenced reported performance and the two charismatic factors influenced subordinate commitment. Only social sensitivity predicted both the performance and commitment of subordinates. The factors of charisma and vision affect follower-level outcomes differentially (Khatri et al., 2001).

The literature indicates that within the broad framework of transformational leadership, subtle differences in its operationalization exist across cultures (Bass, 1997; Den Hartog et al., 1997; Singh, 2003). In their five-nation study, Pillai et al. (1999) found that differences in leadership patterns across cultures lay in the processes through which the leader operated. Many leadership characteristics are universally endorsed, whereas many others are culture bound. The implementation of both types of characteristics also varies across cultures. It is anticipated that there will be unique dimensions in the operationalization of transformational leadership in nations that have unique cultures, like for example India. Therefore, a new scale is needed to measure transformational leadership in India.

The next question that arises is whether a large and diverse nation such as India can be assumed to have one common culture. A criticism against Hofstede (2001) was that he treated large nations like India as single units. Authors on Indian culture have noted the diverse elements that are part of the culture, but have highlighted an underlying unity behind that diversity (Gupta, 2002; Sinha, 2000). Transformational leadership seeks to elevate followers to a higher common plane (Burns, 1978). Therefore, the focus is likely to

be more on the underlying unity, rather than on the various external manifestations of diversity. Hence, it is reasonable to assume a common Indian culture for developing a new scale to measure transformational leadership in India.

Scale Development

Various approaches have been employed by different leadership theorists to measure charismatic or transformational leadership (Alimo-Metcalf and Alban-Metcalf, 2001; Bass, 1985; Conger and Kanungo, 1998; Kouzes and Posner, 2002). The MLQ is the most frequently used instrument (Dumdum et al., 2002). Bass (1985: 29) developed the instrument by following the grounded theory approach. He administered an open-ended survey to 70 male senior executives from the industry. A transformational leader was described as someone who (1) raised their awareness about issues of consequence, (2) shifted them to higher-level needs, and (3) influenced them to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the group or organization and to work harder than they originally had expected they would. The executives were asked to list the behaviors of such a leader. With the behaviors described by the executives and from a survey of the literature, Bass drafted 142 items that described transformational and transactional leadership, which was later reduced to 73 items, based on face validity. This was then administered to 104 personnel from the army, foreign officers, and civilians of equivalent rank. Respondents were asked to indicate how frequently they observed the given behaviors in their immediate supervisors. Factor analysis showed five clear factors that described transformational and transactional leadership. In this study, we followed the method used by Bass (1985) in developing the MLQ.

Method and Results

Parry (1998) reasoned that grounded theory research method is the most appropriate for studying leadership since, in this method, theory emerges from, and is grounded in, the data. According to Conger (1999), when one attempts to capture specific behaviors displayed by the leader that go to the extent of touching the underlying deep emotions, feelings, and thought processes of followers, we should rely on qualitative research methods. In this study we have used the grounded theory method (Egan, 2002) to explore the followers' perspective of what constitutes transformational leadership behaviors of managers in Indian organizations. The essential requirement of this method of scale development is that the researcher should not impose a structure on the emergent data. We used grounded theory for developing the initial pool of items. Bass (1985) was the first person to develop a measure of transformational leadership [the transformational leadership sub-dimension in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: MLQ-TL], and we gave the same instructions to our respondents for generating the initial item-pool.

Grounded Theory for Item Generation (Study 1)

Data collection was done using an open-ended questionnaire that contained a brief description of only the effects of transformational leaders on their followers (Bass, 1985). The effects described were: (1) raised the awareness of followers about issues of consequence; (2) shifted them to higher-level needs; and (3) influenced them to transcend their self-interests for the good of the group or organization and to work harder than they originally had thought they would.

Respondents were asked to think if they had ever worked with a leader who had had such an effect on them. Only three of the respondents reported that they had never come across such a leader, and they were not

included in the study. The remaining respondents were asked to write down the most frequently displayed behaviors (which caused the effects described) of such leaders. It was highlighted before the start of the survey that the researchers were interested in the respondents' personal observations rather than textbook descriptions. This was done to minimize bias and contamination by implicit ideas of leadership formed from previous knowledge of the literature.

The sample consisted of 29 executives from an information technology organization, 33 from a management consulting organization, and 188 full-time executives from various industries all over India who were enrolled in a management program through distance education conducted by an academic institution in eastern India. The last set of 188 executives was requested to answer the survey during a contact classroom session, and the remaining executives in the sample were approached through personal contacts in those two organizations. Participation in the study was voluntary, and only those executives who had at least one year of experience were considered. The executives were asked to describe those supervisors under whom they had worked for at least six months.

The average age of the respondents was 30.8 years, while the mean of their work experience was 8.7 years. They had worked with the leader they had described for an average of 3.5 years. Eighty-six percent of the respondents were male; 23.6% of them were currently working at junior level, 60% at middle level, and 14.4% at senior level in the organizational hierarchy. In terms of their functional profile, 34% were from sales and marketing, 3% from human resources, 41% from systems, 6% from finance, 11% from engineering, and 5% from other areas. Twenty-four percent of the respondents reported that they were currently working in the manufacturing sector, 7% in banking and financial services, 43% in information tech-

nology and related sectors, 16% in the service sector, 4% in processing industries, and 6% in 'other' sectors, which did not fit into any of the above-mentioned categories.

Coding procedure and item generation

One thousand six hundred and seventeen (1617) response sets were generated from the open-ended questionnaire, which were later content analyzed to generate the items. Throughout the data analysis, an attempt was made to extract only those behaviors that were overtly enacted by the leader, and had resulted in transforming the follower. The use of this method ensured that only the behaviors reported by those people who had experienced the transformation were considered as valid, thus ensuring that data would not be contaminated with the researcher's preconception of the phenomenon.

Major areas of importance – reflected in the expression of observed behaviors recurring in respondents' responses – were distilled through an iterative and inferential process during data analysis. Two experts (judges) who were familiar with the leadership literature read the complete set of responses individually. The experts eliminated those statements that were talking about the traits or impacts such leaders had, which resulted in 453 statements that were describing only behaviors displayed by the leader. Using the logic of inductive reasoning, these behavioral indicators were then subjected to a sorting process that served as a pre-test, permitting the deletion of items that seemed to be conceptually inconsistent. For example, one respondent spoke about his role model cricket player (whom he had never met) and tried to analyze the behaviors displayed. The judges also classified the responses into groups such that recurring statements with similar themes could be put together. Disagreement between the judges was resolved through discussion. Using the sorting process, an attempt was made to include at least three items from each theme that emerged from

the data. Finally, 51 items were retained, and these represented the entire universe of possible themes that had emerged from the data (DeVellis, 1991). These items were then rewritten to make sentences simple and clear. The scale did not contain any reverse-coded items (Hinkins, 1995). We developed the scale in English because that is the language used by most executives in the majority of large organizations in India, and we conducted our subsequent two studies using such executives as respondents.

Scale Construction (Study 2)

The initial list of 51 items was then administered to 379 managers of various organizations in an industrial town in eastern India. The respondents answered the items keeping their immediate supervisor in mind. The ratio of the sample size to the number of items is $379/51 = 7.43$, which meets the sample size requirements for factor analysis (Hair et al., 1998).

The average age of the respondents in this stage was 34.78 years, and the mean number of years of working with the manager they had rated in the questionnaire was 5.28 years. Fifty-two percent of the respondents were male; 20.3% reported that they were currently working at junior level in the organization, 30% at middle level, and 18.2% at senior level, while 31.5% did not mark their hierarchical level. Approximately 23.7% of the respondents were from the manufacturing sector, 28.2% from the banking and financial sector, 2% from information technology and related sectors, 39% from the service sector, 4% from process industry, and 1.3% from the 'other' category.

Instruments used In addition to the 51 items on Indian Transformational Leadership (ITL) generated in Study 1, the questionnaire for this stage included measures of transformational leadership, laissez-faire, satisfaction with the leader, extra effort by the subordinate, and perception of the leader's

effectiveness, all taken from the MLQ Form 5X (Bass and Avolio, 1995). The MLQ has 20 items to measure the five factors of transformational leadership. The five factors are: (1) idealized influence (attributed), (2) idealized influence (behavior), (3) inspirational motivation, (4) intellectual stimulation, and (5) individualized consideration. Laissez-faire leadership is an absence of leadership and has been known to correlate negatively with transformational leadership (Bass, 1998); it was measured through four items. The MLQ also has items to capture three outcomes that are known to positively correlate with transformational leadership – satisfaction with the leader, willingness to put in extra effort, and perceived effectiveness of the leader. Two items were used for assessing satisfaction of the subordinates, three items measured willingness to put in extra effort, and the perceived effectiveness of the leader was measured through four items. These items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale with anchors labeled: not at all (0), once in a while (1), sometimes (2), fairly often (3), frequently, if not always (4). Respondents were asked to answer the questionnaire by rating the frequency with which the immediate supervisor displayed the behaviors listed.

Exploratory factor analysis An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the 51 ITL items was conducted using VARIMAX rotation. When the criterion of eigenvalue equal to one was used, nine factors emerged, out of which two factors had one item each. Based on an analysis of the magnitude and scree plot of the eigenvalues, seven factors were identified as a better fit for the data and were extracted. These factors accounted for 58.34% of the variance. Out of the seven factors, one factor was not used for further analysis because it had only one item. Only those items that had factor loadings of more than 0.3 (Hair et al., 1998: 112) were retained. In addition, items that had multiple loadings (across factors) were retained only if the

Table 1   Confirmatory factor analysis results of the Indian transformational leadership scale

	χ^2	DF	χ^2/DF	RMR	GFI	AGFI	PGFI	NFI	CFI	RMSEA
6-Factor model (27 items)	544.74	318	1.71	0.05	0.90	0.88	0.76	0.88	0.94	0.04
9-Factor model (40 items)	1316.2	732	1.80	0.06	0.85	0.83	0.76	0.82	0.91	0.05

values of their cross-loadings were significantly less than the loadings on their principal factor. The total number of items was reduced from 51 to 32 after removing the items that had cross-loadings.

Confirmatory factor analysis   To assess the goodness of fit of the factor structure, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed. EFA is used to explore data to determine the number or nature of factors that account for the covariance between variables when the data do not have sufficient evidence to form an a priori hypothesis. On the other hand, CFA is a theory-testing method, and the researcher specifies which item will be correlated with which factors. In addition, CFA offers the researcher a more viable method for evaluating construct validity (Williams et al., 2003).

AMOS 4 was used to assess the quality of the factor structure by statistically testing the significance of the overall model. The purpose of the analysis was to assess the goodness-of-fit of rival models: a nine-factor model, and the second-order model with six factors. The goodness-of-fit statistics are given in Table 1.

The first model that was tested contained nine factors. It was based on the factor structure that had emerged after the first factor analysis, which was done with 51 items. Problematic items that did not load clearly on any one factor were deleted from the CFA model. Forty items remained after this screening. As is evident from Table 1, the model statistics showed a poor fit and not all the fit indexes met the minimum required standards.

The second model that was tested had six factors with 32 items. The GFI was .85 and the AGFI was .80. There were certain modifications suggested in the AMOS output file and accordingly five items were deleted from the model. After the five items were deleted, the GFI came up to an acceptable level of .90, and the AGFI came up to .88, while the RMSEA obtained was .04 (a model is considered a good fit if the CFI is .90 or higher). Among all the fit statistics presented, CFI is the index that best accounts for parsimony without over-penalizing models that test more paths (Bentler, 1990). Thus model 2 with six factors and 27 items was considered the best-fit model. The six factors were: performance-oriented and humane; open and nurturing; sensitive and conscientious; personal touch; conviction in self; non-traditional. These factors formed the basis of all subsequent analysis. The correlations between the six factors ranged from .50 to .75. A composite score of Indian Transformational Leadership (ITL) was computed by taking the mean of all 27 items (α = .95). Table 2 includes the 27 items with their factor loadings from the exploratory factor analysis.

Scale Validation (Study 3)

Data for the third phase were collected from one of the most profitable multinational banks operating in India. About 95% of the managers from one regional office participated in the study. The data were collected from pairs of managers and subordinates. Only those managers who had work experience of at least one year were included in the study. In addition, only those subordinates who had spent at least six months with their

Table 2 Indian transformational leadership items with factor loadings

Items	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Performance-oriented and humane (α = .71)						
Is hardworking and enthusiastic about the assignments	*.67*	.15	.28	.07	.25	.22
Is extremely fast in his/her daily work	*.61*	.14	.30	.05	.26	.12
Remembers a person's name even if he/she meets them for a short time	*.56*	.15	.06	.28	.09	.04
Asks for regular updates and makes sure things are on track	*.52*	.26	.28	.08	.22	.01
Is both tough and polite with me	*.45*	.19	.11	.17	.05	.05
2. Openness and nurturing (α = .86)						
Is open to criticisms on self	.14	*.64*	.19	.17	.25	.15
Encourages me to solve problems independently	.21	*.55*	.33	.01	.25	.17
Tries to help me improve on my shortcomings	.38	*.52*	.18	.19	.25	.02
Gives credit to the one who deserves or performs	.33	*.50*	.28	.28	.20	−.05
Is sensitive to my personal needs	.15	*.50*	.21	.41	.21	.14
Shows tremendous amount of faith in the ability of the subordinates	.32	*.49*	.38	.30	.06	.01
3. Sensitive and conscientious (α = .82)						
Is punctual	.36	.07	*.65*	.12	.06	−.07
Works with a smile	.12	.31	*.50*	.23	.25	.20
Listens to me with patience	.23	.38	*.49*	.32	.17	−.07
Makes every member feel that he/she is an important member of the unit	.25	.26	*.47*	.22	.14	.18
4. Personal touch (α = .82)						
Ensures that I get all possible support so that I can pursue other interests of life	.20	.21	.10	*.65*	.14	.18
Makes relationships with the subordinates that extend beyond the boundaries of workplace	.19	.25	.38	*.50*	.16	−.05
Shows the bigger picture and how it is related to our tasks	.26	.11	.35	*.46*	.26	−.19
Guides me smilingly even during adverse circumstances	.31	.33	.28	*.44*	.16	.08
5. Conviction in self (α = .82)						
Plans in advance for the worst possible outcomes	.17	.23	.03	.16	*.68*	.08
Is clear in his/her thoughts and actions	.36	.06	.25	.11	*.66*	.03
Is the epitome of confidence, whatever the situation	.32	.22	.26	.35	*.50*	−.10
Is persistent in achieving the targets	.35	.24	.35	.07	*.46*	.13
Has the courage to take bold decisions and stick to them	.31	.22	.30	.12	*.42*	.27
6. Non-traditional (α = .62)						
Makes me question the assumptions I make, for even the simplest of things	.18	.16	.00	.16	.01	*.73*
Respects processes and systems but does not consider them as unbendable when interest of the organization is at stake	.17	.16	.34	.28	.13	*.49*
Influences me not to be selfish, but to think about others' discomfort	.22	.08	.22	.20	.22	*.33*

manager and were working directly under him or her, were included in the study. If more than one subordinate fulfilled this criterion, then the one with the longest duration of working with the manager was included in the study. Management buy-in was ensured before the start of this study, and the human resource manager of the regional office sent a personal request to the employees seeking their cooperation. Respondents were briefly informed of the purpose of the study – their participation was voluntary, and they were assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire was collected by the researcher personally.

The final sample consisted of 101 manager–subordinate dyads, which was the usable sample after removing those where only the manager had responded, or vice versa. The mean age of managers in this stage was 27.48 years, and that of the subordinates was 31.09 years. The managers had a mean of 5.45 years of experience, while the subordinates had worked for an average of 8.26 years. Average time spent with the manager was 1.38 years. Sixty-four percent of the subordinates were males, while the percentage of males in the managerial sample was 53.5%. Among the managers, 56.4% were graduates, 8.9% were postgraduates, and the rest of them had not yet completed their graduate studies.

Instruments used   In addition to the 27-item ITL scale developed in Study 2, the questionnaire for this stage included the same measures of transformational leadership, laissez-faire, satisfaction with the leader, extra effort by the subordinate, and perception of the leader's effectiveness, that were included in Study 2. Subordinates were asked to answer the questionnaire by rating the frequency with which the manager displayed the behaviors listed.

The performance of the subordinate was captured through three measures. First, the actual measure of performance rating (given during the annual performance appraisal) of the subordinate was included. The performance appraisal had just finished before the data collection for this study was done. This was a single item measure. The second measure of performance was contextual performance, which was captured using 16 items. A sample item was: 'Support and encourage a co-worker who is having a problem.' The mean of the 16 items was taken to compute this measure. The third measure captured task performance, which was assessed through three items. A sample item was: 'Performs at a low/average/high level compared with others of the same rank.' The mean of the three items was taken to compute the dimension. Both contextual and task performance were assessed through the scale developed by Motowidlo and van Scotter (1994). Managers were asked to rate the subordinate on the two scales. Contextual performance was assessed through a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'not at all likely' (1) to 'extremely likely' (5), while task performance was assessed through a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7.

Convergent validity   Convergent validity of new scales can be tested by examining correlations with existing measures of the same construct (DeVellis, 1991). Thus we expected that the ITL scale would be positively correlated with MLQ-TL (Bass and Avolio, 1995). This expectation was confirmed by a correlation of .89 between ITL and MLQ-TL. Table 3 gives the correlations, means, standard deviations, and reliability statistics for all the measures. MLQ-TL was also significantly positively correlated to each of the six factors of ITL.

Discriminant validity   Discriminant validity can be established by checking if the newly developed measure correlates negatively with variables that it is expected to correlate negatively with (Hinkin, 1995; Ironson et al., 1989). This validity was

Table 3 Means, standard deviations, and correlations of all variables

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Indian TL	2.75	.67	(.95)								
2. MLQ-TL	2.65	.71	.89***	(.94)							
3. Laissez-faire	1.3	1.02	-.42***	-.39***	(.67)						
4. Effectiveness	2.78	.87	.83***	.84***	-.41***	(.87)					
5. Extra effort	2.74	.86	.76***	.76***	-.30***	.77***	(.86)				
6. Satisfaction	2.78	.91	.80***	.76***	-.42***	.80***	.70***	(.84)			
7. Subordinate ratings	3.63	.73	.18†	0.13	-.17†	0.10	0.04	0.12	NA		
8. Contextual performance	4.02	.61	.45***	.41***	-0.14	.43***	.33***	.36***	0.10	(.91)	
9. Task performance	5.37	.99	.38***	.27**	-0.13	.37***	.27**	.27**	.19†	.65***	(.82)

Notes: Alphas are in parentheses along the diagonal. † = $p < .10$, * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$.
TL = Transformational leadership; MLQ-TL = TL subscale of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

established when the ITL scale correlated significantly negatively with the laissez-faire leadership scale. ITL continued to be significantly negatively correlated with laissez-faire leadership ($r = −.18$, $p < .01$) even after controlling for MLQ-TL. Each of the six factors of ITL was also correlated significantly and negatively with laissez-faire leadership. Thus the discriminant validity of the ITL scale was established.

Criterion-related validity   Another way to assess the validity of a new scale is to test its ability to predict the variables it is expected to predict (Hinkin, 1995; Ironson et al., 1989). Thus we tested the correlation between ITL and satisfaction with work, extra effort, and effectiveness. These three scales are part of the MLQ. As expected, high correlations between ITL and the three criterion variables emerged, all of which were significant at a .001 level. ITL continued to be positively correlated with all the three outcomes (.34 for effectiveness, .29 for extra effort, and .45 for satisfaction; $p < .001$ for all the three) even after controlling for MLQ-TL. Each of the six factors of ITL was also correlated positively with each of the three outcomes.

Three measures of subordinate performance were used to test for predictive validity. As can be seen in Table 3, ITL was positively correlated with contextual performance and task performance, but not with the organizational performance rating. Each of the six factors of ITL was also positively correlated with contextual performance and task performance. The organizational performance rating was positively correlated only with the 'personal touch' factor of ITL.

Comparisons between ITL and MLQ-TL
Although these results indicate the validity of the ITL scale, it is essential to see how it compares with the existing scales of transformational leadership. In order to test for the incremental explanatory power of the new ITL scale over MLQ-TL in the Indian

Table 4   Regression results for testing the predictive validity of ITL

DV	Method	IV	β	R^2	t	F
SR	Enter	ITL	.20	.03	1.79†	3.19†
CP	Enter	ITL	.37	.21	2.16*	12.67***
		MLQ-TL	.06		.37	
	Forward	ITL	.43	.20	5.04***	25.40***
TP	Enter	ITL	.86	.15	2.95**	8.71***
		MLQ-TL	−.30		−1.11	
	Forward	ITL	.58	.14	4.02**	16.14***

Notes: † = *p* < .10, * = *p* < 0.05, ** = *p* < 0.01, *** = *p* < 0.001.
ITL = Indian transformational leadership; MLQ-TL = Transformational leadership subscale of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; TP = task performance; CP = contextual performance; SR = subordinate ratings; IV = independent variable; DV = dependent variable

situation, a series of regression tests were conducted. The results are given in Table 4. Since the correlation between MLQ-TL and the organizational performance rating was not significant, a regression analysis was done with only ITL as the predictor variable and actual performance ratings as the dependent variable. The model attained significance at a .10 level.

Coming to the second measure of contextual performance, a regression analysis was done with ITL and MLQ-TL as the independent variables and contextual performance as the dependent variable. The results showed that MLQ-TL did not significantly predict contextual performance while ITL was present in the model. The findings were further corroborated by running another regression with the forward option. The results showed that ITL entered the model in the first step and MLQ-TL did not enter the model at all once ITL was included. We then did a regression analysis using the forward option with MLQ-TL and the six factors of ITL as independent variables. The ITL factor 'personal touch' was the best predictor of contextual performance; it entered the model in Step 1 and explained

22% of the variance. None of the other variables could explain the significant additional variance in contextual performance and hence none of them entered the model in subsequent steps.

A similar analysis was conducted with task performance as the dependent variable and ITL and MLQ-TL as two independent variables. MLQ-TL did not explain significant variance while ITL was present in the model. In the next analysis, the forward option was used in the regression analysis. ITL entered the model in the first step and the whole model attained significance at a .001 level. MLQ-TL did not enter the model at all once ITL was included. We then did a regression analysis using the forward option with MLQ-TL and the six factors of ITL as independent variables. The ITL factor 'sensitive and conscientious' was the best predictor of task performance; it entered the model in Step 1 and explained 17% of the variance. None of the other variables could explain the significant additional variance in task performance and hence none of them entered the model in subsequent steps. These findings together show that ITL explained outcomes over and above that of MLQ-TL, and

that MLQ-TL did not explain any further significant variance when ITL was present in the model.

Discussion

The development of a scale to measure transformational leadership in India is a major contribution of this article. The procedure for developing the scale was similar to the procedure used by Bass (1985), and the ITL scale could serve as a replacement for the MLQ-TL in India. Robustness of the ITL scale was further established through discriminant and convergent validity tests. The sub-dimensions that emerged after the EFA and CFA provided empirical evidence for the arguments made by Singh (2003). It showed that while some of the factors were similar to the MLQ-TL (non-traditional), some others were culture specific (personal touch).

Earlier studies on transformational leadership also found weaker effects on performance when objective measures were used rather than perceptual measures. In this study also, neither the composite ITL nor MLQ-TL were related to the organizational performance rating. This is also possibly because the subordinate ratings in the organization surveyed are arrived at through a normalization process; they are not very reflective of what the leader truly wishes to assign to the subordinate, but could be the outcome of a political process.

A detailed discussion on the factors of ITL is warranted at this point. The first factor ('performance-oriented and humane') highlights the attitudes that managers have in approaching their tasks. Items such as 'Is hardworking and enthusiastic about the assignments' show that perhaps the manager's focused dedication to his or her work at hand inspires the subordinates to do the same. This factor also highlights the approach used by the manager towards others' tasks. Items such as 'Is both tough and polite with me' and 'Asks for regular updates' indicate that

the manager is expected to guide and preside over the groups' task. Complete delegation of task, with no monitoring at all, would perhaps lead to the laissez-faire style of leadership (Bass and Avolio, 1985). This factor is also not the same as the task dimension of the nurturant-task (NT) model proposed by Sinha (1995). The main difference lies in the assumption of exchange that was built into the model by Sinha. He argued that the manager was benevolent and nurturant towards the subordinate only when the subordinate performed in accordance with the job requirements (pp. 104–19). The focus in the NT model was on the exchange-based supervision of the subordinate's task, while in the ITL questionnaire the focus lies on completion of the task by the subordinate, as well as performing the leader's own tasks.

The second factor ('openness and nurturing') indicates that transformational leadership involves trusting the subordinates and encouraging them to work independently. Indicative items such as 'Encourages me to solve problems independently' and 'Shows a tremendous amount of faith in the ability of the subordinates' show that subordinates expect their managers to empower them. Singh and Bhandarker (1990) presented some patterns of transformational leadership styles in Indian firms and showed that such leaders had an empowering attitude towards their followers.

The third factor ('sensitive and conscientious') includes items such as 'Is punctual' and 'Listens to me with patience'. These items indicate a high degree of sincerity and seriousness of the manager towards others. This aspect has been highlighted by several studies on leadership, and is probably a cross cultural phenomenon (Dayal, 1999). The ITL factor 'sensitive and conscientious' was the best predictor of task performance in this study.

The fourth factor ('personal touch') has been reported by many studies on Indian managers. Indians are said to be high on

need for personalized relationships (Kakar et al., 2002; Sinha, 2000: 19). This factor, although similar to the individualized consideration factor of Bass (1985), has a unique flavor in the ITL scale. As postulated by Sinha (2000: 27), this factor shows that transformational leadership in India involves the manager taking an interest in the whole person; that is, in both personal as well as official aspects of the subordinate's life. Personal touch is the only factor of ITL that is related to the organizational performance rating and it is the best predictor of contextual performance.

The fifth factor ('conviction in self') includes items such as 'Is clear in his/her thoughts and actions' and 'Has the courage to take bold decisions and stick to them.' This factor indicates self-confidence of the manager as well as confidence of the manager in the vision he or she is promoting. This is a universal dimension and has been highlighted in many studies in India (Kanungo and Misra, 2004). This is probably where the role-modeling effect of the leader also comes into play.

The sixth factor ('non-traditional') highlights openness to change of the managers. They are not just open to new ideas and ways of doing things; they also help their subordinates adopt such strategies. This factor also includes an item wherein the manager is appreciated for being open to reinterpreting organizational rules and regulations for the sake of a noble objective. Pillai et al. (2003) have highlighted this in their cross cultural study; they showed that Indian managers preferred distributive rather than procedural justice in organizational contexts. This factor comes close to the model suggested by Khandwalla (1988), in which leaders encourage followers to break away from past practices, the status quo, and socially determined hang-ups.

Implications

The existing literature shows that transformational leadership has some universal elements, and also some culture-specific dimensions. Although the basic concept of transformational leadership remains the same everywhere, its behavioral manifestations in different cultures could vary. Transformational leaders shift the motives, needs, values, and goals of followers in various ways. This study adds to the existing body of knowledge on cross cultural management by identifying exactly how transformational leadership is operationalized in the Indian context. There are unique dimensions in operationalizing transformational leadership in nations like India that have unique cultures. Therefore, the new scale that emerged from this study will help in measuring transformational leadership in India more effectively.

This study helped create a set of behavioral indicators of transformational leadership in the Indian context. Managers who are interested in transforming their followers should try to enhance the frequency of these behaviors. Burns (1978) claimed that the crux of transformational leadership is addressing the real needs of followers. Being sensitive to followers will help in understanding their real needs. Exhibiting personal touch and being nurturing are unique behaviors for the Indian context that will enhance transformational leadership. Transformational leaders serve as role models for their followers. When followers see their leader being conscientious, they are also likely to become devoted and hence perform beyond expectations. Transformational leadership can be enhanced by managers exhibiting the behaviors that emerged in this study.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The new scale for Indian transformational leadership (ITL) was developed based on a sample of executives with a good under-

standing of English. Translating the scale into other languages in India and validating the scale would help in increasing its generalizability and utility. The items in the scale could be refined and made more precise, thereby increasing its reliability. Some additional items could also be added to the ITL scale to see if the factor structure remains the same. Going into the conceptual background, formulating specific hypotheses relating each of the ITL factors to different outcomes, and then testing those hypotheses could be a significant step forward.

Conclusion

The three-stage study involving different sets of managers, along with data collected from many sources, are some of the major strengths of the current study. This article builds a case for studying the influence of national culture in organizations and shows how culture influences the manifestation of transformational leadership. It shows that the many unique features of a culture do not allow a dynamic social process such as leadership to be captured by just one universal description. The foregoing discussion underscores some of the findings from earlier studies on leadership, and brings out new dimensions. Transformational leadership encompasses role modeling, handling of personal relationships with subordinates, duty orientation of the manager, critical thinking, and so on. The findings also underscore the importance of further refinement of the scale, through studies done across different samples and using different methods. The study also highlights that the model of transformational leadership in the Indian context consists of some aspects that are unique to India and some aspects that are universal. It supports the argument of Bass (1985) that there is scope for contingency analysis to assess the effects of culture on the operationalization of transformational leadership. With further studies providing additional support, our understanding of the cross cultural aspects of transformational leadership would be strengthened.

References

Alimo-Metcalfe, B. and Alban-Metcalfe, R.J. (2001) 'The Development of a New Transformational Leadership Questionnaire', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 74: 1–27.

Ardichvili, A. and Gasparishvili, A. (2001) 'Leadership Profiles of Managers in Post-communist Countries: A Comparative Study', *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 22(2): 62–91.

Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M. and Jung, D. (1999) 'Reexamining the Components of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 7: 441–62.

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

Bass, B.M. (1997) 'Does the Transactional–Transformational Leadership Paradigm Transcend Organizational and National Boundaries?', *American Psychologist* 52(2): 130–9.

Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1995) *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B.M. and Steidlmeier, P. (1999) 'Ethics, Character, and Authentic Transformational Leadership Behavior', *Leadership Quarterly* 10(2): 181–217.

Bentler, P.M. (1990) 'Comparative Fit Indexes in Structural Models', *Psychological Bulletin* 107: 238–46.

Beyer, J.M. (1999) 'Taming and Promoting Charisma to Change Organizations', *Leadership Quarterly* 10(2): 307–30.

Boyacigiller, N. and Adler, N.J. (1991) 'The Parochial Dinosaur: The Organizational Sciences in a Global Context', *Academy of Management Review* 16(2): 262–91.

Budhwar, P. (2001) 'Doing Business in India', *Thunderbird International Business Review* 43(4): 549–68.

Budhwar, P. and Boyne, G. (2004) 'Human Resource Management in the Indian Public and Private Sectors: An Empirical Comparison', *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 15(2): 346–70.

Budhwar, P.S. and Debrah, Y. (2001) 'Rethinking Comparative and Cross-national

Human Resource Management Research', *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 12(3): 497–515.

Budhwar, P.S. and Sparrow, P.R. (2002) 'Strategic HRM through the Cultural Looking Glass: Mapping the Cognition of British and Indian Managers', *Organization Studies* 23(4): 599–638.

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

Carless, S.A. (1998) 'Assessing the Discriminant Validity of Transformational Leader Behavior as Measured by the MLQ', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 71: 353–8.

Conger, J.A. (1999) 'Charismatic and Transformational Leadership in Organizations: An Insider's Perspective on these Developing Streams of Research', *Leadership Quarterly* 10(2): 145–79.

Conger, J.A. and Kanungo, R.N. (1998) *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dayal, I. (1999) *Can Organizations Develop Leaders: A Study of Effective Leaders*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications.

Den Hartog, D.N., van Muijen, J.J. and Koopman, P.L. (1997) 'Transactional versus Transformational Leadership: An Analysis of the MLQ', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 70: 19–34.

DeVellis, R.F. (1991) *Scale Development*. New Delhi: Sage.

Dickson, M.W., Den Hartog, D.N. and Mitchelson, J.N. (2003) 'Research on Leadership in a Cross-cultural Context: Making Progress, and Raising New Questions', *The Leadership Quarterly* 14: 729–68.

Dumdum, U.R., Lowe, K.B. and Avolio, B.J. (2002) 'A Meta-analysis of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction: An Update and Extension', in B.J. Avolio and F.J. Yammarino (eds) *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead*, pp. 35–66. Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Earley, P.C. and Erez, M. (1997) 'Introduction', in P.C. Earley and M. Erez (eds) *New Perspectives on International Industrial/Organizational Psychology*, pp. 1–9. San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.

Egan, T.M. (2002) 'Grounded Theory Research and Theory Building', *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 4(3): 277–95.

Gupta, R.K. (2002) *Towards the Optimal Organization: Integrating Indian Culture and Management*. New Delhi: Excel Books.

Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R. and Black, W. (1998) *Multivariate Data: An Analysis*, 5th edn. Englewood Cliffs, NJ. Prentice Hall.

Hinkin, T.R. (1995) 'A Review of Scale Development Practices in the Study of Organizations', *Journal of Management* 21(5): 967–88.

Hofstede, G. (2001) *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations across Cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

House, R.J., Wright, N.S. and Aditya, R.N. (1997) 'Cross-cultural Research on Organizational Leadership: A Critical Analysis and Proposed Theory', in P.C. Earley and M. Erez (eds) *New Perspectives on International Industrial/Organizational Psychology*, pp. 535–625. San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.

Hunt, J.G. and Conger, J.A. (1999) 'From Where We Sit: An Assessment of Transformational and Charismatic Leadership Research', *Leadership Quarterly* 10(3): 335–43.

Hunt, J.G. and Peterson, M.F. (1997) 'Two Scholars' Views of Some Nooks and Crannies in Cross-cultural Leadership', *Leadership Quarterly* 8(4): 343–54.

Hwang, A., Khatri, N. and Srinivas, E.S. (2005) 'Organizational Charisma and Vision across Three Countries', *Management Decision* 43(7/8): 960–74.

Ironson, G.H., Barnnick, M.T., Smith, P.C., Gibson, W.M. and Paul, K.B. (1989) 'Construction of a Job in General Scale: A Comparison of Global, Composite, and Specific Measures', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 74: 193–200.

Jaeger, A.M. (1990) 'The Applicability of Western Management Techniques in Developing Countries: A Cultural Perspective', in A.M. Jaeger and R.N. Kanungo (eds) *Management in Developing Countries*, pp. 131–45. New York: Routledge.

Kakar, S., Kakar, S., Kets de Vries, M.F.R. and Vrignaud, P. (2002) 'Leadership in Indian Organizations from a Comparative Perspective', *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 2(2): 239–50.

Kanungo, R.N. and Jaeger, A.M. (1990) 'Introduction: The Need for Indigenous Management in Developing Counties', in A.M. Jaeger and R.N. Kanungo (eds) *Management in Developing Countries*, pp. 1–19. London: Routledge.

Kanungo, R.N. and Misra, S. (2004)

'Motivation, Leadership, and Human Performance', in J. Pandey (ed.) *Psychology in India Revisited: Developments in the Discipline*, Vol. 3, pp. 309–41. New Delhi: Sage.

Kejriwal, A. and Krishnan, V.R. (2004) 'Impact of Vedic Worldview and Gunas on Transformational Leadership', *Vikalpa* 29(1): 29–40.

Khandwalla, P.N. (1988) 'Organizational Effectiveness', in J. Pandey (ed.) *Psychology in India: The State-of-the-Art*, Vol. 3, pp. 97–216. New Delhi: Sage.

Khandwalla, P.N. (1990) 'Strategic Developmental Organizations: Some Behavioral Properties', in A.M. Jaeger and R.N. Kanungo (eds) *Management in Developing Countries*, pp. 275–86. New York: Routledge.

Khatri, N. (2005) 'An Alternative Model of Transformational Leadership', *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective* 9(2): 19–26.

Khatri, N., Ng, H.A. and Lee, T.H. (2001) 'The Distinction between Charisma and Vision: An Empirical Study', *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* 18(3): 373–93.

Kouzes, J. and Posner, B. (2002) *The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Corporations*, 3rd edn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Motowidlo, S.J. and van Scotter, J.R. (1994) 'Evidence that Task Performance Should Be Distinguished from Contextual Performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79(4): 475–80.

Parry, K.W. (1998) 'Grounded Theory and Social Process: A New Direction for Leadership Research', *The Leadership Quarterly* 9(1): 85–105.

Pillai, R., Scandura, T.A. and Williams, E.A. (1999) 'Leadership and Organizational Justice: Similarities and Differences across Cultures', *Journal of International Business Studies* 30(4): 763–79.

Pillai, R., Williams, E.A., Lowe, K.B. and Jung, D.I. (2003) 'Personality, Transformational Leadership, Trust, and the 2000 U.S. Presidential Vote', *Leadership Quarterly* 14(2): 161–92.

Robert, C., Probst, T.M., Martocchio, J.J., Drasgow, F. and Lawler, J.J. (2000) 'Empowerment and Continuous Improvement in the United States, Mexico, Poland, and India: Predicting Fit on the Basis of the Dimensions of Power Distance and Individualism', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 85(5): 643–58.

Singh, N. (2003) 'Etics and Emics of Transformational Leadership: An Indian Perspective', paper presented at 17th ANZAM Conference, Fremantle, W. Australia.

Singh, P. and Bhandarker, A. (1990) *Corporate Success and Transformational Leadership*. New Delhi: Wiley Eastern.

Sinha, J.B.P. (1995) *The Cultural Context of Leadership and Power*. New Delhi: Sage.

Sinha, J.B.P. (2000) *Patterns of Work Culture. Cases and Strategies for Culture Building*. New Delhi: Sage.

Smith, P.B. and Peterson, M.F. (2002) 'Cross-cultural Leadership', in M.J. Gannon and L.K. Newman (eds) *The Blackwell Handbook of Cross-cultural Management*, pp. 217–35. Oxford: Blackwell.

Triandis, H.C. (2002) 'Generic Individualism and Collectivism', in M.J. Gannon and L.K. Newman (eds) *The Blackwell Handbook of Cross-cultural Management*, pp. 16–45. Oxford: Blackwell.

Williams, L.J., Edwards, J.R. and Vandenberg, R.J. (2003) 'Recent Advances in Causal Modeling Methods for Organizational and Management Research', *Journal of Management* 29(6): 903–36.

Yammarino, F.J., Spangler, W.D. and Dubinsky, A.J. (1998) 'Transformational and Contingent Reward Leadership: Individual, Dyad, and Group Levels of Analysis', *Leadership Quarterly* 9(1): 27–54.

Yukl, G. (1999) 'An Evaluation of Conceptual Weaknesses in Transformational and Charismatic Leadership Theories', *Leadership Quarterly* 10(2): 285–305.

NITI SINGH is with the Gallup Organization, Mumbai, India.

VENKAT R. KRISHNAN is Professor of Organizational Behavior at the Great Lakes Institute of Management, 24 South Mada Street, Srinagar Colony, Saidapet, Chennai – 600015, India.
[email: mail@rkvenkat.com]

Please address correspondence to Venkat Krishnan.

Résumé

Leadership transformationnel en Inde: Développer et valider une nouvelle échelle en se servant de la Grounded Theory (Niti Singh et Venkat R. Krishnan)

Dans cet article nous faisons le compte rendu de trois études que nous avons menées et qui utilisent diverses méthodes pour mettre au point un système permettant de mesurer le leadership transformationnel en Inde. Nous avons observé la théorie ancrée afin de générer la banque d'items initiale (n=250). Dans la seconde étude (n=379), nous avons fait une analyse factorielle explicatoire suivie d'une analyse factorielle confirmatoire, ce qui nous a permis de créer un modèle à six facteurs. Ces derniers montrent un soutien pour les dimensions culturelles universelles et uniques. Dans la troisième étude (n=202; 101 dyades managers-subordonnés), nous avons testé et trouvé un soutien pour les propriétés psychométriques de la nouvelle échelle, y compris une validité incrémentale, discriminatoire, convergente et prédictive. La nouvelle échelle permet d'expliquer les plus significatifs des écarts qui sortent du cadre de la variance qu'explique l'échelle existante de mesure du leadership transformationnel.

摘要

印度的转型领导：利用扎根理论的方法开发并验证一个新量表

Niti Singh et Venkat R. Krishnan

本文报告了三项研究，它们综合了许多方法来开发一个用来测量印度的转型领导的标准。我们根据扎根理论的方法产生了最初的项目组(n=250)。在第二项研究中(n=379)，我们先进行了探索性因子分析，之后又进行了证实性因子分析，结果产生了一个六因素模型。这些因素既支持独特的文化维度也支持普遍的文化维度。在第三项研究中(n=202；101对管理者和下属)，我们检验并发现了对新量表的可靠心理测量特性的支持，其中包括渐进的，判别的，收敛的和预测的效度。新量表不仅能解释已由现存的用来测量转型领导的量表解释了的变量，而且还能解释除此之外的显著变量。