

Ashley A. Miller, EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLE
ON THE FOLLOWER'S SELF-CONCEPT (Under the direction of Dr. John G. Cope)
Department of Psychology, April 2011.

The current study examines the impact of leadership style on the follower's self-concept. Research has shown that certain types of leadership have motivational effects on followers. Specifically, charismatic leadership has been shown to elicit high levels of commitment, personal sacrifice, and performance beyond expectations (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Furthermore, previous research has suggested that these effects occur through activation of the follower's self-concept (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993), while more recent research has suggested that the visions that are communicated by charismatic leaders may serve to activate the follower's future-oriented component of the self-concept, known as the possible self (Stam, van Knippenberg, & Wisse, 2010). This study examined this latter suggestion by looking at the change in possible selves after an intervention in which the participant viewed a leader's speech classified as transactional, transformational, or charismatic. A one-way ANOVA on the difference scores of each group was conducted. Results showed that type of speech had no significant effect on change in possible selves. The implications of these results and the potential explanations for it are considered.

EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLE
ON THE FOLLOWER'S SELF-CONCEPT

A Thesis

Presented To

the Faculty of the Department of Psychology

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Psychology

by

Ashley A. Miller

April, 2011

Ashley A. Miller © 2011

EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLE
ON THE FOLLOWER'S SELF-CONCEPT

by

Ashley A. Miller

APPROVED BY:

THESIS CHAIR: _____
John G. Cope, PhD

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____
Mark C. Bowler, PhD

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____
Karl L. Wuensch, PhD

DEPARTMENT OF
PSYCHOLOGY CHAIR: _____
Kathleen Row, PhD

DEAN OF THE
GRADUATE SCHOOL: _____
Paul J. Gemperline, PhD

Acknowledgements

I would like to sincerely thank my thesis committee, Dr. John G. Cope, Dr. Mark C. Bowler, and Dr. Karl L. Wuensch for their continuous direction, assistance, guidance, and encouragement throughout the completion of this thesis. I would also like to thank my parents and grandparents for their constant faith and support in my endeavors and accomplishments. I owe a special thank you to my classmates and friends, Catherine Buria, Martha Baker, and Ryan Weber, for always encouraging and somehow dealing with me. Without these people in my life, I would be lost.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	viii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Leadership Defined.....	2
The New Model of Leadership	3
Transactional Leadership.....	3
Transformational Leadership	4
Transactional Versus Transformational Leadership	5
Charismatic Leadership Theories	7
Defining Charismatic Leadership	7
Behaviors of Charismatic Leaders	8
Envisioning	10
Empowerment	12
Empathy	13
Charismatic Leadership Outcomes and Follower Effects.....	14
Comparing Transformational and Charismatic Leadership.....	18
The Self-Concept	19
Possible Selves.....	20
The Self-Concept, Possible Selves, and Charismatic Leadership	23
Charismatic Leadership and Academic Possible Selves.....	25
Hypothesis one.....	26
Hypothesis two	27
Hypothesis three	27

Hypothesis four.....	27
CHAPTER II: METHODS	28
Participants.....	28
Measures	28
Demographics questionnaire.....	28
Possible selves questionnaire.....	29
Speeches.....	31
Subject matter expert rating survey	32
Design.....	34
Procedure	35
CHAPTER III: ANALYSES	36
Data Screening.....	36
One-Way ANOVA	36
Correlated t Tests.....	39
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION	42
No Effect Existed.....	42
Achievement Motivation as a Moderator	43
Considering Sample Size	46
Previous Exposure and Bias	47
Experimental Setting.....	47
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION	49
REFERENCES	50
APPENDIX A: IRB APPROVAL LETTER	67

APPENDIX B: POSSIBLE SELVES QUESTIONNAIRE II.....	68
APPENDIX C: SPEECH DESCRIPTIONS AND VIDEO LINKS.....	70
APPENDIX D: SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT RATING SURVEY.....	72
APPENDIX E: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE.....	76

List of Tables

Table 1: One-Way ANOVA	37
Table 2: Correlated t Tests	40
Table 3: Descriptive Statistics	41

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Leadership researchers have been developing theories of leadership for several decades now. Each theory has its own individual differences, while many of them share several similarities. In the most recent years of leadership research, a particular type of leader has captured the attention of many (Choi, 2006; Conger, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; House, 1977; House & Shamir, 1993; House & Howell, 1992; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Specifically, the charismatic leader has been identified as one who has the capability to elicit extraordinary effects from his or her followers (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). However, just how the charismatic leader accomplishes this has remained somewhat of a mystery still open to interpretation and exploration (Choi, 2006; Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000).

One hypothesized explanation for how charismatic leaders elicit these extraordinary effects from their followers is through the self-concept (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). The self-concept can be viewed as a complex and dynamic system containing several different conceptions of one's self (i.e., past, present, and future). Possible selves are one type of self-conception that may be linked to personal meaning as they depict how individuals view what they are capable of becoming in his or her future (Markus & Nurius, 1986; Sosik, 2000). Personal meaning refers to "that which makes one's life most important, coherent, and worthwhile" (Sosik, 2000, p. 4). By allowing an individual to identify the gap between what he or she currently is and what he or she would like to become (or not to become), possible selves act as the missing link between an individual's self-concept and motivation by providing meaning to his or her behavior.

Sosik (2000) suggested that a leader's self-concept and his or her personal meaning are motivational sources for both charismatic and non-charismatic leaders. Although this study examined the differences between the possible selves of charismatic leaders versus non-charismatic *leaders*, the article fails to discuss the implications for possible selves research pertaining to the leader's *followers*. To be sure, possible selves were not examined from the follower's perspective until almost a decade later, when Stam, van Knippenberg, and Wisse (2010) published an article examining the effects of vision communication (an essential component of charismatic leadership) on followers by using possible selves. The present study extends this research by examining how different types of leaders interact with his or her followers and what implications these interactions have for the evolution of the follower's possible self-concept.

Leadership Defined

An individual who exercises maximum influence over others is referred to as a leader (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). Leadership typically refers to the process in which an individual influences others toward the attainment of an identified goal (Yukl, 2006). In other words, this individual guides followers along a proposed path and provides guidance to his or her followers along the way. However, not all individuals that are defined as leaders demonstrate successful leadership. Successful leadership creates purpose and innovation, focuses on people, inspires trust, and challenges the status quo (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Considering the effective behaviors of successful leaders, one would think that all individuals in positions of authority would just exhibit behaviors conducive to successful leadership. This, however, is easier said than done.

The New Model of Leadership

One of the primary distinctions for describing different leadership behaviors is the transactional and transformational leadership paradigm (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Burns (1978) identified two types of leaders: transactional leaders and transformational leaders. Transactional leaders develop relationships with their followers based on symbiotic exchanges, whereas transformational leaders induce followers to go beyond personal interests and dedicate themselves to collective achievement (Chemers, 2000). Burns hypothesized that transactional and transformational leadership were concepts used to describe opposite ends of one continuum (Conger, 1999; Judge & Bono, 2000; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Simply put, a leader could either be transactional or transformational-but not both. Building off of Burns' (1978) initial concepts, Bass (1985) postulated that the two were independent of one another, speculating that a leader could be both transactional and transformational; in fact, he suggested that the best leaders were both (Conger, 1999; Judge & Bono, 2000; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Bass' (1985) model identified four components of transformational leadership, three components of transactional leadership, and one component of non-leadership, also known as Laissez Faire leadership (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership pertains to an exchange relationship between a leader and a follower in order to meet their own respective self-interests (Bass, 1999). Bass's (1985) model identified transactional leadership as three components: contingent reward, management by exception-active, and management by exception-passive. One of the ways transactional leaders satisfy their followers' immediate self-interests is through contingent reward (Bass, 1999). Transactional leaders provide contingent rewards to followers in exchange for their support

(Judge & Bono, 2000) by specifying what needs to be accomplished and taking corrective actions based on their performance (Avolio & Bass, 1998). In other words, a leader may tell a follower, if you meet this goal or expectation by x date or time, I will provide an x amount bonus at the end of the quarter. Management by exception involves monitoring performance and taking corrective actions in response. Whether this type of management is clarified as active or passive depends on when corrective action takes place. Management by exception-active involves anticipating the need for corrective action and managing accordingly to prevent problems from occurring, whereas management by exception-passive involves taking corrective action only once a problem arises (Judge & Bono, 2000; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Subsequently, transactional leadership was reduced to two components: contingent reward and active management by exception, while passive management by exception was termed passive avoidant leadership (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Passive avoidant leadership is essentially the same as Laissez Faire leadership in that the leader often avoids having to make any decisions at all, and as such, was removed from the transactional leadership factor (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership refers to a leader who is capable of elevating his or her followers further than their own self-interests by utilizing idealized influence, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and/or individualized consideration (Bass, 1999). Idealized influence, or charisma, refers to the extent that a leader acts in “admirable ways that causes followers to identify with the leader” (Judge & Piccolo, 2004, p. 755). The second component, inspirational motivation, presents followers with a “clear, appealing, and inspiring vision” to aspire towards (Judge & Bono, 2000, p. 755). Third, intellectual stimulation is present when the leader inspires creativity by “challenging assumptions, taking risks, and soliciting followers’ ideas” (Judge &

Piccolo, 2004, p. 755). Lastly, individualized consideration requires the leader to consider needs, to act as a mentor, and to listen to the concerns of each individual (Judge & Bono, 2000; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). It is important to note that although Bass's (1985) model included four factors of transformational leadership, the construct was subsequently reduced to three factors after noting that although conceptually unique, charismatic and inspirational leadership were often difficult to distinguish empirically (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). For example, Bass and Avolio (1993) found inter-correlations of .80 to .90 between these two factors when they were assessed using separate scales on the MLQ 5X.

Transformational leaders possess self-confidence (Bass, 1990; House, 1977). As a result, transformational leaders are able to: (1) set high performance standards and convince followers that they are capable of successfully attaining these standards (Eden, 1992); (2) challenge the status quo and take risks (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991); (3) inspire trust (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991); (4) present a optimistic, convincing, and inspirational view of the future (Yukl, 1998). Transformational leaders put others' needs ahead of their own, and they display high standards of ethical and moral behavior, acting as role models for their followers (Avolio & Bass, 1998). They give individualized attention to neglected group members and convey gratitude for their followers' efforts (Bass, 1985). Transformational leadership behaviors have been found to result in increased morale, motivation, and morality (Bass, 1999), as well as increased subordinate satisfaction, organizational commitment, and leader effectiveness (Bono & Judge, 2004).

Transactional Versus Transformational Leadership

House and Shamir (1993) and Shamir et al. (1993) proposed that transactional leaders focus on practical paths to goals, whereas as transformational leaders are able to elicit a higher

saliency in the collective identity in their self-concept; a sense of consistency between their self-concept and their actions on behalf of the leader and the collective; a higher level of self-esteem and a greater sense of self worth; similarity between their self-concept and their perception of the leader; a sense of collective efficacy; and a sense of meaningfulness in their work and lives.

Judge and Piccolo (2004) conducted a meta-analysis to determine the comparative validity of transformational and transactional leadership with the following leadership criteria: (a) follower job satisfaction, (b) follower leader satisfaction, (c) follower motivation, (d) leader job performance, (e) group or organization performance, and (f) rated leader effectiveness. The results of this meta-analysis found the highest overall validities across all leadership criteria for transformational leadership ($r = .44$), with contingent reward leadership coming in at a close second ($r = .39$).

Bass's (1985) augmentation effect states that transformational leadership increases the effectiveness of transactional leadership, but the same cannot be said in reverse. Best said by Bass himself, "transformational leadership does not substitute for transactional leadership" (Bass, 1999). As mentioned earlier, the two are independent of one another so it is possible to be both. What one may take away from this is that, to be an effective leader, one must possess transactional qualities to get the job done; however, it is the best leaders that also possess transformational qualities. There has been speculation as to what transformational leadership adds that produces follower effects above and beyond transactional leadership. Many would say it is the first component of transformational leadership, known as idealized influence or charisma (Avolio & Yammarino, 1990; Bass, 1985; Hater & Bass, 1988; Yammarino & Bass, 1990; Conger, 1999).

Charismatic Leadership Theories

Considering the profound follower effects associated with the primary component of transformational leadership (idealized influence or charisma), it may come as no surprise that the study of this factor soon earned enough attention that it claimed its own theories and models (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Since the 1980's a new type of leadership, alternatively referred to as "charismatic," "transformational," "visionary," or "inspirational," emerged in the organizational literature (House, 1977; Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Tichy & Devanna, 1986; Boal & Bryson, 1988; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987; Sashkin, 1988; Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Such leaders convert the needs, values, preferences, and aspirations of followers from self-interests to collective interests. Further, they cause followers to become highly dedicated to the leader's mission, to make significant personal sacrifices for the sake of the mission, and to perform above and beyond the call of duty. This new type of leadership is typically referred to as charismatic because charisma is a central component in all of them, either explicitly or implicitly.

Defining Charismatic Leadership

The term "charisma" is often used to identify an individual who has the ability to elicit intense and extraordinary effects from their followers by means of the personal attributes they possess (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). Perhaps charismatic leadership is best explained by sociologist Max Weber who suggested, "[the charismatic leader is] set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least...exceptional powers and qualities...[which] are not accessible to the ordinary person but are regarded as of divine or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as leader" (Weber, 1968,

pp. 358-359). House (1977), one of the earlier charismatic leadership theorists, postulated that this type of leadership is capable of transforming the self-concepts of followers and attaining its motivational goals by changing follower perceptions, establishing a strong group identity, and heightening self-efficacy within the individual and among the group (Conger, 1999). Extending House's (1977) theory, Conger and Kanungo's (1987) behavioral model rests on the premise that charisma is an attribute that must be attributed to a leader by their followers. Therefore, in order for the effects of charismatic leadership to take place, the leader must be perceived as charismatic by his or her followers.

Behaviors of Charismatic Leaders

Certain personal qualities of charismatic leaders that are recognized consistently throughout the charismatic leadership literature include vision or attractive ideological goals (Bass, 1985; Berlew, 1974; Conger, 1985; House, 1977; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975), behavior that instills confidence (Bass, 1985; Berlew, 1974; House, 1977), a capacity to inspire (Bass, 1985; Berlew, 1974; Conger, 1985; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975), self-confidence (Bass, 1985; House, 1977; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975), social dominance (House, 1977; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975), a need for power (House, 1977), communication ability (Conger, 1985), and unconventional behavior or behavior that varies from the norm (Conger, 1985; Martin & Siehl, 1983). In terms of rhetoric, charismatic leaders use more metaphors involving relationships and the collective, vague and distant visions, and themes of self-sacrifice (Sosik, 2000). In terms of personality characteristics, charismatic leaders have a stronger achievement orientation; greater work involvement, energy, and enthusiasm; greater creative, innovative, visionary, and inspirational tendencies; stronger values pertaining to the collective; and a higher need for power and influence (Sosik, 2000).

The Conger-Kanungo (1987) model of charismatic leadership distinguishes several distinct behavioral components in three separate stages of the leadership process. During the first stage, known as environmental assessment, charismatic leadership is different from other leadership models in two ways. First, followers perceive the leader's aspiration to change the status quo. Second, followers perceive increased sensitivity from the leader in relation to environmental opportunities, constraints, and their needs. During the second stage, referred to as vision formulation, charismatic leadership is different from other forms of leadership by the followers' perceptions of the leader's development of a shared and idealized future vision, as well as his or her effective communication of this vision using inspirational techniques. In stage three, the implementation stage, leaders who are perceived as charismatic engage in behaviors that followers perceive as taking great personal risk and self-sacrifice. Throughout these stages, leaders are able to empower followers and create trust. Although the Conger-Kanungo (1987) model of charismatic leadership remains one of the most well documented models in the literature, a number of other charismatic leadership theories also exist. Therefore, these additional theories should be taken into account when the discussion of charismatic leadership arises.

To be sure, theorists have speculated back and forth as to what charismatic leadership consists of, and most of the theories to date have striking similarities among their identified components. Examination of seven leadership theories that address charisma in some manner (Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Locke et al., 1991; Tichy & Devanna, 1986) identified that there are at least three core components that are common among the theories: communicating a vision, implementing the vision, and demonstrating a charismatic communication style (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996).

Furthermore, Choi (2006) revealed that charismatic leadership is assumed to have three core components that each satisfies individual needs: envisioning, empathy, and empowerment. These three components satisfy the individual need for achievement, affiliation, and power, respectively. Because Choi (2006) identifies envisioning as one component of charismatic leadership, which essentially consists of communicating a vision, implementing the vision, and demonstrating a charismatic communication style, this study will follow Choi's (2006) components of charismatic leadership. In doing so, the authors are able to examine envisioning, which is a critical component across all of the charismatic leadership theories, in addition to empathy and empowerment, which are hypothesized to also have strong effects on the followers of charismatic leaders.

Envisioning. The creation and communication of a vision is one of the most important components of charismatic leadership (Bass, 1985; Berlew, 1974; Blau, 1963; Conger, 1985; Dow, 1969; House, 1977; Willner, 1984; Zaleznik & Kets de Vries, 1975; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Refferty & Griffin, 2004; Strange & Mumford, 2002, 2005). The vision refers to an idealized goal that the leader wants his or her followers to achieve in the future (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Choi, 2006). By presenting an idealized goal to followers, a leader provides a challenging and inspiring drive for change. Charismatic leaders communicate their visions and strategies for achievement through two processes. First, they communicate the context including: the nature of the current status quo, the nature of the future vision, the manner through which achieving this future vision will provide fulfillment to the followers, and plans of action for attaining the vision. Second, charismatic leaders also demonstrate their own enthusiasm to lead their followers. Through both verbal and nonverbal animated actions, the leaders convey their passion, assurance, and commitment in order to give credibility to their vision (Conger &

Kanungo, 1987). Charismatic and transformational leaders speak with an enchanting tone; make direct eye contact; exhibit dynamic facial expressions; and have a unique communication style (Bass, 1985; Conger, 1989, 1991; Friedman, Prince, Riggio, & DiMatteo, 1980; House, Woycke, & Fodor, 1988; Howell & Frost, 1989).

Leaders are perceived as charismatic when their vision differs greatly from the current status quo yet remains within the possibility of acceptance for their followers. Charismatic leaders are willing to exert high personal risk, cost, energy, and self-sacrifice in order to attain a shared vision (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). Charismatic leaders are capable of instilling daily work with meaningfulness and greater intrinsic motivation (Conger, 1989; Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Shamir et al., 1993). They have a profound effect on their followers when communicating a message by utilizing several techniques, such as metaphors, analogies, and stories, to instill inspiring thoughts into the followers' minds (Conger, 1989).

Leaders also articulate their vision by ensuring their actions are in line with the values advocated in their vision (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). In doing this, goals are offered in terms of the values they signify, thus making action oriented toward the attainment of these goals more significant to the follower as a result of being in line with his or her self-concept. Charismatic leadership also enhances the significance of goals and related actions by demonstrating how these goals are in alignment with the collective past and its future (McHugh, 1968). Charismatic leadership differs from other forms of leadership in that it develops and communicates an inspirational vision through demonstrating behaviors and actions that create an impression that the leader and their mission are exemplary (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) concluded that vision positively affected similarity between the participants' and leaders' beliefs and values, participants' trust in the leader, the

degree to which participants were mentally motivated and inspired by the leader, and the degree to which participants perceived the leader as charismatic.

Empowerment. Empowerment is a process that functions to enhance perceptions of self-efficacy in followers, through analyzing the conditions in the environment that create a sense of powerlessness and removing them, by using verbal persuasion and recognition, and functioning as an exemplary model (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Spreitzer, 1995, 1996; Choi, 2006). In utilizing empowerment practices, a charismatic leader inspires followers to believe they are powerful and capable (Tichy & DeVanna, 1986). Bennis and Nanus (1985) found that the perception of making a difference for the collective group is a critical aspect of empowerment. Furthermore, idealized visions have also been found to produce empowering effects of followers (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). For instance, Kanungo and Mandonca (1996) concluded that leaders develop and communicate idealized future goals, which function to strengthen and empower followers to the degree that these goals are internalized.

Charismatic leaders increase the self-esteem of their followers by conveying high expectations and assurance in their ability to meet these expectations (Bandura, 1986; Conger, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Shamir et al., 1993; Yukl, 1989; Eden, 1990), providing independence from bureaucratic restrictions (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Kanter, 1979), and setting inspirational and highly meaningful goals (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; McClelland, 1985). Furthermore, this increase in self-esteem functions to elevate followers' perceived self-efficacy, which refers to an individual's perception of his or her ability to achieve a particular objective or goal. Specifically, charismatic leaders elevate the self-efficacy of their followers in relation to task accomplishment, which in turn serves to increase satisfaction with the leader (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). This relationship is important

because self-efficacy has been identified as a strong source of motivation (Bandura, 1986, p. 351). Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) postulated that charismatic leaders motivate their followers in the following ways: by elevating the intrinsic valence of effort and goal accomplishment, enhancing effort-accomplishment expectancies (by increasing the followers' self-esteem and self-worth), inspiring faith in the future, and fostering personal commitment.

Empathy. Empathy refers to the ability to understand another individual's motives, values, and emotions (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), and it entails entering the other individual's perspectives (Choi, 2006). Charismatic leaders have a strong propensity to demonstrate sensitivity to their followers' needs and emotions (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). In addition, they pay individualized attention to followers, respond to their needs, and encourage their personal development (Bass, 1985).

Empathy may be the key behind relationship-oriented leadership behaviors such as consideration, which is exemplified by mutual trust, respect and support for other's ideas, and respect for their feelings (Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004). Followers are willing to be influenced by the charismatic leader to the extent that they trust the leader (Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Yukl, 1989). Podsakoff et al. (1990) demonstrated that three qualities of a leader play a significant role in developing follower trust: identifying and communicating a vision, acting as a role model for followers by behaving in alignment with the values the leader promotes, and encouraging group cooperation and the approval of group goals. Charismatic leaders also build follower trust through demonstrated risk taking, personal sacrifices, and unconventional behavior (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000).

Charismatic Leadership Outcomes and Follower Effects

The focus on charismatic leaders in the organizational context stems from the numerous benefits these individuals can provide using their unique capabilities. As mentioned earlier, charismatic leaders have profound effects on their followers. In the organizational context, these effects include increased motivation (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993), improved performance and attitudes (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Towler, 2003), increased positive affect (Erez, Misangyi, Johnson, LePine, & Halverson, 2008), leader-follower values congruence (Brown & Trevino, 2009), increased creativity (Jung, 2000), emotional attachment to the leader, job satisfaction, effectiveness, effort, and commitment - to name a few.

Early theorists of transformational and charismatic leadership have identified three changes that take place through this leadership process that motivates followers to go above and beyond average performance expectations (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). First, both Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) proposed that transformational or charismatic leaders have the ability to elevate the needs of their followers from lower level needs to higher level needs. Second, Burns (1978) asserted that these types of leaders elevate their followers to higher levels of morality. Third, House (1977), Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) declared that transformational or charismatic leaders are triumphant in inspiring their followers to put aside their own self-interests to benefit the group's collective mission or goal. Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) refer to these effects as "the transformational effects of charismatic leadership" (p. 579). The problem that remains is that these early theorists were unable to explain the motivational mechanisms by which these effects occur (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993).

Theories of charismatic leadership highlight follower effects such as emotional attachment to the leader; emotional and motivational arousal; elevation of valences in relation to

the mission espoused by the leader; increased self-esteem; trust and confidence in the leader; elevated values; and intrinsic motivation (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Many scholars have argued that a charismatic leader inspires followers and produces a sense of excitement among them (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House, 1977) so that they perform beyond expectations.

Erez, Misangyi, Johnson, LePine, and Halverson (2008) found that charismatic leadership was positively correlated with followers' positive affect and negatively correlated with followers' negative affects. Transmitting positive affect from leader to follower is beneficial for a number of reasons, especially in an organizational context. A number of studies fueled by Isen and colleagues demonstrated that individuals with positive affect think better, make better decisions, show increased creativity, are more motivated, and show increased performance on a range of different tasks (Erez, Misangyi, Johnson, LePine, & Halverson, 2008). In addition, individuals displaying positive affect are more cooperative and helpful and engage in more organizational citizenship behaviors in groups (Erez, Misangyi, Johnson, LePine, & Halverson, 2008). Williams (1994) found further confirmation for the display of increased organizational citizenship behaviors, such as altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue when a transformational leadership style is in play. Specifically, transformational leaders display these behaviors themselves, and as a result, instill these same behaviors in their followers (Bass, 1999).

Realistically speaking, one cannot instill desirable behavior in another individual without the individual's initial free will. In the words of Avolio and Bass (1998), "you can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink unless he is thirsty." Specifically, an individual must first have the motivation and desire to engage in specific types of behavior. The inspiration to engage

in prosocial behaviors depends on an individual's internal values. Thus, charismatic leaders develop this inspiration by forming an emotional attachment with followers (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993; Salovey & Mayer, 1990) and aligning the followers' values with their values (Brown & Trevino, 2006; Brown & Trevino, 2009; Jung & Avolio, 2000). Brown and Trevino (2009) concluded that for 3 of the 4 values they studied, socialized charismatic leadership is correlated with values congruence in followers. In particular, significant effects were found for self-enhancement, openness to change, and self-transcendence values. It is this high level of values congruence between the charismatic leader and the follower that increases intrinsic motivation in followers more so than other styles of leadership in the literature (Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Jung, 2000). Looking back to how this all benefits the organization, Bass (1999) concluded that by appealing to follower self-concepts and arousing their non-conscious motives, the leader subsequently arouses the follower's individual achievement, affiliation, and power motives. The arousal of these motives activates the self-worth component of motivation and thus elevates the follower's motivation. Based on the premise that motive arousal results in self-engagement, the result is increased follower commitment (Bass, 1999).

In addition to the benefits already discussed, there is a reason all of these transformational effects of charismatic leaders are so important. Specifically, increased positive affect, value alignment, job satisfaction, motivation, and creativity are all positively linked to increased performance in some way or another. Using data from organizations around the world, Bass (1998) pointed out that transformational leaders are associated with producing high-performance teams and organizations. Additional studies have echoed the conclusion that transformational and charismatic leadership are correlated with higher performance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Sosik, Avolio, & Kahai, 1997; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Shamir, House, & Arthur,

1993; Towler, 2003). In addition to increased performance in general, there has been evidence for increased *quality* of performance as well. Sosik, Avolio, & Kahai (1996) demonstrated that although transactional leaders generated a greater quantity of brainstorming ideas, transformational leaders generated ideas that were greater in quality. In relation to these findings, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) found that visioning was positively correlated with the quality of performance.

House and Baetz (1979) hypothesized a set of behavioral dimensions that distinguished the followers of charismatic leaders from others. These characteristics include an absolute acceptance of the leader, trust in the leader's beliefs, affection for the leader, eager obedience to the leader, imitation of and identification with the leader, congruence of followers' beliefs to those of the leader, emotional involvement in the mission, heightened goals, and feelings on the part of the followers that they are able to accomplish or contribute to the leader's mission. Conger, Kanungo, and Menon (2000) identified six follower effects from the charismatic leadership literature and tested whether the behavioral components of the Conger-Kanungo model of charismatic leadership produced these predicted effects. They found that three of the components had a strong direct relationship with charismatic leadership: leader reverence, follower collective identity, and follower perceptions of group task performance. Howell and Frost (1989) found that individuals led by charismatic leaders reported greater job satisfaction than did the followers of leaders who were not charismatic. Additionally, several empirical studies have consistently confirmed that the followers of charismatic leaders engage in more organizational citizenship behaviors (Deluga, 1995; Koh et al., 1995; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004).

Of the empirical studies that have been conducted, the findings have pointed out those leaders who engage in the hypothetical charismatic behaviors produce the hypothetical charismatic effects. In addition, they receive higher performance ratings, have followers that are more satisfied and more motivated, and are perceived as more successful by their superiors and followers than other types of leaders (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Despite identifying many of the behaviors of charismatic leaders and the effects they produce of their followers, the literature on charismatic leadership does not provide an explanation of the process by which charismatic leadership has its profound effects. Until recently, no attempts had been made to provide a motivational explanation to identify how charismatic leaders bring about changes in followers' values, goals, needs, and aspirations (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993; Choi, 2006; Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996).

Comparing Transformational and Charismatic Leadership

Conger (1999) identifies three clusters of investigators in the topic of transformational and charismatic leadership, consisting of: Bass, Avolio, and their colleagues; Kanungo, Conger, and Menon; and House, Shamir, Howell, Arthur, and their colleagues. These three clusters were based on the proposition that these investigators have contributed the greatest amount of research to the field in terms of transformational and charismatic leadership. All three bodies of research these investigators have contributed have several similarities with one another, and it can be said they converge with one another in many ways (Conger, 1999). As mentioned earlier, transformational and charismatic leadership have often been used interchangeably. For instance, all three of the theories share the following components: vision, inspiration, role modeling, intellectual stimulation, meaning making, appeals to higher-order needs, empowerment, setting of high expectations, and fostering collective identity (Conger, 1999). An important distinction

of the Conger and Kanungo (1987) theory focuses on progressions through stages, essentially elevating followers from their existing present state toward some future state (Conger, 1999). Additionally, Shamir, House, and Arthur's (1993) theory postulated that the motivational effects of charismatic leadership could be explained by examining the self-concept of the followers.

The Self-Concept

The self-concept represents the “compository of life span experiences, motivational states, and action orientations” (Cross & Markus, 1991, p. 230). It is a complex and dynamic phenomenon consisting of several facets (i.e., past, present, and future self-conceptions), which are arranged in order based on salience or importance. Because the entire self-system is too vast to be retained in memory all at once, the most salient and easily reachable self-conceptions are held in what is known as the working self-concept, the set of self-conceptions that are currently active in the memory (Markus & Kunda, 1986; Markus & Nurius, 1986). Changes in the working self-concept take place when deviations in the individual's psychological states and social contexts occur, which in turn provides information for future behavior (Sosik, 2000).

A focus on the self-knowledge that accompanies an individual's goals, fears, and threats is a natural extension of a cognitive approach to the study of the self-concept (Markus & Nurius, 1986). In this approach, the self-concept is identified as a network of affective-cognitive structures (also called schemas) about the self that provides organization and consistency to the relevant life experiences of the individual. Markus (1977) defined self-schemas as “cognitive generalizations about the self, derived from past experiences, that organize and guide the processing of self-related information contained in the individual's social experiences” (p. 64). Furthermore, these well-elaborated structures of the self shape the perceiver's expectations. Self-schemas also establish which stimuli are selected for attention, which stimuli are remembered,

and what types of inferences are drawn (Markus & Nurius, 1986). Markus and her colleagues (Cross & Markus, 1994; Markus, Cross, & Wurf, 1990) also argued that proficiency in a domain does not rely on the individual's ability alone. Specifically, he or she must also possess a self-schema for this ability. It has been suggested that self-schemas maintain competency in specific domains by assisting in the encoding, evaluation, and retrieval of information relevant in that domain (Cross & Markus, 1994; Markus, 1977). Therefore, an individual with a self-schema in a specific ability domain is sensitive to situations that are relevant to this domain and is prepared to utilize the ability when necessary (Markus, 1983; Markus, Cross, & Wurf, 1990; Markus & Wurf, 1987).

The self-concept has profound effects of its own on an individual's perception, behavior, and motivation (Banaji & Prentice, 1994; Markus & Wurf, 1987). Therefore, if leaders are able to manipulate the self-concept of their followers they may be indirectly manipulating their perception, behavior, and motivation (Stam et al., 2010). Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) hypothesized that vision communication could be used as a tool to alter followers' self-concepts and align them with the values and identities articulated by that vision. The goal of the majority of research pertaining to the self-concept is to relate the self-concept to ongoing behavior, with the premise being that if we want to change behavior, for instance, academic performance, the self-concept for that domain must first be changed (Markus & Nurius, 1986).

Possible Selves

One type of self-conception that has received considerable attention is the domain of possible selves. A recent literature search for possible selves in peer-reviewed journals through PsycINFO returned 10, 070 results. Possible selves relate to how individuals think about their potential and about their future (Markus & Nurius, 1986). An individual may have several

possible selves, including ideal or hoped-for selves, expected selves, and feared selves. Hoped-for selves are the selves we desire and aspire to become. Expected selves are the selves we think we will become. Feared selves are the selves we are afraid of becoming. An individual's collection of possible selves can be viewed as the cognitive expression of stable goals, aspirations, motives, fears, and threats (Markus & Nurius, 1986). Essentially, they provide the critical connection between the self-concept and motivation by providing meaning to behavior (Oyserman & Markus, 1990; Sosik, 2000). Possible selves also allow us to make a more direct link between motives and specific behaviors (Lerner, 1982; Kendall, Lerner, & Craighead, 1984; Markus & Nurius, 1986).

Possible selves are linked to the dynamic properties of the self-concept: motivation, distortion, and change, both temporary and permanent. Possible selves derive from representations of the self in the past, and they include representations of the self in the future (Hoyle & Sherrill, 2006). There is no limit to the number of possible selves that an individual may create; however, the possible selves that are created derive from the categories made relevant by the individual's unique sociological and cultural environment, the information provided by the media, and the individual's direct social experiences (Markus & Nurius, 1986).

The creation of possible selves serves two functions. First, the construction of possible selves serves as motivation for future behavior. Second, possible selves offer a means for evaluating and interpreting an individual's current view of his or her self. In this way, possible selves serve as the "cognitive manifestations of enduring goals, aspirations, motives, fears, and threats" (Markus & Nurius, 1987, p. 158). Because possible selves are not well anchored in social experience, they comprise the self-knowledge that is the most vulnerable and responsive to

changes in the environment (Hoyle & Sherrill, 2006). They are the first elements of the self-concept to absorb and reveal such change.

Hoped-for possible selves have been positively correlated with performance (Higgins, 1997; Markus & Ruvolo, 1989) and behavioral motivation (Hooker & Kaus, 1992). Feared selves have been correlated with negative effects such as depression (Carver, Lawrence, & Scheier, 1999), lower life satisfaction (Ogilvie & Clark, 1992), and anxiety and guilt (Carver, Lawrence, & Scheier, 1999). If an individual values and desires a particular hoped-for self, he or she will modify his or her behavior to increase the chances of attaining those selves. In contrast, if an individual is afraid of realizing a particular feared possible self, he or she will engage in behaviors that will decrease the chances of him or her becoming those selves (Leondari, 2007). Possible selves can play an important motivational role in a number of domains, including academic striving (Oyserman, Gant, & Ager, 1995).

The motivational significance of an individual's perception of the future is imbedded in the concept of possible selves to the extent that the constructed possible selves provide a frame of reference for determining the path he or she will take in order to achieve a desired goal (Markus & Nurius, 1986; Markus & Ruvolo, 1989; Oyserman & Markus, 1990a; Wurf & Markus, 1991). The more salient a possible self is to an individual, the more likely it will be related to the individual's subsequent behaviors (Leondari, 2007). Research on mental stimulation and visualization has shown that imagining successful attainment of one's goals is related to elevated goal progress, a tighter link between thought and action, and a perception of meaningfulness in one's life (Leondari, 2007).

The Self-Concept, Possible Selves, and Charismatic Leadership

Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) proposed a self-concept based theory of the motivational effects of charismatic leadership. They proposed a theory consisting of four main components that link with one another: leader behaviors; effects of followers' self-concepts; further effects on followers; and the motivational mechanisms by which the leader behaviors generate the charismatic effects. As mentioned earlier, charismatic leaders elevate the intrinsic valence of goals by linking them to salient aspects of the follower's self-concept, thereby connecting the motivational forces of self-expression, self-consistency, self-esteem, and self-worth. They also increase self-efficacy and collective efficacy by giving positive evaluations and higher performance expectations, showing confidence in followers' ability to meet these expectations, and stressing the individual's ties to the group (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). There is another speculative rationale for expecting goals and self-efficacy to play a part in the sequence starting with vision and leading to action. Goals and self-efficacy have strong, direct effects on performance variations that surpass ability effects (Bandura, 1982; Locke, 1991; Locke, Frederick, Lee, & Bobko, 1984; Locke & Latham, 1990).

In addition to Shamir, House, and Arthur's (1993) self-concept based theory of the motivational effects of charismatic leadership, the current study also takes into account the three core components that are thought to make up charismatic leadership: envisioning, empathy, and empowerment (Choi, 2006). Conger (1989) is among those who suggested that envisioning, communication of vision, trust, and empowerment are the key components of charismatic leadership. Furthermore, many researchers defend that articulating an inspiring vision of the future is critical for leaders to mobilize followers (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1998; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Visions, like ideal possible selves, are future-

oriented (Berson, Shamir, Avolio, & Popper, 2001; Shamir et al., 1993). Communication a vision may produce follower effects such as increased efficiency, organizational identity, meaningfulness (Shamir et al., 1993), follower and organizational performance (Baum et al, 1998; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996), and follower motivation (Baum, Kirkpatrick, & Locke, 1998; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). Empirical research that accounts for when and why visions are effective is sparse (Stam, van Knippenberg, & Wisse, 2010). In an effort to unveil this mystery, Stam et al. (2010) suggested that one of the reasons why visions are effective might be because they encourage followers to create an ideal or hoped-for possible self.

Because visions pertain to the future, it would make sense that vision effectiveness may be explained by the part of the self-concept that deals with the future. Possible selves may explain how vision communication motivates followers, because they are associated with motivational and self-regulatory processes, such as identity development, long-term self-regulation, and social comparison processes (Dunkel, 2000; Ibarra, 1999; Lockwood & Kunda, 1997; Oyserman, Bybee, Terry, & Hart-Johnson, 2004; Oyserman & Markus, 1990). The possible self that is of the most interest in explaining vision effectiveness is the ideal or hoped-for possible self. This is based on the fact that ideal possible selves and visions both pertain to an ideal future. Visions may portray an image of an idealized future and this image may be internalized into an ideal possible self for followers (Stam et al., 2010). Furthermore, both possible selves and charismatic leadership deal with individual achievement, power, and affiliation motives (Markus & Nurius, 1986; Choi, 2006).

If the key component of charismatic leadership pertains to the inspiring vision presented by the leader, and presenting an inspiring vision to followers is associated with the follower's creation of an ideal possible self, one may suggest that the motivational mechanism by

charismatic leadership functions is through the possible self-concept in followers. For example, Stam et al. (2010) demonstrated that when a vision focused on followers by addressing them individually and encouraging them to think about the role they play in the vision, followers were more likely to create an ideal possible self in relation to this vision. Their findings highlight the importance of possible selves in vision effectiveness and as a result also shed light on the role possible selves may play in charismatic leadership. The current study seeks to extend the findings of Sham et al. (2010) by looking further than vision communication alone, to the additional components of charismatic leadership and how these components influence the creation of ideal possible selves in followers who interact with such leaders.

Charismatic Leadership and Academic Possible Selves

An individual's educational experience is a process that can be said to progress through stages. For example, a high school student has completed grammar school in his or her past, is presently attending high school, and is faced with the decision to continue their education by attending college in the future. Thus, an important component of individual's educational experience is future-oriented (Leondari, 2007). Possible selves are the future-oriented components of the self-schema and are considered the critical components for behavioral action and motivation (Oyserman & Markus, 1990b). Possible-self development is a two-part process: (a) the creation of possible selves based on past experiences and ideas about the future, and (b) successful attainment or prevention of created possible selves (Dunkel, 2000; Wurf & Markus, 1991; Markus & Nurius, 1987; Cross & Markus, 1991; Yowell, 2000, 2002). The distinction between hoped-for, expected, and feared selves is important because it demonstrates individuals do actually realize the differences in what they hope to happen compared to what they think will happen (Pizzolato, 2006). Students' hopes and desires are represented in hoped-for possible

selves, while their expected possible selves represent what they think they will actually become. The educator's role in transforming the student's perceived self-efficacy is critical. Educators can accomplish this by introducing possible future aspirations and developing a sense of academic empowerment (Terry, 2006).

A necessary condition for a leader's vision to have charismatic effects is that the vision is in alignment with the existing values and identities held by followers (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). For this reason, college graduation speeches addressing academic success were chosen as part of this study. It was assumed that the message of the leader would be in alignment with the followers' existing values and identities based on the fact that the students had already made the choice to further their education by attending college. Therefore, it was likely that the students had preexisting values and identities pertaining to the importance of academic success that could easily be activated by a charismatic leader. Given the literature describing the profound effects charismatic leaders have on their followers in respect to subsequent motivation and performance and the critical role the follower's self-concept plays in this process, there is reason to believe that the future-oriented component of the follower's self-concept, that is the possible self, is an important aspect of this motivational process. Specifically, this study hypothesized that the charismatic leader would motivate the students to endorse greater hoped-for and expected possible selves related to success, whereas the other leaders would not produce this effect.

Hypothesis one. Each of the three types of leadership demonstrated in its respective speech will result in a greater increase in reported hoped-for positive possible selves at post-test from pretest than will the control condition.

Hypothesis two. Transformational leadership will result in a greater increase in reported hoped-for and expected positive possible selves at post-test from pretest than will transactional leadership.

Hypothesis three. Charismatic leadership will result in a greater increase in reported hoped-for and expected positive possible selves as well as a decrease in reported hoped-for and expected negative possible selves at post-test from pretest than will transactional leadership.

Hypothesis four. Charismatic leadership will result in a greater increase in reported hoped-for and expected possible positive possible selves as well as a decrease in reported hoped-for and expected negative possible selves at post-test from pretest than will transformational leadership.

CHAPTER II: METHODS

Participants

The sample consisted of undergraduate students ($N = 192$) attending a large, southeastern University. In exchange for their participation in this study, students received 1.5 research participation credits through the university. This study was conducted through the university's online experiment management program. The age of participants in this study ranged from 18 to 50 ($M = 18.93$). The majority (77.6%) of participants were female ($n = 149$), while the remaining 22.4% of participants were male ($n = 43$). The majority of participants were also white (74.5%), with African Americans representing 20.8% of participants. Fewer than 5% of participants represented other races. Sixty-three and a half percent of participants indicated they were single, while 34.9% indicated they were not married but in a relationship, and the remaining 1.6% stated they were married. None of the participants were divorced or widowed. Almost all of the participants were enrolled in school full-time (97.4%), with the remaining 2.6% attending school part-time. One hundred and fifty-seven participants were freshman; 29 participants were sophomores; 5 participants were juniors; 1 participant was a senior. Only 27.6% of participants stated that they were employed, while the remaining 72.4% stated they were unemployed. Finally, of the 192 total participants, 41 were randomly assigned to the transactional condition; 52 to the transformational condition; 43 to the charismatic condition; and 56 to the control condition.

Measures

Demographics questionnaire. At the time of the pretest, all participants completed a questionnaire consisting of eleven questions designed to assess the demographics of the sample. The first question asked the participant his or her university ID in order to link responses from

pretest to posttest. The remaining ten questions pertained to the participant's age range, ethnicity, race, sex, marital status, highest level of education completed, current enrollment status in school, current employment status, and if applicable, current occupation. The questionnaire was administered electronically.

Possible selves questionnaire. Possible selves have been measured using both open- and closed-ended formats. Open-ended formats ask participants to generate their own possible selves, while closed-ended formats provide participants with a list of possible selves and asked to either endorse possible selves they deem relevant or to rate the likelihood of each of the possible selves listed (Lee & Oyserman, 2009). The current study utilized the closed-ended format so that the participant's pretest and posttest scores could be meaningfully compared with one another. For example, using an open-ended format would allow participants to describe different possible selves at posttest than at pretest, therefore making comparing the pretest and posttest scores difficult, whereas the closed-ended format can produce a summation score for a consistent set of possible selves so that the participant's posttest scores could be compared to his or her pretest responses more easily. The traditional closed-ended format produces summation scores of positive and negative possible selves across domains (Oyserman & Fryberg, 2006). Markus and Nurius's (1986) seminal article introduced the closed-ended measure to positive and negative possible selves with college students, although a number of different closed-ended measures exist in the literature. The current study utilized a short form of Markus's (1987) Possible Self Questionnaire and consisted of 32 items, 16 of which were classified as positive, 16 of which were classified as negative. Following Markus and Nurius (1986), the measure was presented in a matrix format although it was modified from its original format in the present study. Specifically, the original format presented the possible self descriptors and asked participants to

rate to what extent each descriptor “describes me now,” think this will describe me in the future,” and “like this to describe me in the future” all in one matrix. The present format asks participants to rate each of the possible selves using a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all like me*) to 7 (*very much like me*). However, the 32 possible selves are listed in three separate matrices, with one matrix for “describes me now,” one matrix for “think this will describe me in the future,” and one matrix for “like this to describe me in the future.” The rationale behind creating three possible selves matrices for each question was that it would cause students to have to think about each time period (i.e, now and future) distinctly, as opposed to rating each question side-by-side and perhaps not adequately thinking of each time period as distinct from the other.

Possible selves can be seen as valenced, thus the rationale behind positive possible selves and negative possible selves (Lee & Oyserman, 2009). In other words, individuals have positive regard for the selves he or she would like to become or expect to become and negative regard for the selves he or she would like to avoid becoming or fears becoming (Lee & Oyserman, 2009). Following Oyserman and Markus (1990), the three matrices were classified into six subscales for scoring purposes as follows: positive current self, negative current self, positive hoped-for self, negative hoped-for self, positive expected self, and negative expected self. Each of the six subscale scores signifies the mean level of endorsement of the items in that particular subscale. For instance, the positive current self score signifies the mean level of endorsement of the 16 positive possible self items for the matrix “describes me now,” while the negative hoped-for self score signifies the mean level or endorsement of the 16 negative possible self items for the matrix “like this to describe me in the future.” The positive possible self descriptors were as follows: in good shape, athletic, financially secure, travel extensively, content with life, self-employed, long-lived, good parent, famous, close to family, married, creative, competent, loved,

in good health, and carefree. The negative possible self descriptors were as follows: living in a nursing home, ordinary, have a breakdown, in poor health, unemployed, alone, street person, unwanted/forgotten by my family, on welfare, divorced, physically disabled, depressed, spouse/child abuser, bored, not in control of your life, and drug/alcohol dependent. The PSQ has a test-retest reliability of .72 for positive selves and .89 for negative selves. The PSQ has been used with college students, 13-16 year olds, middle school students, teen-aged mothers and their parents, adults recovering from life crises, and a variety of non-college student adults. The questionnaire was administered electronically.

Speeches. Videos of college graduation speeches from the past five years were recorded and analyzed to identify speeches given by a leader that could be classified as transactional, transformational, or charismatic. To maintain uniformity in the operationalization of these three leadership styles across research, the speeches were analyzed using two of the most widely used leadership scales utilized throughout the past three decades. Specifically, subject matter experts used a subset of items from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Bass, 1985) to identify both transactional and transformational leadership behaviors, while a subset of items from the Conger-Kanungo Scale of Charismatic Leadership (CKS) (Conger & Kanungo, 1987) was used to identify charismatic leadership behaviors. Using the items from each of the two scales, the analyzed speeches were reduced to three speeches, with each speech representing one of the three types of leadership examined in this study. The items used to identify transactional, transformational, and charismatic leadership can be found in Appendix D. In the present study, Arnold Schwarzenegger's commencement speech at Emory University was classified as transactional, while Steve Job's Stanford commencement speech was classified as

transformational. Barack Obama's commencement speech from Arizona State University was classified as charismatic.

Speeches from college graduations were selected for two reasons. First, the target audience for these types of speeches was college students. Second, speeches of this nature should be content relevant to the participants in the current study- that is, college students. For example, college students are more likely to be interested in a speech that pertains to his or her future as opposed to a speech that pertains to the newest invention or medical procedure, for example. Furthermore, male leaders will deliver the three speeches selected to represent each type of leadership. This was done to also maintain uniformity and prevent any chance of a confound pertaining to the gender of the person delivering the speech in relation to the participants interpreting the speech.

Subject matter expert rating survey. Using a subset of the items from the MLQ (Bass, 1985) pertaining to transactional and transformational leadership and a subset of the items from the CKS (Conger & Kanungo, 1987), seven subject matter experts (SME) rated the leader from each speech as transactional, transformational, or charismatic. Specifically, four of the eight transactional items from the MLQ and ten of the twenty transformational items from the MLQ were used to measure transactional and transformational leadership, respectively. In addition, ten of the twenty items from CKS were used to measure charismatic leadership. Subsets of items from these measures were used as opposed to measure in its entirety in order to maintain item relevance. For example, some of the items from both the MLQ and the CKS were irrelevant to use when rating a speech given by a leader as the items pertained to interactions between the leader and the follower. Accordingly, when viewing a speech the leader and the follower are unable to interact.

Master's candidates and full-time faculty from the Industrial and Organizational Psychology program of a large southeastern University were used as subject matter experts. Each subject matter expert has undergone academic training in the field of leadership and is regarded as qualified to rate leaders as a particular type of leader over another. The Master's candidates have completed at least one semester's work in both organizational behavior and leadership, in addition to other courses that reiterate the concepts learned in the formerly mentioned courses. The full-time faculty has undergone extensive training in the field of leadership having earned a Ph.D. in the field of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Each SME viewed each speech selected for this study. Following the completion of each speech, the SME completed the Subject Matter Expert Rating Survey pertaining to the speech he or she just viewed in order to rate his or her agreement with the leader's identified leadership type.

Inter-rater agreement (IRA) analyses were conducted to determine the subject matter expert agreement for the items used to assess each type of leadership. Inter-rater agreement refers to the total agreement in scores given by multiple raters for one or more targets, or in this case, items (LeBreton & Senter, 2008). James, Demaree, and Wolf's (1984, 1993) single-item r_{WG} and multi-item $r_{WG(j)}$ are regarded as the most common estimates of IRA. The r_{WG} estimate is used when multiple raters provide scores for a single target on a single variable on an interval scale of measurement, whereas the $r_{WG(j)}$ estimate is used when multiple raters provide scores for a single target on multiple variables or items. Accordingly, the $r_{WG(j)}$ was the appropriate estimate as each of the subject matter experts provided scores for a single target (each of the speeches independently) on multiple items. A $r_{WG(j)} = 0.0$ indicates a complete lack of agreement, while a $r_{WG(j)} = 1.0$ indicates perfect agreement. The $r_{WG(j)}$ statistic can be interpreted as the "proportional reduction in error variance" as it compares the observed variance in scores

given by multiple raters to the variance that would be expected had the judges responded completely at random (LeBreton & Senter, 2008, p. 819). LeBreton and Senter (2008) provided revised standards for interpreting IRA estimates. Previously, a dichotomous cutpoint of .70 had been used to denote high versus low IRA (Lance, Butts, & Michels, 2006). The revised standards created a guideline of heuristics, ranging from lack of agreement to very strong agreement. Following these guidelines, a $r_{WG(J)} = 0.71$ to $.90$ indicates “strong agreement,” whereas a $r_{WG(J)} = 0.91$ to 1.00 indicates “very strong agreement” (LeBreton & Senter, 2008, p. 836). The IRA for the transactional speech was $r_{WG(J)} = .83$. The IRA for the transformational speech was $r_{WG(J)} = .93$. The IRA for the charismatic speech was $r_{WG(J)} = .85$. Accordingly, it can be said that the seven subject matter experts had strong agreement with one another in classifying Arnold Schwarzenegger as transactional and very strong agreement with one another in classifying Steve Jobs as transformational and Barack Obama as charismatic.

Design

The design of the current study was that of a pretest-posttest with control group and multiple treatment groups. First, the Possible Selves Questionnaire II (PSQ II) was administered to participants as both a pretest and a posttest. Second, the group pertains to the speech each participant viewed, which resulted in four different groups as follows: control, transactional, transformational, and charismatic. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four groups. A one-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) on the difference scores between pretest and posttest by group was conducted to examine the effect of type of speech on change in reported possible selves. Correlated t tests were also conducted to examine the effects of type of speech of pretest-posttest change in reported possible selves collapsed across groups.

Procedure

The present study consisted of two parts. Neither part required the participant to come to a lab. Both parts of this study were completed from a personal or public computer with audio capability and Internet access. Part 1 took approximately 20 minutes to complete. Each participant first read the Informed Consent Form. Participants provided their consent to participate electronically by checking the box indicating his or her consent. Without providing this consent, the participant was not able to access the study. After providing electronic consent, the participant was instructed to type his or her University ID in the space provided. The University ID was used for two reasons. First, the University ID was entered during the pretest and the posttest so that the responses for each participant could be linked to each other. Second, entering the University ID made it easy to grant participants their research participation credit. Subsequently, the participant was instructed to complete an online survey consisting of the Possible Selves Questionnaire II. At the end of this session, participants were informed that they would receive e-mail in two days time with an invitation code to complete Part 2 of the study that same day in order to receive any credit for their participation. Following this statement, students were prompted to email the principal investigator if he or she had any questions about how to complete Part 2. The second part of the study consisted of one of four randomly assigned videos that the participant was instructed to view in its entirety. Each video was placed on a timer depending on its respective length so that participants could not move forward with the study until the video had finished playing in its entirety. Following the video, participants were prompted to complete an online survey consisting of the Possible Selves Questionnaire II. Part 2 of the study took approximately 40 minutes to complete.

CHAPTER III: ANALYSES

Data Screening

At the completion of the study, the data from both Parts 1 and 2 were screened to eliminate duplicate responses and eliminate participants that did not provide data for both Parts 1 and 2. Once each University ID for Part 1 and Part 2 matched one another, both data files were merged together in SPSS by Pirate ID to produce one data file containing one line of data for each participant with both Part 1 and Part 2 responses. Part 1 contained pretest data, while Part 2 contained posttest data. After removing duplicate responses and participants with missing data, a total of 192 participants remained in the final data file.

One-Way ANOVA

First, the grouping variable was created to classify each of the three experimental conditions and the one control condition. Then, difference scores were created for each of the six subscales' pretest-posttest scores. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of group on pretest-posttest difference scores for each of the six possible self subscales. As shown in Table 1, type of speech had no significant effect on change in possible selves. Specifically, type of speech had no significant effect on current positive possible selves, $F(3, 188) = 1.198$, $MSE = .179$, $p = .312$, or current negative possible selves, $F(3, 188) = 1.024$, $MSE = .279$, $p = .383$. Furthermore, type of speech had no significant effect on hoped-for positive possible selves, $F(3, 188) = .355$, $MSE = .456$, $p = .786$, or hoped-for negative possible selves, $F(3, 188) = .762$, $MSE = .331$, $p = .516$. Finally, type of speech had no significant effect on expected positive possible selves, $F(3, 188) = .284$, $MSE = .231$, $p = .837$, or expected negative possible selves, $F(3, 188) = .469$, $MSE = .368$, $p = .704$.

Table 1. *One-Way ANOVA*

		<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Diff Current Positive	Between Groups	3	.214	1.198	.312
	Within Groups	188	.179		
	Total	191			
Diff Current Negative	Between Groups	3	.286	1.024	.383
	Within Groups	188	.279		
	Total	191			
Diff Hoped Positive	Between Groups	3	.162	.355	.786
	Within Groups	188	.456		
	Total	191			

Diff Hoped Negative	Between	3	.252	.762	.516
	Groups				
	Within	188	.331		
	Groups				
	Total	191			
Diff Expected Positive	Between	3	.066	.284	.837
	Groups				
	Within	188	.231		
	Groups				
	Total	191			
Diff Expected Negative	Between	3	.173	.469	
	Groups				.704
	Within	188	.386		
	Groups				
	Total	191			

Correlated *t* Tests

A correlated *t* test was also conducted comparing pretest with posttest for each of the six possible self subscales. As shown in Table 2, posttest scores did differ significantly from pretest scores for two of the six possible self subscales. Participants' ($n = 192$) current negative possible selves were significantly lower at posttest ($M = 1.91, s = .646$) than at pretest ($M = 2.04, s = .550$), $t(191) = 3.194, p = .002$. Participants' ($n = 192$) expected positive possible selves was significantly lower at posttest ($M = 5.48, s = .608$) than at pretest ($M = 5.56, s = .633$), $t(191) = 2.417, p = .017$. Descriptive statistics are shown below in Table 3.

Table 2. *Correlated t Tests*

	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Diff Current Positive	.724	191	.470	.022	-.038	.082
Diff Current Negative	3.194	191	.002*	.122	.047	.197
Diff Hoped Positive	-1.350	191	.179	-.065	-.161	.030
Diff Hoped Negative	-.361	191	.718	-.015	-.097	.067
Diff Expected Positive	2.417	191	.017*	.083	.015	.151
Diff Expected Negative	-.090	191	.929	-.004	-.089	.082

* $p < .05$

Table 3. *Descriptive Statistics*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Current Positive PS	192	3	6	4.25	.578
Post Current PPS	192	2.437	5.937	4.227	.577
Current Negative PS	192	1	3	2.04	.550
Post Current NPS	192	1	5	1.913	.645
Hoped for Positive PS	192	4	7	5.94	.710
Post Hoped for PPS	192	3.50	7	6.006	.596
Hoped for Negative PS	192	1	4	1.41	.440
Post Hoped for NPs	192	1	5.312	1.428	.557
Expected Positive PS	192	4	7	5.56	.633
Post Expected PPS	192	3.687	6.812	5.480	.607
Expected Negative PS	192	1	4	1.70	.569

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

The results of this study fail to support any of its hypotheses. Unfortunately, the one-way ANOVA demonstrated that the type of speech (representing type of leadership) viewed by participants had no significant effect on pretest-posttest changes in reported possible selves, regardless of the subscale being examined. The alternative analysis did produce significant results for two of the six subscales, although neither of these significant effects was initially hypothesized. The type of speech viewed significantly reduced reported current negative possible selves. This demonstrates that the type of speech viewed may have had an effect on how the participant perceived his or herself currently. In particular, the type of speech viewed may have reduced the negative self-conception the participants had regarding themselves prior to watching the speech. On the other hand, the type of speech viewed also significantly reduced reported expected positive possible selves. This demonstrates that the type of speech viewed actually altered the way the participant viewed what he or she expected to accomplish in the future for the worse. The implications of these results are discussed below.

No Effect Existed

There are a number of possibilities that could explain why the results of this study were not as hypothesized. First and foremost, it is possible that there simply was no relationship to find. In other words, it is possible that there is no relationship between leadership style and the amount of possible selves that are created by followers. If this were the case, researchers would need to reexamine the possible motivational mechanisms underlying the relationship between charismatic leaders and their followers. However, in light of the existing literature, it is also likely that a number of other possibilities exist to explain the results of the present study. Future

research should attempt to examine the relationship between leadership style and the possible self-concept while incorporating the following recommendations and modifications.

Achievement Motivation as a Moderator

It is also possible that an effect for type of speech viewed may have been found in achievement motivation had been measured and controlled at pretest. That is, using achievement motivation as a moderator variable may have uncovered an effect for type of speech viewed by participants. For example, Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) suggests that follower characteristics exist that may moderate the extraordinary follower effects of charismatic leadership. In addition, some followers may be more receptive to charismatic leadership than others (Choi, 2006). For example, Howell and Shamir (2005) found that followers' self-perceptions could influence their susceptibility to charismatic leadership. Another follower characteristic that may influence an individual's susceptibility to charismatic leadership is an individual's need for achievement. The need for achievement refers to the concern for long-term involvement, competition against an identified standard of excellence, and unique accomplishment (McClelland, 1985; Choi, 2006). A strong interest in tasks requiring moderate to high skill level and problem-solving ability, a tendency to create reasonably difficult goals, a preference for objective feedback, and a preference for intrinsic satisfaction all distinguish an individual with a high need for achievement (Choi, 2006). Charismatic leaders are able to increase their followers' need for achievement more so than other leaders by utilizing envisioning behaviors, and as a result, obtain high task performance from their followers (Choi, 2006).

Another way of looking at the need for achievement is by examining the concept of achievement motivation. Throughout the past six decades, there have been several theoretical

conceptualizations of achievement motivation, although a select few have been consistently identified as the most influential while one in particular has garnered the most research attention in the past two decades, known as the achievement goal approach (Elliot & McGregor, 1999, 2001; McGregor & Elliot, 2002). Most recently, a hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation was developed to incorporate both the achievement motive approach (e.g., Atkinson, 1957; McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953; Murray, 1938) and the achievement goal approach (e.g., Dweck, 1986; Nicholls, 1984). This hierarchical model identifies the need for achievement and the fear of failure as achievement motives that are general and higher order motivational tendencies, while achievement goals are identified as more concrete, midlevel cognitive representations that guide individuals toward specific end states (Elliot & McGregor, 1999). Achievement motives (i.e., need for achievement and fear of failure) are the predecessors of achievement goals, which in turn predict achievement-related outcomes (Elliot & McGregor, 1999). After a number of revisions to the original framework of this hierarchical model, Elliot and McGregor (2001) presented a 2x2 framework for the achievement goal model. In other words, achievement goals are distinguished using two separate dimensions. The first dimension pertains to the referent used to evaluate competence. On this dimension, individuals undertake tasks or goals using either one of two goal types: mastery and performance goals (e.g., Dweck, 1986; Nicholls, 1984). Specifically, mastery goals refer to the development of competence through task mastery, while performance goals refer to demonstrating competence in relation to others (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; McGregor & Elliot, 2002). Second, individuals undertake tasks or goals in terms of either one of two valences: positive and negative valences. A positive valence refers to a positive, desirable possibility such as success, while a negative valence refers to a negative, undesirable possibility such as failure (Elliot & McGregor,

2001). A positive valence is indicative of approaching success, while a negative valence is indicative of avoiding failure. Incorporating the different combinations of these two dimensions results in four different achievement goals.

Performance-approach goals focus on attaining competence in relation to the performance of others, whereas performance-avoidance goals focus on avoiding incompetence in relation to the performance of others. On the other hand, mastery-approach goals focus on achieving task mastery on an absolute or interpersonal level, whereas mastery-avoidance goals focus on avoiding task failure on an absolute or interpersonal level. Elliot and McGregor (2001) conducted exploratory factor analyses and confirmatory factor analyses to test the existence of this 2x2 framework and found that each of the four achievement goals represented empirically distinct and internally consistent constructs. Furthermore, Elliot and McGregor (2001) also conducted a regression analysis to determine the influence of the antecedent variables of overall need for achievement, fear of failure, and SAT scores, while controlling for SAT scores. They concluded overall need for achievement was a positive predictor for mastery-approach goals, and fear of failure was a positive predictor of mastery-avoidance goals. In addition, both overall need for achievement and fear of failure were positive predictors of performance-approach goals, and fear of failure was a positive predictor of performance-avoidance goals.

Future research may be able to examine achievement motivation as a moderator of the effects of charismatic leadership on followers by utilizing Elliot and McGregor's (2001) 2x2 achievement goal framework. It is possible that the motivational effects of charismatic leadership would be greater for participants with high achievement motivation than participants with low achievement motivation, although it is also possible that this would occur across all leadership conditions. That is, participants with high achievement motivation will create greater numbers of

positive possible selves at posttest than from pretest than will participants with low achievement motivation across all leadership conditions. In other words, individuals with a mastery-approach to achievement goals may create significantly more positive possible selves at posttest than pretest across all leadership conditions, followed by individuals with a performance-approach to achievement goals. More importantly, when controlling for achievement motivation, it is possible participants in the charismatic leadership condition will create more positive possible selves at posttest than from pretest than participants in the control, transactional, or transformational conditions.

Considering Sample Size

Another limitation of this study that could explain the lack of significance pertains to the small sample size. With four different groups, the total sample of 192 was significantly smaller than what one would normally consider adequate. In addition, due to the random assignment to groups in Qualtrics, the number of participants assigned to each group was not equally balanced. In fact, the control condition contained more participants than any of the other three experimental conditions. Future research should aim to have an approximate overall sample size of 400 with the number assigned to each condition as equally balanced as possible. Also, although not a likely determinant in this study, future research should also aim to examine individuals that are employed. Over 70% of the participants in the current study indicated they were unemployed. It is possible that these individuals have not yet had the life experiences that provide them with the schemas to imagine the various possible selves described in the PSQ II, whereas individuals who have been employed may have had broader experiences that allow them to refer to the possible self descriptions utilized in this study.

Previous Exposure and Bias

Two more limitations exist in the current study that could have hindered potentially significant results. First, the leaders used in the videos were all well recognized individuals within the media. As a result, participants had more than certainly been previously exposed to them at some point. Therefore, it is possible that participants had already developed opinions and/or biases toward or against these leaders that could have influenced their perception of them and subsequently the effect the speaker has on him or her. Furthermore, male leaders were used in all of the videos for the present study. This was done to prevent a possible confound. Specifically, leaders of the same were used so that any effect resulting from the leader's speeches over another could not be attributed to that particular leader being a man over a woman or vice versa. However, it is possible in doing this that a different but important confound may have been introduced. That is, all of the leaders being men may have had an undesirable effect on the predominantly female sample used in the present study. Future research may consider developing speeches that are content relevant to his or her sample of interest and have unknown actors recite these speeches using the appropriate jargon and communication style for the corresponding leadership style. In addition, future research should examine the effects of both male and female leaders on participants. This way, participants will not have had the opportunity to be previously influenced by or unconsciously biased toward or against the leader.

Experimental Setting

Finally, the design of the current study enabled participants to participate in both parts of the study outside of the lab from his or her personal computer as opposed to completing the study in a controlled laboratory setting. Although convenient for both the researcher and the participants, this allowed for a number of confounds to be introduced to the study. While

completing the study at home, it is possible that participants did not actually focus on the speech as he or she was asked to do. He or she may have been surfing the web or even cleaning their room, missing out on important aspects of the particular experimental condition. Future research should require participants to complete at least Part 2 of the study in the laboratory setting. Doing so will allow the researcher to ensure that participants are watching the speech in its entirety in addition to focusing his or her full attention on the speaker.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

The current study set out to demonstrate that leadership style affects the follower's possible self-concept. Alternatively, the one-way ANOVA demonstrated that leadership style (represented by type of speech) had no significant effect on the pretest-posttest change in participants' reported possible selves. A correlated one-way *t* test indicated that leadership style (represented by type of speech) significantly reduced reported current negative possible selves and expected positive possible selves. These results were not expected, and the latter of the two significant effects seems unlikely given the existing research on leadership style and the self-concept. Future research focusing on leadership style and possible selves should aim to resolve the limitations of the current study to better examine the effects of leadership style on the possible self-concept.

REFERENCES

- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1998). You can drag a horse to water but you can't make it drink unless it is thirsty. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(1), 4-17.
doi:10.1177/107179199800500102
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-462.
doi:10.1348/096317999166789
- Avolio, B. J., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Operational charismatic leadership using a levels-of-analysis framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(3), 193-208. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(90)90020-I
- Banaji, M. R., & Prentice, D. A. (1994). The self in social contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 45, 297-332. doi:10.1146/annurev.ps.45.020194.001501
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the

vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*.

Mahwah, NJ US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership.

European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology, 8(1), 9-32.

doi:10.1080/135943299398410

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Developing Transformational Leadership: 1992 and

Beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14(5), 21-27. Retrieved from

EBSCOhost.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M.

M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 49-80). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Baum, J., Locke, E. A., & Kirkpatrick, S. A. (1998). A longitudinal study of the relation of

vision and vision communication to venture growth in entrepreneurial firms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 43-54. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.83.1.43

Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, G. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY:

Harper & Row.

Berlew, D. E. (1974). Leadership and organizational excitement. In D. A. Kolb, I. M. Rubin, J.

M. McIntyre (Eds.), *Organizational psychology: A book of readings*. (2nd Ed.) Oxford England: Prentice-Hall.

- Berson, Y., Shamir, B., Avolio, B. J., & Popper, M. (2001). The relationship between vision strength, leadership style, and context. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12*(1), 53-73.
doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00064-9
- Blau, P. M. (1963). *The dynamics of bureaucracy: study of interpersonal relations in two government agencies* (rev. ed.). University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL.
- Boal, K. B., & Bryson, J. M. (1988). Charismatic leadership: A phenomenological and structural approach. In J. Hunt, B. Baliga, H. Dachler, C. A. Schriesheim, J. Hunt, B. Baliga, ... C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 11-28). Lexington, MA England: Lexington Books/D. C. Heath and Com.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 901-910.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.901
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Socialized charismatic leadership, values congruence, and deviance in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 954-962.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.954
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2009). Leader–follower values congruence: Are socialized charismatic leaders better able to achieve it? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 478-490.
doi:10.1037/a0014069
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Carver, C. S., Lawrence, J. W., & Scheier, M. F. (1999). Self-discrepancies and affect:

- Incorporating the role of feared selves. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 783-792. doi:10.1177/0146167299025007002
- Chemers, M. M. (2000). Leadership research and theory: A functional integration. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 4(1), 27-43. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.4.1.27
- Choi, J. (2006). A motivational theory of charismatic leadership: Envisioning, empathy, and empowerment. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13(1), 24-43.
- Conger, J. (1985). Charismatic leadership in business: An exploratory study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard Business School, Boston, MA.
- Conger, J. A. (1989). *The charismatic leader: Behind the mystique of exceptional leadership*. San Francisco, CA US: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J. A. (1991). Inspiring others: the language of leadership. *Executive (19389779)*, 5(1), 31-45. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- 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.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637-647.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 471-482. doi:10.2307/258093
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in*

organizational effectiveness. San Francisco, CA US: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 747-767. doi:10.1002/1099-1379(200011)21:7<747::AID-JOB46>3.0.CO;2-J

Cross, S., & Markus, H. (1991). Possible selves across the life span. *Human Development*, 34, 230-255. doi:10.1159/000277058

Cross, S. E., & Markus, H. (1994). Self-schemas, possible selves, and competent performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86, 423-438. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.86.3.423

Deluga, R. J. (1995). The relationship between attributional charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 1652-1669. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1995.tb02638.x

Dow, J. E. (1969). The theory of charisma. *Sociological Quarterly*, 10, 306-318. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Dunkel, C. S. (2000). Possible selves as a mechanism for identity exploration. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 519-529. doi:10.1006/jado.2000.0340

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 735-744.

- Dweck, C. S. (1991). Self-theories and goals: Their role in motivation, personality, and development. In R. A. Dienstbier, R. A. Dienstbier (Eds.) , Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1990: *Perspectives on motivation* (pp. 199-235). Lincoln, NE US: University of Nebraska Press. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Eden, D. (1990). Pygmalion without interpersonal contrast effects: Whole groups gain from raising manager expectations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 394-398.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.75.4.394
- Eden, D. (1992). Leadership and expectations: Pygmalion effects and other self-fulfilling prophecies in organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly, 3*, 271-305. doi:10.1016/1048-9843(92)90018-B
- Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (1999). Test anxiety and the hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 628-644.
- Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2x2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 501-519. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.80.3.501
- Erez, A., Misangyi, V. F., Johnson, D. E., LePine, M. A., & Halverson, K. C. (2008). Stirring the hearts of followers: Charismatic leadership as the transferal of affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 602-616. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.602
- Friedman, H. S., Prince, L. M., Riggio, R. E., & DiMatteo, M. (1980). Understanding and assessing nonverbal expressiveness: The Affective Communication Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 333-351. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.39.2.333

- Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 32-58.
- Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 695-702.
- Higgins, E. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280-1300.
doi:10.1037/0003-066X.52.12.1280
- Hooker, K., & Kaus, C. R. (1992). Possible selves and health behaviors in later life. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 4, 390-411. doi:10.1177/089826439200400304
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp.189-207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R. J., & Baetz, M. L. (1979). Leadership: Some empirical generalizations and new research directions. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (pp. 1341-1423). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- House, R. J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. In M. M. Chemers, R. Ayman, M. M. Chemers, R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 81-107). San Diego, CA US: Academic Press.
- House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3, 81-108.

- House, R. J., Woycke, J., & Fodor, E. M. (1988). Charismatic and noncharismatic leaders: Differences in behavior and effectiveness. In J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 98-121). San Francisco, CA US: Jossey-Bass.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 891-902.
- Howell, J. M., & Frost, P. J. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 43*, 243-269. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(89)90052-6
- Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review, 30*, 96-112.
- Ibarra, H. (1999). Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44*, 764-791. doi:10.2307/2667055
- James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 85-98.
- James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1993). r_{WG} : An assessment of within-group interrater agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 306-309.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 751-765. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.751

- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 755-768.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755
- Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Ilies, R. (2004). The Forgotten Ones? The Validity of Consideration and Initiating Structure in Leadership Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 36-51. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.36
- Jung, D. I. (2000). Transformational and transactional leadership and their effects on creativity in groups. *Creativity Research Journal, 13*(2), 185-195.
- Kanter, R. M. (1979). Power failure in management circuits. *Harvard Business Review, 57*(4), 65-75. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Kanungo, R., & Mendonca, M. (1996). *Ethical dimensions of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kendall, P. C., Lerner, R. M., & Craighead, W. (1984). Human development and intervention in childhood psychopathology. *Child Development, 55*(1), 71-82. doi:10.2307/1129835
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: do traits matter?. *Executive (19389779), 5*(2), 48-60. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 36-51. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.81.1.36
- Koh, W. L., Steers, R. M., & Terborg, J. R. (1995). The effects of transformation leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational*

Behavior, 16, 319-333. doi:10.1002/job.4030160404

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA US: Jossey-Bass.

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 648-657. doi:10.2307/258070

Lance, C. E., Butts, M. M., & Michels, L. C. (2006). The sources of four commonly reported cutoff criteria: What did they really say? *Organizational Research Methods*, 9, 202-220.

LeBreton, J. M., & Senter, J. L. (2008). Answers to 20 questions about interrater reliability and interrater agreement. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11, 815-852. doi: 10.1177/1094428106296642

Lee, S. J. & Oyserman, D. (2009). Possible selves theory. In E. Anderman & L. Anderman (Eds.), *Psychology of classroom learning: An encyclopedia*. Detroit, Michigan: Macmillan Reference USA.

Leondari, A. (2007). Future time perspective, possible selves, and academic achievement. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 114, 17-26. doi: 10.1002/ace.253

Lerner, R. M. (1982). Children and adolescents as producers of their own development. *Developmental Review*, 2, 342-370. doi:10.1016/0273-2297(82)90018-1

Locke, E. A. (1991). Goal theory vs. control theory: Contrasting approaches to understanding work motivation. *Motivation and Emotion*, 15(1), 9-28. doi:10.1007/BF00991473

- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). Work motivation and satisfaction: Light at the End of the Tunnel. *Psychological Science, 1*, 240-246. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Locke, E. A., & Taylor, M. (1991). Stress, coping, and the meaning of work. In A. Monat, R. S. Lazarus, A. Monat, R. S. Lazarus (Eds.), *Stress and coping: An anthology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 140-157). New York, NY US: Columbia University Press.
- Locke, E. A., Frederick, E., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1984). Effect of self-efficacy, goals, and task strategies on task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 241-251.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.69.2.241
- Lockwood, P., & Kunda, Z. (1997). Superstars and me: Predicting the impact of role models on the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 91-103. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.91
- Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2001). Leadership, values, and subordinate self-concepts. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12*(2), 133-152. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00072-8
- Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2004). *Leadership processes and follower self-identity*. Mahwah, NJ US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., & Freiberg, S. J. (1999). Understanding the dynamics of leadership: The role of follower self-concepts in the leader/follower relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 78*(3), 167-203. doi:10.1006/obhd.1999.2832
- Lord, R. G., & Emrich, C. G. (2000). Thinking outside the box by looking inside the box: Extending the cognitive revolution in leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly, 11*,

551-579. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00060-6

Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 63-78. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.35.2.63

Markus, H. (1983). Self-knowledge: An expanded view. *Journal of Personality*, *51*, 543-565. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1983.tb00344.x

Markus, H. (1987). Possible selves questionnaire. Available from H. Markus, Department of Psychology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305–2130.

Markus, H., Cross, S., & Wurf, E. (1990). The role of the self-system in competence. In R. J. Sternberg, J. r. Kolligian, R. J. Sternberg, J. R. Kolligian (Eds.), *Competence considered* (pp. 205-225). New Haven, CT US: Yale University Press.

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, *41*, 954-969. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.41.9.954

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1987). Possible selves: The interface between motivation and the self-concept. In K. Yardley, T. Honess, K. Yardley, T. Honess (Eds.), *Self and identity: Psychosocial perspectives* (pp. 157-172). Oxford England: John Wiley & Sons.

Markus, H., & Ruvolo, A. (1989). Possible selves: Personalized representations of goals. In L. A. Pervin, L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Goal concepts in personality and social psychology* (pp. 211-241). Hillsdale, NJ England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *38*, 299-337. doi:10.1146/annurev.ps.38.020187.001503

- Martin, J., & Siehl, C. (1983). Organizational culture and counterculture: An uneasy symbiosis. *Organizational Dynamics, 12*(2), 52-64. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(83)90033-5
- McClelland, D. C. (1985). How motives, skills, and values determine what people do. *American Psychologist, 40*, 812-825. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.40.7.812
- McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation*. Glenview, CA: Scott Foresman.
- McGregor, H. A., & Elliot, A. J. (2002). Achievement goals as predictors of achievement-relevant processes prior to task engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*, 381-395. doi: 10.1037//0022-0663.94.2.381
- McHugh, P. (1968). *Defining the situation: The organization of meaning in social interaction*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merril.
- Ogilvie, D. M., & Clark, M. D. (1992). The best and worst of it: Age and sex differences in self-discrepancy research. In R. P. Lipka, T. M. Brinthaupt, R. P. Lipka, T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), *Self-perspectives across the life span* (pp. 186-222). Albany, NY US: State University of New York Press.
- Oyserman, D., Bybee, D., Terry, K., & Hart-Johnson, T. (2004). Possible selves as roadmaps. *Journal of Research in Personality, 38*, 130-149. doi:10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00057-6
- Oyserman, D., & Fryberg, S. (2006). The possible selves of diverse adolescents: Content and function across gender, race, and national origin. In C. Dunkel & J. Kerpelman (Eds.), *Possible selves: Theory, research, and application*. Huntington, NY: Nova.
- Oyserman, D., Gant, L., & Ager, J. (1995). A socially contextualized model of African American identity: Possible selves and school persistence. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, 69, 1216-1232. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.69.6.1216

Oyserman, D., & Markus, H. (1990a). Possible selves in balance: Implications for delinquency.

Journal of Social Issues, 46(2), 141-157. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Oyserman, D., & Markus, H. R. (1990b). Possible selves and delinquency. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 112-125. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.59.1.112

Pizzolato, J. (2006). Achieving college student possible selves: Navigating the space between

commitment and achievement of long-term identity goals. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic*

Minority Psychology, 12(1), 57-69. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.12.1.57

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational

leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and

organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.

doi:10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7

Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual

and empirical extensions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 329-354.

doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.009

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and*

Personality, 9, 185-211.

Sashkin, M. (1988). The visionary leader. In J. A. Conger, R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic*

leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness (pp. 122-160). San

Francisco, CA US: Jossey-Bass.

- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4, 577-594.
- Sosik, J. J. (2000). Meaning from within: Possible selves and personal meaning of charismatic and non-charismatic leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(2), 3-17.
doi:10.1177/107179190000700201
- Sosik, J. J. (2000). The role of personal meaning in charismatic leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(2), 60-74. doi:10.1177/107179190000700206
- Sosik, J. J., Avolio, B. J., & Kahai, S. S. (1997). Effects of leadership style and anonymity on group potency and effectiveness in a group decision support system environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 89-103.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 1442-1465.
doi:10.2307/256865
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1996). Social structural characteristics of psychological empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 483-504. doi:10.2307/256789
- Stam, D., van Knippenberg, D., & Wisse, B. (2010). Focusing on followers: The role of regulatory focus and possible selves in visionary leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 457-468. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.009
- Strange, J. M., & Mumford, M. D. (2002). The origins of vision: Charismatic versus ideological leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 343-377. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00125-X

- Strange, J. M., & Mumford, M. D. (2005). The origins of vision: Effects of reflection, models, and analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(1), 121-148. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.07.006
- Terry, M. (2006). Making a difference in learners' lives: Results of a study based on adult literacy programs. *Adult Basic Education, 16*, 3-19.
- Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). The transformational leader. *Training & Development Journal, 40*(7), 27-32. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Towler, A. J. (2003). Effects of charismatic influence training on attitudes, behavior, and performance. *Personnel Psychology, 56*, 363-381.
- van Knippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., De Cremer, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2004). Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*, 825-856. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.09.002
- Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and society*, ed. Roth G, Wittich C. New York, NY: Bedminster Press Incorporated.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1991). Relations between social competence and academic achievement in early adolescence. *Child Development, 62*, 1066-1078. doi:10.2307/1131152
- Williams, E. S. (1994). Tying up loose ends: The role of transformational leadership in OCBs, commitment, trust, and fairness perceptions. Unpublished Paper, Southern Management Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Willner, A. R. (1984). *The spellbinders: Charismatic political leadership*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Wurf, E., & Markus, H. (1991). Possible selves and the psychology of personal growth. In D. J. Ozer, J. R. Healy, A. J. Stewart, D. J. Ozer, J. R. Healy, A. J. Stewart (Eds.), *Perspectives*

- in personality, Vol. 3: Part A: Self and emotion; Part B: Approaches to understanding lives* (pp. 39-62). London England: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among Naval officers: Some preliminary findings. In K. E. Clark & M. R. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 151-169). West Orange, NY: Leadership Library of America.
- Yowell, C. M. (2000). Possible selves and future orientation: Exploring hopes and fears of Latino boys and girls. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 20*, 245-280.
doi:10.1177/0272431600020003001
- Yowell, C. M. (2002). Dreams of the future: The pursuit of education and career possible selves among ninth grade Latino youth. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(2), 62-72.
doi:10.1207/S1532480XADS0602_2
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management, 15*, 251-289. doi:10.1177/014920638901500207
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zaleznik, A., & Kets de Vries, M. F. (1975). *Power and the corporate mind*. Oxford England: Houghton Mifflin.

APPENDIX A: IRB APPROVAL LETTER



Informed Consent to Participate in Research

Information to consider before taking part in research that has no more than minimal risk.

Title of Research Study: Examining the Effects of Leadership Style on the Follower's Self-Concept

Principal Investigator: Ashley Miller
Institution/Department or Division: East Carolina University, Department of Psychology
Address: 104 Rawl Building, Department of Psychology, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC 27858-4353
Telephone #: 843-457-6055

Researchers at East Carolina University (ECU) study problems in society, health problems, environmental problems, behavior problems and the human condition. Our goal is to try to find ways to improve the lives of you and others. To do this, we need the help of volunteers who are willing to take part in research.

Why is this research being done?

The purpose of this research is to examine the impact of college graduation speeches. The decision to take part in this research is yours to make.

Why am I being invited to take part in this research?

You are being invited to take part in this research because you are a student enrolled in college. If you volunteer to take part in this research, you will be one of approximately 500 participants.

Are there reasons I should not take part in this research?

There are no foreseeable reasons why you should not take part in this research.

What other choices do I have if I do not take part in this research?

You can choose not to participate.

Where is the research going to take place and how long will it last?

The research procedures will be conducted via a private or public personal computer with Internet access. You will not need to come to the East Carolina University campus at any time during the study. There are two sessions that must be completed in order to fully participate in this study. The total amount of time you will be asked to volunteer for this study is an hour and a half over the next two days.

What will I be asked to do?

You are being asked to do the following:
• The study will consist of two sessions. Neither of the sessions will require you to come to a lab. Both sessions of this study can be completed from a personal or public computer with audio capability and Internet access.

UMC/IRB Number: 11-065

Consent Version # or Date: 02/02/11
UMC/IRB Version 2010.05.01

FROM 2-10-11 UMCIRB APPROVED
1-30-12

Participant's Initials

APPENDIX B: POSSIBLE SELVES QUESTIONNAIRE II (MARKUS, 1987)

Instructions:

Listed below are a number of possible selves that other people have thought of. We are interested in what possible selves you may have considered.

The following questionnaire asks three questions about each item in the column on the extreme left: “How much does this possible self describe you now?”, “How much would you like this possible self to describe you in the future?”, and “How much do you think that this possible self will describe you in the future?”

Please use the scale below to indicate your answers to these questions. For example, the first question asks “How much does this possible self describe you now?” If this possible self does not describe you at all, mark a “1” (not at all) in the blank beside the word. If this possible self describes you very much, please mark a “7” (very much) in the blank beside the word.

The second question asks, “How much would you like this to be a possible self for you?” If you are quite sure that you would not like to be this self, mark “1.” If you would like very much to see yourself like this, mark “7.” Choose a number in between for less extreme judgments of how much you would like this possible self for you.

The last question asks, “For you, how likely is this possible self?” If you have considered this as a possibility for you, but the chances seem very small that this will ever characterize you, mark “1” (not at all). If you are very certain that you will become this way, mark “7” (very much). Again, use the numbers in between to indicate less extreme responses.

Please mark your answers in the blank beside the word or words. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Please work very rapidly on this questionnaire. We are interested in your first thoughts and responses about your possible selves.

SCALE

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at all somewhat very much

Example Items from Possible Selves Questionnaire II:

Possible Self:	Describes you now	Like this to describe you in the future	Think this will describe you in the future
Financially secure			
Self-employed			
Ordinary			
Good parent			
Famous			
Close to family			
Unemployed			
On welfare			
Creative			
Depressed			
Loved			

APPENDIX C: SPEECH DESCRIPTIONS AND VIDEO LINKS

All participants will view a video of either one of three college graduation speeches or a video of a statistics lecture given by Karl L. Weunsch, PhD.

The statistics lecture was recorded in June of 2000 at 8: 00 am during a section of PSYC 2101. This lecture was selected to serve as the control condition of the study because it was suggested that a statistics lecture, although academically relevant, should not act as an inspiration or serve to motivate any of the participants seeing as it is simply a lecture pertaining to statistical procedures. This lecture is approximately 20 minutes long. The video will be embedded into the online experiment management system and viewed by participants after completing the appropriate instruments.

The three videos of college graduation speeches were selected to represent three different types of leadership. First, Arnold Schwarzenegger's Emory University commencement speech was selected to represent transactional leadership. This speech was selected for this purpose because the California governor, although giving a speech intended to motivate the graduating class, speaks to the audience in terms of financial gain and rewards they can expect to receive for their hard work. By motivating graduates extrinsically, he best represents transactional leadership. This speech is approximately 26 minutes long. The video will be embedded into the online experiment management system and viewed by participants after completing the appropriate instruments. The link for the video is:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IR_9uj5maUs.

Second, Steve Jobs' Stanford University commencement speech was selected to represent transformational leadership. This speech was selected for this purpose because the CEO of Apple motivates the audience intrinsically. He speaks about the value of hard work and the intrinsic

satisfaction of doing something you love. His speech is both motivating and inspirational but falls just short of charismatic due to his rhetoric and communication style. This speech is approximately 22 minutes long. The video will be embedded into the online experiment management system and viewed by participants after completing the appropriate instruments.

The link for the video is: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hd_ptbiPoXM.

Third, Barack Obama's Arizona State University commencement speech was selected to represent charismatic leadership. This speech was selected for this purpose because the President speaks to the audience about doing something for the greater good of all, references the importance of the collective group (i.e., our country), utilizes charismatic rhetoric such as "you" and "we," and inspires listeners to put aside their own self-interests for the sake of something bigger. This speech is approximately 28 minutes long after an eight-minute introduction by the chancellor (participants will not view the introduction by the chancellor). The video will be embedded into the online experiment management system and viewed by participants after completing the appropriate instruments. The link for the video is:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qbel5MhtDq4>.

APPENDIX D: SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT RATING QUESTIONNAIRE

Subject matter experts will use the following questionnaire to rate each of the three speeches. Answer each description by marking your response using a 1 (*never*) to 6 (*always*) Likert scale below.

Items from Subject Matter Expert Rating Questionnaire Adapted from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Conger-Kanungo Scale of Charismatic Leadership (CKS):

1. Transactional Leadership: Arnold Schwarzenegger

	Never	Not Often	Occasionally	Average	Frequently	Always
Provide me with assistance in exchange for my efforts						
Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets						
Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved						
Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards						

2. Considering the definition of a transactional leader, overall, would you say that Arnold Schwarzenegger can be considered a transactional leader?

Yes
 No

3. Transformational Leadership: Steve Jobs

	Never	Not Often	Occasionally	Average	Frequently	Always
Acts in ways that builds my respect						
Displays a sense of power and confidence						
Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs						
Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose						
Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished						
Articulates a compelling vision of the future						
Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved						
Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems						
Gets me to look at problems from many different angles						
Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others						

4. Considering the definition of a transformational leader, overall, would you say that Steve Jobs can be considered a transformational leader?

___ Yes
 ___ No

5. Charismatic Leadership: Barack Obama

	Never	Not Often	Occasionally	Average	Frequently	Always
Inspirational; able to motivate by articulating effectively the importance of what organizational members are doing						
Exciting public speaker						
Entrepreneurial; seizes new opportunities in order to achieve goals						
Has vision; often brings up ideas about possibilities for the future						
Readily recognizes constraints in the physical environment (technological limitations, lack of resources, etc.) that may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives						
Readily recognizes constraints in the organization's social and cultural environment (cultural norms, lack of grass roots support, etc.) that						

may stand in the way of achieving organizational objectives						
Recognizes the abilities and skills of other members of the organization						
Often expresses personal concern for the needs and feelings of other members in the organization						
Takes high personal risks for the sake of the organization						
Often exhibits very unique behavior that surprises other members of the organization						

6. Considering the definition of a charismatic leader, overall, would you say that Barack Obama can be considered a charismatic leader?

Yes
 No

APPENDIX E: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please enter your University ID (e.g., smithj11). This information is used only to link your responses across Part 1 and Part 2 of this study and to ensure you receive your research participation credit. Your University ID will not be associated with your responses and your confidentiality is guaranteed throughout your participation as well as after completion of the study. Again, please enter your University ID- NOT your BannerID.

2. What is your age in years?

3. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

- No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano
- Yes, Puerto Rican
- Yes, Cuban
- Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin

4. What is your race?

- White
- Black, African American, or Negro
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian (e.g., Asian Indian, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, or other Asian)
- Pacific Islander (e.g., Native Hawaiian, Guamanian, Chamorro, or other Pacific Islander)

5. What is your sex?

- Male
- Female

6. What is your marital status?

- Single
- Not Married, In a Relationship

Married
Divorced
Widowed

7. What year are you in school currently?

Freshman
Sophomore
Junior
Senior
Graduate Student

8. What is your current enrollment status in school?

Part-time
Full-time

9. Are you currently employed?

Yes
No

10. How many hours a week do you work?

Not employed
Less than 10 hours
10-20 hours
20-30 hours
30-40 hours
More than 40 hours

11. What is your job/occupation?

