

7-1-2016

Personality and transformational leadership: A review

Saima Ghazal
University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

Arooj Arshad
University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

Fatima Kamran University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.iba.edu.pk/businessreview>



Part of the **Economics Commons**



This work is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License**.

iRepository Citation

Ghazal, S., Arshad, A., & Kamran, F. (2016). Personality and transformational leadership: A review. *Business Review*, 11(2), 41-52. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.54784/1990-6587.1067>

This article is brought to you by *iRepository* for open access under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License** and is available at <https://ir.iba.edu.pk/businessreview/vol11/iss2/4>. For more information, please contact irepository@iba.edu.pk.

ARTICLE

Personality and Transformational Leadership: A Review

Saima Ghazal

University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

Arooj Arshad

University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

Fatima Kamran

University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan

Abstract

A review of the literature shows that extroversion is the strongest and most consistent positive predictor of transformational leadership. Furthermore, such leadership is shown to predict team performance, subordinate's individual performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Key Words: Personality, transformational leadership, performance

Introduction

With the changing work environment, the role of leadership is becoming more important for organizations to be successful. Transformational leadership especially is said to be more effective among leadership theories (Judge & Bono, 2000), it has been the research focus since last two decades. Transformational leaders motivate their followers to reach their maximum potential, set more challenging expectations and achieve higher performances (Bass, 1998). Because transformational leadership is so important for individual and organizational success, many researchers have tried to determine the dispositional basis of transformational leadership and found that Personality traits are helpful in predicting transformational leadership (Bono & Judge, 2004; Judge, Bono, Ilis, & Gerhardt, 2002; Lim & Ployhart, 2004; Ross & Offermann, 1997). This paper reviews the literature on transformational leadership with the following sections a) to define what transformational leadership is, how it is different from transactional leadership b) why and which personality traits and attributes predict transformational leadership and c) how transformational leadership is related to the positive individual and organizational outcomes.

Transformational Vs Transactional Leadership

Transformational leadership is among the most prevalent approaches in understanding effectiveness of leadership. Leader who appeals to the moral values of followers, transform their goals into organizational goals and mobilize their energy and resources to reform organizations, are said to be transformational leaders (Burn, 1978). Inspired by the work of Burns, Bass (1985) proposed his own theory of transformational leadership defining the concept as a leader's ability to push followers beyond their immediate self-interests. Bass (1985) proposed four components of transformational leadership: 1) Idealized influence where leader exhibits abilities like sense of purpose, goal, and determination, and a confidence in actions of the group. He ensures the success of the group and gives followers a sense of empowerment and ownership. 2) Inspirational Motivation refers to a leader's ability to motivate and clearly communicate his vision to the followers. A leader who provides such motivation displays enthusiasm, optimism, and commitment to goals. 3) Intellectual Stimulation refers to a leader's ability to stimulate and push his

followers to discuss and question all the policies, challenge the status quo, critically evaluate problems from new perspectives, and develop new approaches to problem solving. 4) Individualized Consideration focuses on a leader's ability where leader exhibits genuine concern for the needs of the followers. His focus is on the follower development by providing support, encouragement, and coaching (Bass, 1998).

The four components are highly correlated while measured by Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass, 1985). Most research (Judge & Bono, 2000; Lim & Ployhart, 2004; Ross & Offerman, 1997) used a composite of transformational leadership. Moreover, since Idealized influence and Inspirational motivation are highly correlated, they are often combined together into one factor called charisma. Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1999) have suggested a good-fit model for transformational leadership using confirmatory factor analysis. Their analysis included three factors: individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational-idealized influence (charisma). Charisma is the largest component of variance explained in transformational leadership (Bass, 1999).

On the other hand, transactional leadership refers to the exchange relationship between leaders and followers seeking to meet their own self-interests. Transactional leadership (Bass, 1985) is aimed at monitoring, controlling, and motivating the followers through economic incentives. Bass (1985) also proposed four components of transactional leadership. First component is Contingent reward, by which a leader provides valued resources in exchange for a follower's efforts and performance. This is the most effective type of transactional leadership; however, it is not as effective as transformational leadership behaviors in motivating followers to perform better. Management by Exception (active) involves monitoring performance and taking corrective action when necessary. This technique is effective in some situations, for example, those involving safety. Management by Exception (passive) involves monitoring with minimal intervention, here leader passively monitors, and intervenes only when problem become serious. Leaders sometimes practice passive management by exception when number of subordinates is large and directly reporting to the leader. Laissez-Faire Leadership, the fourth component of transactional leadership, can be thought of as non-leadership or avoidance of leadership. This non-leadership style avoids decisions, delays actions, and ignores responsibilities; thus, authority remains unused (Bass, 1998). Bass in the development of his theory combined Management by exception (passive) and Laissez-faire leadership into one component labeled Passive leadership, which correlates negatively with transformational leadership. Contingent reward dimension is the only dimension of transactional leadership that generally, correlates positively with transformational leadership and follower performance (Bass, 1998).

Burn (1978) has suggested that leaders could be either transformational or transactional, whereas Bass's theory of transformational leadership (1985) proposed that a leader could be both transformational and transactional, indicating that the two types do not represent opposite poles. Bass assumed on augmentation effect, that is, he assumed that transformational leadership adds to the effectiveness of transactional leadership. This assumption has been supported by some empirical studies (Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, as cited in Bass, 1998). Thus every leader displays a frequency of both the transformational and transactional characteristics, but each leader's profile involves more of one type and less of the other. Church and Waclawski (1998) found that those leaders who are more inventors and motivators are more often perceived as primarily transformational leaders, whereas coordinators or implementers are viewed as primarily transactional leaders. Both types of leadership are important to organizations, but the most effective leaders are more transformational than transactional (Bass, 1999).

Personality & Transformational Leadership

Bass (1998) proposed transformational leadership as a behavior theory. He suspected that transformational leadership behaviors can be learned, but that they may also be traceable to personality characteristics. Personality refers to individual differences in characteristics and traits that are relatively permanent (Scholts, 2005). The traits refer to persistent characteristics that are reflected in particular patterns of behavior under different situations. Personality is an important predictor of successful leadership (Conway, 2000). Studies have shown that personality traits that can predict leaders' success are related to transformational leadership (Kavnoy, 2000). Leadership and personality is an area of interest for researchers for past many decades (De hoogh, den hartog & koopman, 2005), but has gained more attention over last 20 years (Hayutala, 2005). Identifying the traits that are important for successful leadership is crucial. There are certain personality traits that are strongly related to and are predictors of transformational leadership (Ross and Offerman, 1997), and this is what this paper focuses on. The goal of this paper is to find out the most important personality traits that predict transformational leadership. This would help in defining a personality profile of a leader that is more transformational and more successful.

Transformational leadership and its relationship with personality was traced many years ago (De hoogh, den hartog & koopman, 2005). This has been area of interest for the researchers for past any years, and have gained more focus and attention within last 20 years (Hayutala, 2005). Personality is indeed an important factor in recognizing/predicting success of a leader (Conway, 2000). Similarly, Ross and Offerman (1997) declared that certain personality traits are related to transformational leadership. Recent studies also have shown that personality traits that can predict leaders' success are related to transformational leadership (Kavnoy, 2000).

Judge and Bono (2000) tried to link personality directly to transformational leadership to determine its dispositional basis; they found that transformational leadership behaviors are predictable based on personality traits, but the correlations were low to conclude that transformational theory is a trait theory. A meta-analysis (Judge et al., 2002) provided evidence that some personality traits are consistently associated with leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness. In an attempt to relate these findings to transformational leadership, Bono and Judge (2004) identified a relationship between personality traits and transformational leadership (Correlations however, were not high); leading them to conclude that transformational leadership has a dispositional basis, and personality traits are still important in predicting transformational leadership behaviors.

Researchers have grouped personality traits in various ways, but the five-factor model, commonly called "Big Five" has revolutionized the psychology of personality (Judge & Bono, 2000). The big five are broad personality constructs, each with a group of specific traits. Costa and McCare (1992) defined the traits associated with each factor, measured by NEO –PI-R, a most commonly used personality inventory. Factor 1, Extraversion, is a tendency to be outgoing, assertive, and active. The extravert seeks excitement and has positive emotions. The six facets of extraversion, as measured by NEO-PI-R, are warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement seeking, and positive emotions. Factor 2, Agreeableness, is a tendency to be kind, gentle, trusting, trustworthy, and warm. The six facets of agreeableness being measured by five factor model are, trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty, and tender-mindedness. The Individualized consideration dimension of transformational leadership is strongly linked with agreeableness; both focus on the subordinate's individual needs. Factor 3, Openness to experience, sometimes referred as intellectance, is characterized by traits such as appreciation for art, emotion, and adventure.

Its facets are fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, ideas, actions, and values. Factor 4, Conscientiousness, is indicated by two major components: achievement and dependability; specific facets are competence, order, dutifulness, achievement striving, and self-discipline. Conscientious people are perceived as achievement oriented and reliable. Factor 5, Neuroticism, is defined as emotional instability. A person high on neuroticism may experience unpleasant emotions easily and exhibit the traits such as anxiety, angry hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness, and vulnerability.

Using the five-factor model of personality, agreeableness (Judge & Bono, 2000; Lim & Ployhart, 2004; Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005), and extraversion (Bono & Judge, 2004; Judge & Bono, 2000; Judge et al., 2002; Lim & Ployhart, 2004) were found to be most significantly related to transformational leadership. Researchers who used personality measurement tools other than the five-factor model have also found significant relationships between personality traits and transformational leadership (Eeden, Cilliers, & Deventer, 2003; Hautala, 2006; Ross & Offerman, 1997).

Judge, et al. (2002) in their meta-analysis found that extraversion was the strongest and most consistent correlate of leadership. This factor was more strongly related to leader emergence than leader effectiveness, indicating that social and dominant people tend to assert themselves in group situations. Bono and Judge (2004) found that extraversion was most positively linked to charisma dimension of transformational leadership, but it was also positively related to intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and transformational leadership overall. Similarly, Lim & Ployhart (2004) found extraversion to be a significant predictor of transformational leadership. Even collective extraversion (taking the personality at collective level) has been significantly positively related to transformational leadership (Hofmann & Jones, 2005). Shao and Webber (2006) on the other hand, found a negative relationship between extraversion and transformational leadership. Rubin, Munz, & Bommer (2005) did not find extraversion as significant predictor of transformational leadership, but they found it played a significant role in moderating the relationship between emotion recognition and transformational leadership behaviors. Overall, however, extraversion tended to be the strongest and most consistent correlate of transformational leadership (Judge et al., 2002) among the three groups (business leaders, military/government leaders, and students), and based on either of two criteria (emergence and effectiveness). An overall analysis of all studies combined also indicates the significance of extraversion when controlling for the big five traits (See Table 1).

Other research has highlighted and found important links between agreeableness and transformational leadership too. Rubin et al. (2005) found agreeableness as the only significant predictor of transformational leadership as compared to other personality traits/factors, emphasizing that trustworthy, compassionate, and empathetic leaders are viewed more positively as transformational leaders. Judge and Bono (2000) also found agreeableness as most significant predictor of transformational leadership. Judge et al. (2002) also found relationship between agreeableness and transformational leadership, however, the relationship was weak. Bono and Judge (2004) found no significant predictive relationship between agreeableness and transformational leadership, but they did find agreeableness as a strong predictor for contingent reward (a dimension for transactional leadership). Lim & Ployhart (2004) found a negative relationship between agreeableness and transformational leadership, which might arise because agreeable individuals tend to be more passive and compliant, making them less likely to emerge as leaders. Their results may have been affected by the military sample, among whom more agreeable leaders were rated by their followers as less transformational. The varying results on this dimension of five-factor model, indicates that agreeableness might not be a consistent predictor of transformational leadership. Or

maybe the differences in results using the same measures can be contributed to the nature of the sample, as Judge et al. (2002) found that agreeableness was more closely related to leadership when the criterion was effectiveness and when the sample was composed of students rather than business or government leaders.

On the most part, research does not support the relationship of openness to experience in predicting transformational leadership (Lim & Ployhart, 2004; Shao & Webber, 2006), a few studies however, contradict the general findings (Bono & Judge, 2004; Judge & Bono, 2000). Pashavi, Abadi and Sanamnejad (2012) found significant positive relationship between Extraversion and Openness to Experience with transformational leadership. Some facets of openness to experience may be more closely related to transformational leadership than others. Shao and Webber (2006) found that fantasy, a trait of openness, was linked with intellectual stimulation, a component of transformational leadership. Although creativity and change are linked with both openness to experience (McCare & Costa, 2000) and transformational leadership, and although leaders who are particularly open to experience provide more intellectual stimulation, but research has little empirical support for such a relationship.

Conscientiousness has been described under two main components; achievement and dependability. Generally, conscientiousness has not been found to be related to transformational leadership (Judge, & Bono, 2000; Judge et al., 2002; Bono & Judge, 2004; Lim & Ployhart, 2004; Shao & Webber, 2006). In the study of American presidential election of 2000, Pillai, Williams, Lowe, and Jung (2003) found a strong link between the need for achievement and transformational and charismatic leadership. Their findings contradict those of House, Spangler, and Woycke, (1996) in their study of US presidents; found that the need for achievement was negatively correlated with charisma. This indicates that a strong need for achievement may be a hindrance to the exercise transformational leadership behaviors. Overall, the empirical data do not support a relationship between conscientiousness and transformational leadership.

Neuroticism, also called emotional instability, is a tendency to experience negative emotions. Individuals high on neuroticism are unlikely to exhibit transformational leadership behaviors (Bass, 1985); therefore, neuroticism correlates negatively to transformational leadership. Judge and Bono (2000) found no significant relationship between neuroticism and transformational leadership, either when using five factor model, or when measuring neuroticism separately with theory of core self-evaluation based on four separate personality attributes (i.e., self-esteem, locus of control, generalized self-efficacy, and low neuroticism) or on a composite of these attributes. Judge et al. (2002) found that neuroticism was negatively related to leadership but not a significant predictor of it. Bono and Judge (2004), Lim and Ployhart (2004), Shao and Webber (2006) found that neuroticism was significantly negatively related to transformational leadership. Bass (1985) indicated that self-confidence and self-esteem (indicators of low neuroticism) were predictive of leadership. Ross and Offerman (1997) found that self-confidence, which is opposite of neuroticism traits, significantly correlated with transformational leadership. Overall research provided some support for negative relationship between neuroticism and transformational leadership (see Table 1).

Research thus far indicates that personality traits are important in predicting transformational leadership. The five-factor model of personality is a good predictor of transformational leadership (Judge et al., 2002), or maybe it is not (Judge, & Bono, 2000). A more specific focus on the facets of each factor in the five-factor model, or more specific traits may better predict transformational leadership (Bono, & Judge, 2004). Judge et al.

(2002) concluded that the five-factor model provides a good basis for examining the dispositional predictors of leadership.

Other research has focused on individual personality traits and attributes to find out this relationship. Ross and Offerman (1997) found that transformational leadership was associated with the personality attributes, including high levels of pragmatism, nurturance, feminine attributes, and self-confidence, and low levels of criticalness and aggressiveness. These attributes are often feminine, i.e., more closely linked to females. Church & Waclawski (1998) and Hautala (2006) found an association between personality and transformational leadership using Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), another personality measure. The MBTI (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) framework assumes that individuals differ along four primary dichotomous preference dimensions: extraversion-introversion, sensing-intuition, thinking-feeling, and judging-perceiving. These fundamental preferences are quite robust. In particular Hautala (2006) found that ratings made by leaders indicated that perceiving, intuitive and extraverted individuals were more often transformational leaders, whereas subordinates perceived more sensing individuals as transformational leaders. Similarly, Church and Waclawski (1998) found that inventors (who are often high on perceiving) and motivators (who are generally intuitive and insightful) were perceived both by themselves and by others as more transformational.

Using Sixteen Personality Factors (16 PF) as a personality measure, Eeden, Culliers, and Deventer (2006) identified the personality traits associated with transformational leadership, those include, sense of responsibility, perseverance, ambition, motivation, trust tolerance and care for others. Pillai et al. (2003) found significant positive correlations between transformational leadership and personality traits such as proactivity, need for achievement, and emotional empathy. Moreover, Judge et al. (2002) found that sociability and dominance specifically have a stronger relationship with transformational leadership than does overall. They also found a stronger relationship with achievement and dependability than with conscientiousness affect overall. Self-confidence, a specific trait opposite to neuroticism, was significantly related to transformational leadership (Ross & Offemann, 1997). No matter we studied personality in models, groups of traits, or individual traits and attributes, it was found to be consistent and stronger predictor of transformational leadership, with extraversion and agreeableness as stronger factors.

Some other antecedents of transformational leadership are cynicism, social context and emotional intelligence. Boomer, Rubin, and Baldwin (2004) found that one quarter of the variance in transformational leadership was explained by just two antecedents: leaders' cynicism about organizational change and social context, specifically peer leadership behavior. Leaders are more transformational when they believe that positive change is possible in an organization, and when they believe that their peers expect them to bring about that change. Emotional Intelligence is another important antecedent of transformational leadership. Moss, Ritossa, and Ngu (2006) found a positive link between leadership styles and emotional intelligence. Rubin, Munz, and Bommer (2005) found that emotion recognition, was a significant predictor of transformational leadership. They also found that extraversion moderated the relationship between emotion recognition and transformational leadership so that the leaders high on extraversion and high on emotion recognition were rated as more transformational. These findings support the notion that emotional intelligence is an important component of transformational leadership.

Other Factors Involved in Personality-Transformational Leadership Relationships

Research has identified other variables that may affect the relationship between personality and transformational leadership such as culture. In replicating Judge and Bono's

(2000) study (data was from American managers), Shao & Webber (2006) found different results in the context of Chinese culture. In Chinese culture, they reinforce hierarchical and conformist authority with a top down command structure in which subordinates accept both authority and distance between authority and subordinates. So Chinese managers' score was found to be low on all four transformational behaviors compared to American managers, especially on intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. (Shao & Webber, 2006). Judge and Bono found agreeableness as a strongest predictor of transformational leadership in American culture, whereas Shao and Webber did not find it significant, may be because of high power distance cultural. Thus, traits associated with transformational leadership in one culture might not be linked in other cultures. Atwater, Wang, Smither, and Fleenor (2009) also observed the significant moderating effect of cultural characteristics while comparing the leadership ratings from different sources. The relationship between self and subordinate ratings and self and peer ratings was stronger in highly assertive cultures and in high power distance cultures.

The role of the rater is also important. In most cases, the ratings for the transformational leadership were taken from the subordinates, when they were compared to leader's self-ratings of transformational leadership, there was a difference (Church & Waclawski, 1998). Comparing the subordinate's ratings and leaders self-ratings of transformational leadership, leaders demonstrated themselves as more transformational as compared to subordinate ratings of a leader (Church & Waclawski, 1998), and extraverted leaders rated themselves as more transformational than do introverted leaders, perhaps because extraverted people have the tendency to overrate themselves (Hautala, 2005). Another factor in case of ratings from the subordinates or supervisors, is that their ratings may be biased by implicit theories of leadership, an effect of cognitive categorization by which an individual matches the perceived attributes of a leader with his or her own internal prototype of leadership (Foti&Luch, 1992).

The personality of the followers is also important in the relationship between personality and transformational leadership. Hetland, Savdal, and Johnson (2008) found that subordinates with low neuroticism and high agreeableness perceived themselves to be more transformational. Moreover, subordinate's traits were similar to the transformational leader's traits, that is subordinates with traits similar to those of their leader tend to rate themselves and their leaders as equally transformational, which might suggest that similar characteristics attract individuals. Furthermore, Jong and Birgit (2006) reported that extraverted followers perceived more transformational leadership behaviors and thus tend to give more positive evaluations of transformational leadership than the followers who were low in extraversion. The personality of rater affects ratings of transformational leadership behavior because personality differences influence the assessments of the leaders.

Gender is also important in the relationship of personality and transformational leadership. Contrary to expectations, Bass (1999) found that female leaders were more transformational than their male counterparts. Other research has also found strong links between gender and leadership, however, it was again observed that female leaders were rated as more transformational than male leaders (Balthazard, Waldman, and Warren, 2009).

The nature of the organizational settings also has played a role in personality leadership theory. Judge et al. (2002) found that five-factor model predicted student leadership better than leadership in government and military settings. It is possible that the students do not experience a real strong situation as those occurring in actual corporate work situations. Students might not experience real stresses and pressures, and in such weak situations personality or dispositional factors become more powerful (House, Shane & Herold,

as cited in Judge et al., 2002). In discussing the role of organizational culture, Bass, (1999) suggested that some organizational cultures (e.g., collectivist cultures) are more favorable for transformational leaders than others (e.g., individualist cultures). Sometimes, organizational values such as respect for their leaders, support, and innovation are more conducive to transformational leadership. Personality traits may best be described in terms of a blend of situational and dispositional factors. Murtha, Kanfer, and Ackerman (1996) have offered a situational–dispositional perspective, indicating that the personality of an individual may be evident in behavior or communication under some characteristics but not others. For example, in terms of the emergence of transformational leadership, leadership and personality were less closely related in virtual teams than among those of face-to-face teams (Balthazard, Waldman, & Warren, 2009). Of those personality traits demonstrated by Judge and Bono (2000) to be related to transformational leadership, several were not related in the context of virtual teams (Balthazard et al., 2009). This finding supports the interactionist situational dispositional perspective put forth by Murtha et al. (1996) and suggests that a joint taxonomy of traits and situations could be helpful in the study of leadership.

Table 1: Major Research Articles Published During 2000-2012, Showing Relationship between Personality Traits and Transformational Leadership

Author	Aim/purpose	Sample	Design	Results
Bono & Judge (2004)	To investigate relationship of Personality traits with 3 dimensions of transformational leadership (charisma, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration)	26 studies	Meta-analysis	Extraversion and neuroticism was the strongest predictors
Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, (2005)	Leaders' emotion recognition ability and personality characteristics influenced performance of transformational leadership.	145 managers	Correlational	Agreeableness was found to be the significant predictor of transformational leadership
Hautala, (2006)	To find if the relationship between personality and transformational leadership exists, from leaders themselves and from their subordinates	439 leaders and 380 subordinates	Correlational	Leaders' self-ratings; the extraverted, intuitive and perceiving preferences favor transformational leadership while subordinates' ratings revealed transformational leaders as those with sensing preferences.
Hofmann & Jones (2005)	leadership (i.e., transformational, transactional, and passive) would predict collective personality.	sample of franchised units	correlational	Collective extraversion has been significantly related to transformational leadership
Lim & Ployhart (2004)	To examine how leader personality, based on the Five-Factor Model (FFM), relates to subordinate ratings of the leader's transformational behaviors.	Asian military sample (n = 276)	Correlational	Extroversion was positively related to while neuroticism was negatively related to transformational leadership
Zopiatis, & Constanti, (2012)	To investigate the relationship between leadership styles and the "Big Five" personality traits (NEO-FFI)	131 hotel industry participants	Correlational study	Transformational leadership was positively associated with extraversion
Eeden, Culliers, & Deventer (2006)	Personality traits of managers exercising different leadership styles are explained in terms of, and add to, the description of these styles.	Management team	Intervention study	Using 16 PF traits, a sense of responsibility, perseverance, ambition, motivation, trust tolerance and care for others are related with transformational leadership.
Pillai et al. (2003)	To examine relationship b/w personality, transformational leadership, trust, and the 2000 U.S. presidential vote	342 respondents across three regions of USA	Correlational	Positive correlations between transformational leadership and personality traits such as proactivity, need for achievement, and emotional empathy.
Balthazard, Waldman, & Warren (2009)	To examined the relationship between aspects of personality and the emergence of transformational leadership virtual team contexts.	127 (virtual decision-making) with 135 (traditional teams)	Cross sectional	Positive relationship between transformational leadership extraversion and emotional stability

Hetland, Savdal, & Johnson (2008)	To investigate how the personality of subordinates is related to leadership.	Subordinates (n = 289)	Correlational	Transformational leadership and subordinates' level of agreeableness are related. Also, ratings of passive-avoidant leadership were associated with subordinates' level of agreeableness and openness.
Jong, & Birgit (2006)	To examine the influence of followers' personal characteristics on their perception of leadership	175 students	Experimental study	Extraverted followers perceived more transformational leadership behaviors and tend to give more positive evaluations of transformational leaders than followers who were low in extraversion.
Hautala (2005)	To investigate the subordinates' personalities' ratings they give of their leaders' transformational behavior.	67 subordinates	Correlational	Extraverted and feeling subordinates give clearly higher ratings than their introverted thinking counterparts.
Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt (2002)	To provide a qualitative review of the trait perspective in leadership research	73 samples	A meta-analysis	Extraversion was the most consistent correlate of leadership across study settings. Overall, the 5-factor model had a multiple correlation of .48 with leadership, indicating strong support for the leader trait perspective when traits are organized according to the 5-factor model.
Pashavi, Abadi, & Sanamnejad, (2012).	To explore relationship b/w personality and transformational leadership among the school managers of the educational regions	75 school managers	Correlational	Extraversion had significant positive relationship with transformational leadership
Shao & Webber, (2006)	Five-Factor Model of Personality and Transformational Leadership" to examine the applicability of the findings in the Chinese culture.	350 participants	Correlational	Found relationship between extraversion and transformational leadership

The present work has sought the dispositional bases of transformational leadership. Review of the literature indicates that personality is a more established predictor of transformational leadership. Transformational leaders appear to differ from other leaders in their personality attributes. Extraversion is most important in predicting transformational leadership (see Table 1). Future research may focus on more specific or narrower traits, perhaps on facets of the big factors and models, to improve prediction and to specify a more precise personality profile of a transformational leader, which can help organizations in hiring more charismatic leaders.

Transformational leadership is important and preferable over other leadership styles because a number of positive individual and organizational outcomes are linked with it. Transformational leadership is important as it predicts team performance (Hater & Bass, 1988; Hoffman & Jones, 2005; Lim & Ployhart, 2004; Ling, Simssek, Lubatkin, & Veiga 2008; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson; 2003), individual performance (Dvir et al., 2002; Walumbwa, Avolio, & Zhu, 2008), and employees work motivation (Judge & Bono, 2000). Transformational leadership is found to be positively related to Job satisfaction (Bono & Judge, 2003; Ross and Offermann, 1997), and organizational commitment (Bono & Judge, 2003; Judge & Bono, 2000; Lim & Ployhart, 2004). Transformational leadership predicts follower's outcomes (e.g. commitment, involvement, loyalty, perception of leader's effectiveness, and performance) better than what transactional leadership predicts (Hater & Bass, 1988, Judge & Bono, 2000).

Changes in the workforce, marketplace, in organizational hierarchy, and in social and organizational values have resulted in a need for leaders to be more transformational and

less transactional (Bass, 1999). Personality traits are helpful in predicting transformational leadership. Extraversion and agreeableness are more consistently related to transformational leadership. Overall, at least one quarter of the variance in transformational leadership behavior can be explained by the personality traits. The relationship between personality and transformational leadership could be strengthened with the use of more specific personality traits. Identification of such relationships would be useful for organizations in selecting and developing transformational leaders.

References

- Atwater, L., Wang, M., Smither, J. W., & Fleenor, J. W. (2009). Are cultural characteristics associated with relationship between self and other's ratings of leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 876-886.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Reexamining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-462.
- Balthazard, P. A., Waldman, D. A., & Warren, J. E. (2009). Predictors of the emergence of transformational leadership in virtual decision teams. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 651-663.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades in research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 9-32.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 207-218.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self concordance at work: Towards understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 554-571.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 901-910.
- Boomer, W. H., Rubin, R. S., & Baldwin, T. T. (2004). Setting the stage for effective leadership: Antecedents of transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 195-210.
- Burn, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Conway, J. M. (2000). Managerial performance development constructs and personality correlates. *Human Performance*, 13(1), 23-46.
- Cost, P. T. Jr. & McCare, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO_PI_R) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO_FFI) professional manual. Odessa, FL: PAR.
- Church, A. H., & Waclawski, J. (1998). The relationship between individual personality orientation and executive leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 71, 99-125.
- De Hoogh, A. H. B., den Hartog, D. N., & Koopman, P. L. (2005) Linking the Big Five-Factors of personality to charismatic and transactional leadership; perceived dynamic work

- environment as a moderator. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(7), 839-865.
- Dvir, T., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 4, 735-744.
- Eeden, R. V., Cilliers, F., & Deventer, V. V. (2003) Leadership styles and associated personality traits: Support for conceptualization of transformational and transactional leadership. *South Asian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 253-267.
- Foti, R. J., & Luch, C. H. (1992). The influence of individual differences on the perception and categorization of leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3, 55-66.
- Hautala, T. (2005). *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 11, 84-92.
- Hautala, T. (2006). Relationship between personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, 25, 777-794.
- Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Supervisor's evaluation and subordinates perception of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 695-702.
- Hetland, H., Savdal, G. M., & Johnson, T. B. (2008). Follower's personality and leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 14, 322-331.
- Hofmann, D. A., & Jones, L. M. (2005). Leadership, collective personality and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 502-522.
- Jong, F., & Birgit, S. (2006). Personality and perception of transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 708-739.
- Judge, J.A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 751-765.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 765-780.
- Lim, B. C., & Ployhart, R. E. (2004). Transformational leadership: Relations to five factor model and team performance in typical and maximum contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 610-621.
- Ling, Y., Simsek, Z., Lubatkin, M. H., & Veiga, J. F. (2008). The Impact of transformational CEOs on the performance of small and medium sized firms: Does organizational context matter? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 876-886.
- McCrae, R. R., Costa J, P. T., Ostendorf, F., Angleitner, A., Hřebíčková, M., Avia, M. D., & Saunders, P. R. (2000). Nature over nurture: temperament, personality, and life span development. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 78(1), 173.
- Moss, S., Ritossa, D., & Ngu, S. (2006). The effect of follower regularity focus and extraversion on leadership behavior. The role of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 27, 93-107.
- Murtha, T. C., Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (1996). Toward an interactionist taxonomy of personality and situations: An integrative situational-dispositional representation of personality traits. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 193-207.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist press.

Pashavi, G., Abadi, A. P. D. H. J., & Sanamnejad, G. (2012). An investigation of the relationship between personality aspects and transformational leadership among the school managers of the educational regions 1 and 2 in Urmia. *Journal of Educational & Instructional Studies in the World*, 2(3). 221-228

Pillai, R., Williams, E. A., Lowe, K. B., & Jung, D. I. (2003). Personality, transformational leadership, trust, and the 2000 U.S. Presidential vote. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 161-192.

Ross, S. M., Offermann, L. R. (1997). Transformational leadership: Measurement of personality attributes and work group performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 1078-1094.

Rubin, R. S., Munz, D. C., & Bommer, W. H. (2005). Leading from within: The effects of emotion recognition and personality on transformational leadership behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 48, 845-858.

Schultz, D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (2005). *Theories of Personality* (8th Ed.) Wadworth", Thomason. ISBN 0-534-62403-2., Publication of Virayesh

Shao, L., & Webber, S. (2006). A cross cultural test of the five factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Business Research*, 59, 936-944.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., & Zhu, W. (2008). How transformational leadership weaves its influence on individual job performance: The role of identification and efficacy beliefs. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 793-825