

**A CROSS-CULTURAL TEST OF THE “FIVE-FACTOR MODEL OF  
PERSONALITY AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP”**

Lian Shao

A Thesis

In

the John Molson School of Business

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Science in Administration at  
Concordia University  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

April 2002

© Lian Shao, 2002

National Library  
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services

Acquisitions et  
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file    Votre référence*

*ISBN: 0-612-83965-6*

*Our file    Notre référence*

*ISBN: 0-612-83965-6*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

**Canada**

## **ABSTRACT**

### **A CROSS-CULTURAL TEST OF “FIVE-FACTOR MODEL OF PERSONALITY AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP”**

Lian Shao

Transformational leadership has gained popularity during the past ten years because of its consistent effect on individual and organizational performance. The increasing globalization of business and the consequent emergence of a diversified workforce have prompted the importance of understanding the cultural context of transformational leadership theory. Judge and Bono (2000) demonstrated some support for the argument that the leaders' personality predicts their transformational leadership behavior and the positive association between transformational leadership and organizational outcomes such as: subordinate satisfaction with the leader, subordinate overall job satisfaction, subordinate organizational commitment, subordinate work motivation and leadership effectiveness. The purpose of the study is to conduct a conceptual replication to test the cross-cultural generalizability of this finding utilizing a Chinese sample.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

This thesis builds upon many hours of work and it would have been completely impossible if weren't for the enormous help of my supervisor Dr. Sheila Webber, and my committee members, Dr. Linda Dyer and Dr. Stéphane Brutus, who offered insightful advises and led me in the right direction. Also, a special thanks goes to my mom, who helped me establish contact with the professors at the Shanghai Economic Management College to allow for the distribution of questionnaires to students in MBA and EMBA classes and alumni members in other programs.

## Table of Contents

Literature Review .....	2
<i>Transformational Leadership and transactional leadership</i> .....	2
<i>Five Factor Model of Personality</i> .....	8
<i>Big Five Personality and Transformational leadership</i> .....	11
<i>Culture</i> .....	14
Hypotheses .....	30
Methodology .....	41
<i>Participants and procedure</i> .....	41
<i>Measures</i> .....	45
Results .....	48
<i>Descriptive statistics and correlations among the variables</i> .....	48
<i>Personality and transformational leadership</i> .....	50
<i>Transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness</i> .....	52
Discussion .....	53
Limitations .....	64
Implications .....	68
Bibliography .....	71
Table 1: Table of studies on transformational leadership .....	78
Table 2: Descriptive statistics and correlations among the variables .....	82
Table 3: Personality and transformational leadership .....	85
Table 4: Big five facets versus overall construct in predicting transformational leadership behavior .....	86
Table 5: Transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness .....	87

Appendix 1:	Letter of Intention .....	88
	<i>Letter of Intention to leaders</i> .....	88
	<i>Letter of Intention to subordinates and superiors</i> .....	89
Appendix 2:	Questionnaires .....	90
	<i>NEO-PI-R (Big Five Personality)</i> .....	90
	<i>MLQ(Transformational Leadership)</i> .....	96
	<i>Leadership Effectiveness Questionnaires</i> .....	98
	<i>Subordinate satisfaction with leader</i> .....	98
	<i>Subordinate overall job satisfaction</i> .....	98
	<i>Subordinate organizational commitment</i> .....	99
	<i>Leader Effectiveness</i> .....	99

Recent study of the correlation between personality and transformational leadership suggested that the leaders' personality traits could predict their exhibition of transformational leadership behaviors (Judge & Bono, 2000). However, like other studies in this field, Judge and Bono (2000) confined their study in the context of North American culture. To date, little is known about the link between personality and transformational leadership in cultures other than the United States (Vertinsky, Tse & Wehrung, 1990; Weldon & Vanhoner, 1999; Ireland, 1991; Lindsay, 1985; Hofstede, 1980a). Considering the cultural impact on the generalization of leadership theory, I propose a replication of Judge and Bono (2000) study to examine the applicability of the findings in the Chinese culture. In other words, I plan to investigate the linkage between leader's personality and transformational leadership behavior in China. Specifically, I am interested in investigating how and to what extent culture will affect personality as a predictor of transformational leadership behaviors. In addition, I will examine the linkage between transformational leadership behavior and leadership effectiveness in the Chinese culture. The boundary of Judge and Bono (2000) findings could be extended if the same research is conducted in the Chinese cultural context.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Transformational and Transactional Leadership**

The interest in studying transformational leadership in organizations has blossomed in the past decade. Numerous books and articles have been written on the subject. Since then, a large number of studies have found that transformational leadership has competitive advantages over other leadership styles in the age of dynamic change (Eisenbach, Watson & Pillai, 1999). New technology has emphasized the importance for organizations to develop a workforce that not only responds to change, but also promotes change to remain competitive (Avolio, Waldman & Yammarino, 1991). The changes have resulted the organizational hierarchy to turn flatter with high level of integration between work units. Such changes in organizational structure call for effective leaders, who are capable of delegating subordinates to handle greater levels of responsibilities and uncertainties, and helping them to go through such transitions. Leaders are required to promote positive changes in individuals, groups, teams and even entire organizations (Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1995). Under such circumstance, transformational leaders, who are capable of coping with transformation while building employee morale and commitment, exhibit their effectiveness over those with other leadership styles (Conger & Kanungo, 1988).

The term “transformational leadership” first appeared in Burns’ Pulitzer Prize-winning book, *Leadership*, which was devoted to the study of leaders in political settings (1978). He perceived that there were two essential forms of leadership: “transactional” (or exchange) and “transformational” (or charismatic). Transactional leaders focus on



fostering a leader-follower relationship rooted in exchange: transactional leaders provide their subordinates with a clear understanding of what is expected from them and what they can hope to receive once fulfilling these expectations. Under transactional leadership, followers behave in ways desired by their leaders in exchange for goods. The goods are usually specific, tangible, and calculable. The relationship lasts only as long as the needs of both leader and followers are satisfied with the continuing exchange (Bass, 1985; Avolio, 1999). Thus, it is not a relationship that “binds leaders and followers together in mutual and continuing pursuit of a higher purpose” (Burns, 1978, p.20). In contrast, transformational leadership is based on trust and commitment between leaders and subordinates (Bass, 1985). Transformational leaders are able to motivate subordinates to transcend their immediate self-interests to realize the higher level of goals, such as group or organizational goals. Transformational leadership takes place “when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (Burns, 1978, p 20). It is a relationship built upon the deeper needs and emotional desires of followers, as well as their leaders.

Bass and his associate Avolio conducted several studies to see if Burn’s (1978) concept of transformational leadership could be applied to organizational settings. In 1985, Bass built the model of transformational leadership for organizational leaders around Burns’ ideas. The core of Bass’s model of transformational leaders is that these leaders are able to motivate subordinates to perform at levels that exceed their original expectations. Transformational leaders accomplish this by raising the value of certain goals, demonstrating the means to achieve them, and encouraging subordinates to

transcend their self-interests for higher level of achievements. Bass categorized transformational leadership behavior into four dimensions: idealized influence/charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. These dimensions will be described in more detail in the following section.

### **Idealized influence/Charisma**

Idealized influence/charisma has been perceived as the most important component of transformational leadership. Charismatic leadership was believed to be the most exemplary form that transformational leaders could assume (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Bryman, 1992; Howell & Frost, 1989). Charismatic leaders usually serve as symbols of success and accomplishment for their subordinates, which enable them to earn subordinates' trust and respect and be regarded as role models. Consequently, subordinates want to identify with the leaders, exert extra effort to strive for the common vision raised by the leader. Bass (1985) pointed out that charisma is the most significant component of transformational leadership, but by itself is not sufficient to account for the transformational process and charisma cannot stand alone in terms of organizational effectiveness.

### **Inspirational motivation**

The second dimension of transformational leadership is inspirational motivation. Transformational leaders inspire enthusiasm and self-confidence among the subordinates through articulating the importance and value of the desired goals, demonstrating the their commitment to the goals and shared vision, providing challenges to subordinates, involving subordinates in thinking about various attractive future states or scenario and exhibiting high level of expectation in subordinates (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994;

Avolio, 1999). These inspirations elevate subordinates' level of motivation, arouse their team spirit, exert their performance to a higher level and transcend their immediate self-interests to the long-term organizational goals.

### **Intellectual stimulation**

Intellectual stimulation behavior encourages subordinates to question their own values, beliefs and assumptions, and those of the leader, which may be outdated or inappropriate for solving the problems confronting an organization, and to rethink the way of problem solving to find a better approach (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Avolio, 1999). In such a culture, new and creative ideas are welcome. Subordinates will not be punished for their attempting to challenge the status quo. Through the intellectual stimulation, the leader is able to arouse the subordinates' awareness of problem, to understand each subordinate's thoughts and imagination (Bass, 1985). As a consequence, the intellectually stimulated subordinates develop their own capabilities to recognize, analyze and eventually solve the problem.

### **Individualized consideration**

The final dimension of the transformational leadership is individualized consideration. Transformational leaders pay attention to each subordinate and listen to his or her individual concerns. A key assumption of individualized consideration is that each employee has different needs and those needs will change over time partially based on the influence of the leader (Bass, 1985). The transformational leader must be able to diagnose and evaluate the needs of each follower and develop each follower to his or her optimum potential. Followers who receive leader's special attention are more likely to work hard to meet the high expectations set by the leaders and more likely to show

loyalty and commitment to the organizations. Individual consideration is best represented in the mentoring role (Avolio, 1999). A mentor takes the time to learn the strength and weakness of a 'student' while helping to nourish abilities and confidence (Russell, 1999; Avolio, 1999)

While transformational leadership consists of four dimensions, transactional leadership is also categorized into four dimensions. As aforementioned, transactional leadership occurs when the leader rewards or disciplines the follower, depending on the adequacy of the follower's behavior or performance (Avolio, 1999).

### **Transactional Leadership**

The four dimensions of transactional leadership are: contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), management-by-exception (passive), and laissez-faire. With the method of contingent reward, the leader gets agreement on what needs to be done and promises reward in exchange for satisfactorily carrying the assignment. In management-by-exception (active), the leader actively monitors deviancies from standards, mistakes, and errors in the follower's assignments and to take corrective action as necessary. Management-by-exception (passive) implies waiting passively for deviancies, mistakes, and errors to occur and then take corrective actions. The laissez-faire leadership style is the avoidance or absence of leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bass, 1985).

### **Summary**

Empirical evidence shows that leaders who display the four dimensions of transformational leadership behavior are generally viewed as more effective leaders than transactional leaders (Yammario & Bass, 1990; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Hater &

Bass, 1988). Furthermore, transformational leadership has been demonstrated to have a significant effect on individual and organizational performance (Howell & Avolio, 1993; Keller, 1992; Yammarino & Bass, 1990; Ralph & Robert, 2000; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990). Positive results continue to emerge on the effects of transformational leadership. Transformational leadership enhances subordinates' satisfaction (Hater & Bass, 1988) and trust (Podsakoff, Mackenzie & Boomer, 1996) in leadership, as well as employees' affective commitment (Barling, Weber & Kelloway, 1996). In addition, transformational leadership is associated with business unit performance (Barling et al., 1996; Howell & Avolio, 1993). The effectiveness of the transformational leadership has been tested across organizations and levels within organizations (Chemers & Ayman, 1993).

Bass (1997) maintained that the concepts and components of transformational leadership are applicable from one culture to another: not only in the U.S., but also in a number of other countries, including China. He further proposed that transformational leadership is more effective than other leadership styles. When people think about leadership, their ideal model is the transformational leader, despite that the specific behaviors involved may be different as it crosses through countries with different cultural characteristics. Yet, it has to be pointed out that most studies on transformational leadership are conducted in the North American culture. Table 1 lists some of the transformational leadership studies published in popular managerial publications. It also lists the countries where the studies were carried out, and where the participants came from.

The focus of this study is the relationship between personality traits and transformational leadership. It is important to link transformational leadership with a personality construct that can categorize personality accurately and completely. Five-Factor model of personality has gained wide support as an instrument in the personality study.

### **Five-Factor Model of Personality**

Researchers have proposed that certain personality traits leaders possess could predict their transformational leadership behavior (Judge & Bono, 2000; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). Some research reported, “Personality disposition has been correlated with transformational leadership concurrently, retrospectively, and as forecasts of transformational leadership” (Bass, 1998, p. 122). Among research attempting to identify factors that influence transformational leadership, a correlation has been found between personality and transformational leadership behavior. Stogdill (1948) proposed that traits are likely to be better predictors of leader behavior and effectiveness if they are treated as variables that interact with other contextual variables, such as culture. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) discussed the five aspects of drive could significantly contribute to business leaders’ success. These five drives could be summarized as achievement motivation, leadership motivation, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, and creativity. Furthermore, they argued that possessing the appropriate traits does not guarantee successful leadership, but only increase the likelihood of behaviors corresponding to transformational leadership. They also pointed out that no traits were universally associated with effective leadership and that situational factors were also influential.

House and Howell (1992) concluded that the personality traits, such as the need for power, authoritarianism, self-esteem and locus of control, are traits that are likely to differentiate charismatic leaders from non-charismatic leaders.

At the time these studies were conducted, no well-accepted taxonomy was adopted for classifying personality traits (Barrick & Mount, 1991). There were numerous personality models used in studying the correlation between personality and transformational leadership. Consequently, the validity of personality as a predictor of effective leadership behavior is quite low. In addition, it was not possible to determine whether there were consistent, meaningful relationships between particular personality constructs and performance criteria (Block, 1995).

Fortunately, in the past twenty years, personnel psychologists have come to agree that the Five-Factor model of personality, consisting of five independent personality dimensions, could provide a meaningful framework for formulating and testing hypotheses relating individual differences in personality (Wiggins, 1996). Furthermore, a Five-Factor model is sufficient to serve as a meaningful taxonomy for classifying personality attributes at a global level (Mount, Barrick & Stewart, 1998). Considerable research data favored the Five-Factor model of personality as an orderly classification model for the communication and accumulation of empirical findings, and as the most appropriate personality measurement in different cultures (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Its validation across instruments and observers was supported as well (McCrae & Costa, 1987). While some researchers suggest that more than five dimensions are needed to encompass the domain of personality and some disagree about the precise meaning attached to each dimension (Block, 1995), there is a great deal of commonality in the

traits that define each factor. Overall, the robustness of the Big-Five personality model across cultures and measures has led to its wide acceptance among personality researchers (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

The five fundamental dimensions of personality are: neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Neuroticism is generally viewed as negative emotionality. Common traits associated with neuroticism include being worried, insecure, self-conscious and temperamental. A person who scores high in neuroticism has the propensity to experience a variety of negative affects, such as anxiety, depression, anger and embarrassment. Extraversion is identified with lively sociability and defined by terms as sociable, fun loving, affectionate, friendly, and talkative. Openness to experience is best characterized by being original, imaginative, broad interests, and daring. Openness to experience consists of hallmarks, such as fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas and values. The essential nature of agreeableness includes being courteous, flexible, trusting, good-natured, cooperative, forgiving, softhearted, and tolerant. Conscientiousness reflects being careful, thorough, responsible, organized, hardworking, achievement-oriented and persevering (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Each of the dimensions has six facets. They are as follows: neuroticism-anxiety, angry hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness, and vulnerability; extraversion-warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement seeking, and positive emotions; openness to experience-fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas and values; agreeableness-trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty and tender-mindedness; conscientiousness-competence,



order, dutifulness, achievement striving, self-discipline and deliberation (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

### **Big Five Personality and Transformational Leadership**

In response to the calling for more research on the dispositional basis of transformational leadership (Bass, 1998; House & Howell, 1992), in other words, the empirical support on personality as a predictor of transformational leadership, Judge and Bono (2000) examined the relationship between Big Five personality traits and transformational leadership. Specifically, they examined the degree to which the Five-Factor model of personality was related to transformational leadership behavior. Of the five personality traits, Judge and Bono (2000) found that agreeableness, extraversion, and openness to experience had a significantly positive relationship with transformational leadership.

Agreeableness is associated with traits such as being courteous, trusting. Agreeable individuals are cooperative, forgiving, flexible and considerate of others' feelings and needs. Leader with agreeable personality are more likely to be considerate and be empathetic towards the needs of the subordinates (Ross & Offerman, 1991). Leaders' exhibition of concern towards subordinates' needs and interests reflected their individualized consideration behavior, the component of transformational leadership. In return, agreeable leaders are more approachable in the eyes of their subordinates and subordinates respond well to their respectful and kind behaviors (Hogan & Shelton, 1998). Agreeableness displayed the strongest link with transformational leadership both as a simple correlation and after controlling for the other Big Five traits. Judge and Bono

(2000) justified this strong correlation by pointing out that agreeableness is the trait that most closely associated with charisma, one component that is most strongly correlated with transformational leadership.

Extraverts have strong tendencies to be articulate and articulation is the characteristic of transformational leader. Through effective articulation of desirable vision, transformational leaders are able to affect followers' views of their role in achieving the vision, and mobilize them to higher levels of commitment for common set of goals for the group or the organization. Extraverts usually have good communication skills. The dimension of inspirational motivation, one component of the transformational leadership, centers on communication. Transformational leaders are able to communicate high expectations and express important purposes in efficient and appealing ways. Subordinates are expected to come to accept and internalize their leaders' value and vision (Avolio & Bass, 1988). When subordinates' values are congruent with that of the transformational leader, they are expected to shift motivation from focusing on self-interests to considering the more collective interests of the group and the organization. Furthermore, identifying with the leader reduces the follower's resistance to change and creates a sense of excitement about the mission among followers. Extroversion displayed a significant correlation with transformational leadership in Judge and Bono (2000) study.

Openness to experience assesses personal characteristics such as curious, broadminded, and intelligent, which are attributes positively associated with changing and learning experience. Such individuals are more likely to have positive attitudes and be motivated to change. Consequently, they are more likely to benefit from the changing

(Eisenbach et al, 1999). Open individuals encourage change (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). They are open to incorporate ideas and arguments from subordinates, peers, or superiors into final decisions even when the opinion differs from their own. Leaders who are open to change are more encouraging of their subordinates to challenge the existing rules and way of doing things. These qualities closely associate with that required by transformational leadership. Openness to experience demonstrated a significant correlation with transformational leadership as a simple correlation in Judge and Bono (2000) study. However, when the other Big Five traits were controlled, the relationship dropped significantly.

The other two Big Five traits, neuroticism and conscientiousness, according to the study, did not exhibit any significant relationship with transformational leadership. In addition, Judge and Bono investigated the relative predictive power of overall traits versus specific facets of the Big Five model on transformational leadership. They found that Big-Five facets did not appear to predict transformational leadership better than the overall construct did. Overall, although the correlations between Big-Five personality and transformational leadership identified in the study were not large, the results did indicate that personality traits could predict transformational leadership behaviors (Judge & Bono, 2000).

In addition to the relationship between personality traits and transformational leadership, Judge and Bono (2000) also reported significant positive relations between transformational leadership and a number of outcomes reflecting subordinate perceptions of leadership effectiveness. They measured leadership outcomes, such as subordinate satisfaction with leader, subordinates overall job satisfaction, subordinates organizational

commitment, and subordinate work motivation. The correlations between transformational leadership and leadership outcomes were measured after controlling for the effect of transactional leadership behaviors. Results also indicated that transactional leadership exhibited insignificant predictive power on the set of outcomes.

The two major findings of the study, certain personality traits predict transformational leadership, and transformational leadership is positively related to leadership effectiveness, suggest that the Big-Five traits might assist organizations in choosing transformational leaders. Organizations might benefit from selecting leaders on the basis of certain personality traits (Judge & Bono, 2000).

### **Culture**

Judge and Bono (2000) study was conducted in North America culture. In fact, leadership theories have been deeply embedded in the North America culture. Most data are generated from studies of North America institutions. The appropriateness of these theories in other types of cultures remains unsolved (Erez, 1994; Hofstede, 1980a; 1993). Increasing globalization of business and the consequent emergence of a diversified workforce composition require international managers to understand the cultural context within which the leadership model is employed (Hofstede, 1980b, 1991; Triandis, 1993). It is necessary to understand the culture within which management development is undertaken, because culture creates barriers or sets limits to the transferability of managerial concepts, practices and procedures (Triandis, 1993). Hofstede (1980b) argued that many differences in individual motivation and leadership styles were traceable to the differences in culture. International management scholars and

practitioners also agree that managers cannot simply assume that leadership behavior effective in one culture can be readily transferred to other cultures (Blunt & Jones, 1996; Erez, 1994). In other words, even though the North American culture supports positive or negative linkages between certain personalities and transformational leadership behaviors, such significant correlations might not be valid in another cultural context, such as China, where the cultural characteristics are quite different from those in the North American culture. While some personality traits are considered strong indicators of transformational leadership, no traits have been universally associated with effective leadership. Situational factors also play influential roles (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). Traits are likely to be better predictors of leader behavior if they are treated as variables to interact with selected contextual variables (Stogdill, 1948). These variables include cultural ones.

Culture refers to the deeply held beliefs, values and norms among people that affect their subsequent behavior (Bjerke, 1999). It is a collective mental programming that the people have in common as a result of same education and similar life experience (Hofstede, 1980b; 1991). Persons in every culture carry around the “mental programs” that guide their behaviors. Culture is difficult to change in the sense of its collective mental programming (Bjerke, 1999). Everyone is culturally influenced and sees the world in the way he or she has learned to see it. Similarly, the cross-cultural differences in leadership concepts may result from the different cultural assumptions and values about the nature and function of power and authority, the structure of leader-led relationships, styles of interpersonal interaction, and desirable leader and subordinate characteristics (Hofstede, 1980a; Bjerke, 1999). For example, the U.S. culture

ideologically tends towards democratic and participative leadership principles, while the Chinese culture is more comfortable with a directive and autocratic leadership style (Bjerke, 1999).

The cultural influences are composed of many different levels: family, group, nation and other (Groeschl, 2000). My focus in this study is the impact of the national culture. It is reflected by basic values, beliefs and assumptions of the people of the nation (Hofstede, 1980b). The culture of a nation where a company is operating will affect and have different consequences on many business variables, such as the extent to which power is centralized or decentralized, willingness among people to take risks, to what extent people are interested in change, and how loyal employees are to their place of work (Bjerke, 1999). In order to study the relationship between personality and transformational leadership across different cultural influences, it is necessary to choose a personality construct that has wide applicability across different cultures. So far, Big-Five personality has shown applicability across North America and the European countries.

Salgado (1997) used meta-analyses to investigate the cross-cultural validity of the relationship between the Big-Five personality traits and job criteria in European countries, and compared the findings to those from studies in North America. The comparison revealed similar results in both North America and European countries. Among his findings, Salgado reported that conscientiousness and neuroticism had high cross-cultural validity for all occupations and job criteria; openness to experience was a valid predictor of training proficiency; extraversion and agreeableness were valid predictors of job performance for occupations emphasized interpersonal factors. Salgado

concluded that Big-Five model of personality was a useful construct for studying the relationship between personality and job criteria across North American and European countries.

Since the focus of this study is on the moderating effect of the culture on the predictive power of personality traits on transformational leadership, the findings in Salgado (1997) study were of particular interest. Many differences in management styles of companies throughout the world can be traced to differences in national cultures. Research indicates that transformational leadership is impacted by such cultural characteristics as power distance, level of collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance (Jaeger, 1986; 1990). Leadership per se may be a universal phenomenon, but concepts, styles and practices associated with it are not (Heck, 1996). Consequently, the non-universality, culture-boundedness and non-transferability of leadership theories and models have been increasingly recognized (Hofstede, 1980a). Individual and situational factors must be considered when assessing leadership, because leadership is almost always affected by the situation and the time period in which leaders and subordinates are operating (Hofstede, 1991; 1993; Lim, 1997; Pawar & Eastman, 1997). The behavior of a leader should not be judged in isolation of the context and time period in which it occurs. Under normal day-to-day surrounding, the leader's behavior would seem completely unacceptable and inappropriate, yet the same behavior may be thought not only appropriate but also highly desired under different circumstance (Hofstede, 1991). At this point, it is valuable to investigate how the Chinese culture, which is significantly different from the North America cultures, would affect the findings discovered in the North American countries. In other words, whether the correlation between personality

and transformational leadership behavior found by Judge and Bono (2000) could also be identified in the Chinese culture.

Discussion of the Chinese culture has to start with the Confucianism.

Confucianism has been the dominant cultural influence in China for over 2000 years. It is widely accepted as the foundation of Chinese culture (Jacobs, Gao & Herbig, 1995). The Confucian tradition has a concern for the correct and well-mannered conduct of one's duties, which is based on respect for the social conventions of a patrimonial system. It stresses order, hierarchy, quality of relationships, and obligation to social collectivities (Jacobs et al, 1995). In all, Confucian values provide the norm of behavior in every aspect of life (Jacobs et al, 1995).

While Big-Five personality is used as a model to communicate and describe empirical findings in personality, a model is also needed to describe cultural difference among nations. Many researchers herald the model of culture developed by Hofstede (1980b), who built a cultural model for 40 different countries based on a questionnaire survey in a multinational organization. Hofstede's cultural dimensions were derived at the organizational level to represent the varieties in social values. The conceptual framework built on four dimensions of national culture, in conjunction with the cultural maps of the world, helps researchers to see where and to what extent theories developed in one country are likely to apply elsewhere.

Hofstede's four-dimensions of basic cultural variation address issues of power distance, individualism/collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and femininity/masculinity (Hofstede, 1980b). Power distance concerns how culture deals with inequity. It focuses on the norms that how leaders can determine the behavior of their subordinates



(Hofstede, 1980b). In a high power distance country like China, the rigid hierarchy between rulers and the ruled is considered natural and proper (Wang, Zhang & Goodfellow, 1998). Protest, dissent, and criticism from the ruled are appropriate only when the authorities are deviated from the social principles (Pasa, 2000).

Collectivists tend to have a stronger attachment to their organization than individualists do (Jung, Bass & Sosik, 1995). They exhibit high levels of loyalty and commitment to the leader and the organization and usually maintain long-term relationships with their organizations (Hofstede, 1991). Correspondingly, subordinates in the collectivism culture tend to identify with the shared vision of group and organizations proposed by leaders. Collectivists prioritize group and organizational benefit to personal interest (Bond & Forgas, 1984). They value group conformity and harmony. They believe that an individual should behave as modestly as possible to avoid conflicts with others for the sake of inter-group cohesion (Fan, 1995; Wang et al, 1998). In addition, collectivists view interpersonal skills and relationship as being more valuable than specific job knowledge and skills (Fan, 1995).

Uncertainty avoidance is related to norms, values, and beliefs regarding the tolerance for ambiguity (Hofstede, 1980b). In the Chinese culture, rules and regulations predominate (Bjerke, 1999). Order and predictability are paramount. Risky situations make people stressed and upset. Norms, values and beliefs have been developed, which implies that conflict should be avoided; deviant people and ideas should not be tolerated; laws are very important and should be followed; experts and authorities are usually correct and consensus is important (Hofstede, 1980b).

Masculinity/femininity is one of the four cultural dimensions defined by Hofstede (1980b). It is unclear whether it is an important moderator in the relationship between personality traits and transformational leadership. I will not discuss this aspect of the culture in this study.

### **Chinese Culture and Leaders**

The Chinese culture is characterized as high power distance, collectivism, and high risk-avoidance; whereas the North America countries exhibit a cultural tendency of being low power distance, individualism, and low risk-avoidance. I will examine how and to what extent these culture dimensions would influence the relationship between each personality dimension and transformational leadership behavior discovered by Judge and Bono (2000) in the U.S. culture.

Lockett (1988) studied the culture and the characteristics of Chinese management. In his article, he defined Chinese culture as a set of core values that underlie social interaction among Chinese people. These sets of ideas are transmitted inter-generationally and expected to impact managerial behavior and practice. Four key features of Chinese culture are identified: respect for age and hierarchical position, group orientation, the concept of face, and the importance of relationship and harmony.

### **Respect for age and hierarchical position**

Respect for age is a major component of Confucian principles. Confucianism emphasizes that only in a distinct hierarchy, where each lower level gives obedience to a higher level, the steadiness of a country can be guaranteed and the power of a particular ruler can then be safeguarded (Jacobs et al, 1995). It requires that everyone follow norms and values as stipulated by elders. The feature of respect for age is an underling principle

that governs Chinese management practice, which is consistent with a culture of high power distance between rulers and the ruled.

The rigidly hierarchical society has nurtured a dominant leadership style that is essentially paternalistic or authoritarian in nature (Child, 1994). Superiors and subordinates in the workplace all consider each other unequal (Wang et al, 1998). Subordinates are expected to yield to their managers and fully comply with their instructions (Wang et al, 1998). The conformity and obedience of subordinates to leaders is a basic cultural expectation (Hofstede, 1980b), and this paternalistic characteristic is an important feature of the Chinese society (Wang et al, 1998). Most decision-making power is in the hands of few top managers or Communist Party officials. Consequently, they limit the scope of communication with colleagues and subordinates. By collecting information themselves, they believe it is the most effective way of gathering information for decision-making (Wang et al, 1998). Under this kind of organizational culture, the middle managers have little authority, and they have little delegation of responsibility. They defer decision-making to higher authority (Wang et al, 1998), which leads them to a less active management style.

The old negative authoritarianism is based on organizational position or political background, which only required manager to comply with a superior's immediate demands. It becomes obsolete in modern Chinese management circles. With the increasing need for professional knowledge in every area of operations, Chinese managers are more aware than ever that decision-making power must be based on knowledge, skill and capacity (Wang et al, 1998). This is a new and positive type of authoritarianism. It is still related to centralized control within the organizational

structure, but it can be challenged through the knowledge and capacity of subordinates (Fukuda, 1989). However, despite many positive changes in some negative organizational attitudes, senior Chinese managers still adopt an autocratic style as far as making a significant final decision. Chinese middle managers still have no substantial power to influence final decisions (Wang et al, 1998).

### **Group orientation**

The group orientation emphasizes the importance of group as opposed to individual orientation (Lockett, 1988), which reflects the collectivist character of Chinese culture. In Chinese culture, collectivism defines individual status. Individuals are not identified by independent status, but by dependent relations within the social system (Earley, 1989). Confucianism emphasizes the importance of maintaining harmonious interpersonal relationships (Earley, 1997). To meet this requirement, a person should act in accordance with external expectations rather than with their own internal wishes or desires (Jung & Avolio, 1999). Giving up individual interests in favor of a higher social authority is considered an example of a perfect Confucian personality (Jacobs et al, 1995). Confucianism does not conceive individuals as existing separately from the social structure, but as ethical components to social as a whole.

Chinese managers insist on collective orientation (Wang et al, 1998). Any achievement by an individual is claimed on behalf of the group or organization, although recent research indicates that Chinese employees' personal achievement motivation rating has become much stronger since the mid-1990s (Bjerke, 1999). As a consequence of this distinctive collective orientation, many Chinese managers adhere to a non-competitive management ethic (Child, 1994). This situation is very different from many

North American organizations that are characterized by a spirit of self-actualizing competition (Nevis, 1983). The atmosphere in a Chinese organization is less encouraging for outstanding individual achievers (Bjerke, 1999). Another consequence of the collective orientation is that Chinese managers tend to shirk responsibility whenever possible (Wang et al, 1998). While they do make decisions autocratically, they believe that the responsibility for implementing decisions should not be taken individually (Wang et al, 1998). If a manager expected others to take responsibility, then essentially nobody would be in a responsible position, because the question of who should take final responsibility would never be clarified.

Chinese managers constantly try to strike a balance between modest individual virtues and prominence in a group. They believe that they must consider the feelings of superiors or colleagues, who do not like someone trying to surpass them in the hierarchical scale (Wang et al, 1998). Chinese managers think that the ideal middle way is for everyone to be qualified in their position and to be compatible with others rather than competitive (Yang, 1995). They keep competitive behavior to a degree that is acceptable by the majority (Wang et al, 1998). Chinese managers constantly express the view that individuals should work in harmony with others in organizations.

### **The concept of face**

‘Face’ is a literal translation of the Chinese ‘lien’. It is the unique cultural aspect in China, which could be illustrated as the essential requirements placed upon a person by virtue of the occupied social position or the recognition by others of one’s social position (Earley, 1997). The concept of ‘face protection’ in Chinese culture is, like most aspects of Chinese society, associated with hierarchy. Yet ‘face protection’ is a concept that is

not held by Chinese people uniquely: it has universal applicability (Earley, 1997). The reason that it is more often identified as a Chinese value is that it is more important to the cohesion of a collective society like China than it is to the more individualistic societies of the Western world (Redding & Ichael, 1982). 'Face protection' ensures that everyone is sensitive to each other's hierarchical status and emphasizes that a person should meet superiors' social or personal requirements. In this process the individuals are obliged to demonstrate cooperation after properly identifying themselves modestly within the terms of rank. From a Chinese point of view, this value is a necessary condition for any individual to function appropriately within society and within their position (Wang et al, 1998; Yang, 1995). A person of lower relative social standing must be sensitive to the social requirements of those higher on the social scale. They must also be aware of the absolute importance of authority.

In the collective Chinese society, the individual is not "inner-directed" but controlled by a need for not losing face (Earley, 1997). In other words, collectivism does not mean a denial of individual interest or well-being. It is implicitly assumed that maintaining group well-being is the best guarantee for enhancing individual face, both faces of the leader and the led (Lockett, 1988). This behavior is inherently connected to the group orientation characteristic of the Chinese society.

### **The importance of relationship and harmony**

This feature of Chinese culture is intertwined with other three cultural features. All Chinese managers operate within a web of relationships. This web of relationship is particularly complex in the large state-owned enterprises. Managers there have to negotiate with bureaucracy, market, and community. Among these relationships, the

upward relation of enterprises with their controlling bureaus is most important, which is in accordance with the rigid hierarchical aspect of Chinese culture. Enterprising managers give considerate attention to the upward relationships with government bureaucracies (Lin, Cai & Li, 1998).

Chinese managers place high value on informal relationships within the organization (Antoniou & Whitman, 1998). They often pay more attention to personal relationships within the work environment than to the job at hand compared with that of North American managers (Child, 1994). Chinese managers believe that maintaining good relationships through all levels of organization is crucial. They are not only concerned with authority and power, but also use their position in a paternalistic manner to build up good faith and friendly working relationships with subordinates (Wang et al, 1998). The 'small society' characteristics of Chinese enterprises help to explain this situation, so does the fact that employees in state-owned enterprises normally enjoy a guarantee of lifetime employment (Lin et al, 1998).

### **Chinese Social System, Organizational Structure and Function**

Since all the participants in my study are from median to large size state-owned organizations, the focus of this section is on the state-owned organizations in China and their structure and function.

Culture and social system are interwoven (Child, 1994). To a certain extent, Chinese culture is influenced by its social system. Under the socialistic political system, the organizational structure of most Chinese enterprises differs from North American companies. There is a parallel management system in the Chinese enterprises. One is the administrative system and the other is the internal leadership structure based around the

Communist party (Child, 1994). The Communist party is present in almost every Chinese enterprise. The main responsibilities of the Communist party are supervising and guaranteeing the strategic direction of the enterprise and participating in important decisions. Consequently, in all large state-owned enterprises, different individuals hold positions as general manager and communist party secretary (Lin et al, 1998). The differences of opinion often arise between the two management streams. It is the most significant difficulty associated with operating in a parallel system (Fukuda, 1989).

Another big difference with the North American organizations is that the Chinese leaders operate in an organization, where resembles rather a total institution than a business unit in many aspects (Child, 1994). In the typical Chinese state enterprises, employees often expect their management to take care of all their needs, such as housing, children care, healthcare and a variety of daily functions. Whitley (1991) described the Chinese enterprise as a political coalition and a sociopolitical community, with a consequential need for the managers to cultivate vertical relationships with superiors as well as non-market exchange relationships with other enterprises horizontally. Child (1994) reported that the typical Chinese enterprises operate simultaneously on three levels: life support, social political support, and business operations. Only the third level of operation is in common with North American commercial enterprises, the other two are unique in the Chinese system.

As the result of such a complicated operating environment, managers in China have to distribute their working hours over these three areas of activity: administrative/personal affaires, political affairs, and basic business activities. The percentage of the time leaders devoted to these three areas varies among different



organizational types (Child, 1994). The managers in service companies spend most time on basic business activities where the company's structure is much simpler and profits become the manager's major task. While leaders in the manufacturing companies allocate most time on administration and personal matters and the least time on business activities, one of the salient features of management in China is that organizations play an extensive role in both the professional and private lives of their employees (Child, 1994; Wang et al, 1998). Most state-owned enterprises have deeply held belief that a credible enterprise must take care of every aspect of their employees' life, including their work and family affairs, in addition to the usual development and operational concerns that all managers must deal with. Meanwhile, the employees of Chinese enterprises regard their organization as 'large family', in which the senior general managers assume the role of 'parent'. If employees feel that their general managers have successfully assumed the role of being good 'parent', employees will show their respect to managers normally afforded to the head of the family (Child, 1994). Accordingly, the enterprises will be cohesive and efficient. Employees consider managers who do not live up to this basic cultural expectation a failure, regardless of how profitable their company is (Child, 1994). Hence, managers in China are judged on whether they could secure basic material and welfare benefits for employees in the context of maintaining a high performance commercial enterprise (Child, 1994).

Besides, since Chinese managers think of their enterprise as a family system, subordinates are treated like 'children', who must be dependent and cannot ever be fully trusted. Managers make most substantive decisions on their own (James, Chen & Cropanzano, 1996; Ireland, 1991).

## **Chinese Leaders**

Since transformational leadership shows its effective advantage over other leadership styles, it is necessary to have a look at the personality and behavior of the effective leaders in China. Stewart and Him (1991) conducted a study to examine the characteristics that Chinese top managers believed to be most important for a successful career and the qualities must have in potential candidates for further promotion. In the study, the managers were asked to identify key elements contributed to their present positions. The ranked key elements were: hard work, interpersonal relationship, personal commitments, proven competence, loyalty, and seniority in the organization. Hard work has the highest score among the elements considered as fundamental to career success.

This study also listed the key factors contributed to career success for the American managers. The ranked factors were: leadership experience, a proven track record in a broad range of functional areas established at an early stage of one's career, motivational drive, interpersonal skills and communication ability. The three elements missed in the American list are: hard work, loyalty and seniority, which reflect such Chinese cultural characteristics as high uncertainty avoidance, collectivism and high power distance. Yet, motivational drive and hard work might be understood as same factor with different expression. Hard work usually comes from motivational drive. In this study, both the Chinese and American managers identified harmonious interpersonal relationships and a career track record as common elements contributing to managerial success. In particular importance is the interpersonal relationship. Building a favorable interpersonal relationship seems reasonably to be assumed as a fundamental requirement for successful managers.

Tabak, Solomon and Nielsen (1998) conducted a study focusing on the profile of effective managers in China. They suggested eight significant traits determining the managerial success in China. They are: supervisory ability, intelligence, self-assurance, decisiveness, achievement motivation, self-actualization, need for security, and initiative. Moreover, they pointed out that despite the major economic, political, social and managerial reforms China has experienced for decades, these eight managerial success factors still hold the same. In this paper, the supervisory ability refers to the ability to direct others, organize and coordinate work activities. Intelligence encompasses judgment, reasoning, cognitive complexity, as well as the ability to learn, analyze and synthesize. Self-assurance reflects one's confidence in handling issues or problems effectively and their belief in the ability to handle confronting problems. Decisiveness refers to the extent that one is a confident decision maker. Achievement motivation reflects the drive to achieve, excel, and succeed. Self-actualization means reaching one's potential by employing one's skills and talents to the fullest. Need for security refers to concerns over continuation of employment and desire to be protected from adverse effects. Lastly, initiative is the drive to achieve goals.

Comparing the two studies, Tabak, Solomon and Nielsen (1998) did not list interpersonal relationship as an important requisite for successful managers as Stewart and Him (1991) did in their paper. Currently there is no consensus on which personality traits are predictive of successful leaders in China. This study, based on analysis of Chinese culture, will attempt to hypothesize the relationship between personality and transformational leadership.

## **HYPOTHESES**

### **Extraversion**

Extraversion emerged as significantly correlated with transformational leadership in Judge and Bono study (2000). According to Judge and Bono (2000), the personality of extraversion is linked to transformational leadership behavior in two ways: dominance and articulation.

Dominance, or specifically, social dominance, is associated with initiative taking, and taking charge of situations (Kalma, Visser & Peeters, 1993). It is identified as one of the requisite traits of transformational leaders (Bass, 1998). Largely due to the high power distance characteristic of Chinese culture, Chinese leaders are naturally in the dominant positions. Their subordinates do not question leaders' decisions. Therefore, the Chinese leaders have natural tendencies to be extraverts in terms of dominance.

Communication skill is important to the practice of transformational leadership. This relationship is reflected through the inspirational motivation dimension of transformational leadership. In order to inspire subordinate, transformational leaders must be able to communicate high expectation in appealing ways. It has been recognized that effective leadership cannot be maintained in an organization without an adequate system of intercommunication.

Despite the continuing transition in the Chinese economy, the government agencies continued to operate as monopolistic providers of goods and services (Child, 1994). In the Chinese organization, there is a political administrative side operating in parallel with the commercial administration. Leaders in these organizations must

coordinate both sides to achieve balance between political agendas and commercial interests. In order to follow the directives of state ministries, maintain their good will, and ensure that the organization and its employees do not violate party policies and directives, these leaders take responsibilities as spoken person to interact with their superiors and subordinates. They must explain the political line and try to gain the support of the subordinates to keep the existing harmony (Child, 1994). To maintain the harmony prioritized by the collective culture (Earley, 1997), they must commit unusual amount of time to communicate with superiors and subordinates (Child, 1994). These communications usually take place in the form of meetings. Chinese managers are heavily burdened with meeting with both superiors and subordinates. In order to carry out all the explanation work, leaders must clearly and convincingly interact with followers. It is like what transformational leaders has to do to convince subordinates to share a common vision. Hence, it is logical to suggest that under Chinese culture, extraversion is a positive indicator of transformational leadership. Since it is a much emphasized personality trait in China, the positive relation should be comparable to that in the US culture.

Hypothesis 1: Similar to the finding in Judge and Bono (2000) study of the North America culture, in the Chinese cultural context, extraversion is positively related to transformational leadership behavior. In particular, extraversion is positively related to the inspirational motivation dimension of the transformational leadership.

## **Openness to Experience**

According to Judge and Bono's research (2000), openness to experience positively correlated with transformational leadership. By definition, transformation means change. Intellectual stimulation, the component of transformational leadership behavior, reflects this change characteristic. Intellectual stimulation involves questioning old approaches and encouraging the new ways of doing things (Bass, 1985). It concerns flow of new ideas and leader's perspectives that challenge followers to rethink old and conventional ways of approaching organizational tasks. By using intellectual stimulation, the transformational leaders encourage followers to think of their recommendations using a more innovative and long-term perspective (Bass, 1985). Intellectual stimulation as one dimension of transformational leadership behavior is mostly close with the personality of openness to experience. Leaders high in personality of openness to experience would be expected to provide more intellectual stimulation. They have a desire for change and are better able to understand the need for change (Avolio, 1999).

Although intellectual stimulation may produce desirable effects in the long run, in the short run, leaders who continually urge followers to search for new and better methods of doing things may create ambiguity, conflict, or other forms of stress in the minds of followers (Avolio, 1999). Since intellectual stimulation causes a cognitive reappraisal of current circumstances and leads to a questioning of old and perhaps comfortable assumptions, negative feedbacks from followers about the leader might happen. Podsakoff et al (1990) reported a negative relationship between transformational leader's intellectual stimulation and follower's trust in and satisfaction with the leader. They argued that intellectual stimulation is likely to create role conflict, ambiguity, and

stress that require a cognitive reappraisal of one's current ways of thinking. This negative relationship may be more prevalent in a high uncertainty-avoidance culture like China, where the society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations (Bjerke, 1999). People in such culture look for a structure in their organizations, institutions, and relationships that can make events clearly interpretable and predictable (Wang et al, 1998). The acceptance among subordinates towards risk and ambiguity is not easy to achieve. The openness to experience personality of a leader can be perceived as being less predictable and undependable (Jung & Avolio, 2000; Podsakoff et al, 1990). If the vision of a Chinese leader is potentially risky or its outcome is uncertain, it is less likely that the subordinates will identify with the vision. The negative impact associated with openness to express may significantly lessen the ability of the leaders to convince their followers to strive for common goals. Consequently, the negative impact of the openness to experience is potentially severe in the Chinese culture. It may negatively affect the relationship between openness to experience and transformational leadership.

Hypothesis 2: In the Chinese culture, openness to experience is negatively related to transformational leadership behavior. A negative correlation is expected between openness to experience and intellectual stimulation dimension of the transformational leadership. This relation is opposite to the finding in US culture.

### **Conscientiousness**

There are conflicting evidences on whether conscientiousness is linked to transformational leadership. Bass (1985) has argued that self-determination, a major

hallmark of conscientiousness, is a characteristic of transformational leadership. On the other hand, Avolio et al. (1996) found very weak and non-significant correlation between conscientiousness and transformational leadership. Judge and Bono (2000) did not offer a hypothesis regarding this relationship. It would be interesting to see whether any relationship exists in the Chinese culture.

Conscientiousness indicates two major facets: dependability and achievement (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Dependable leaders are more likely to carry out their business and social obligations. It is widely known that North American companies are very conscious of economic results. Consequently, North American culture focuses on individual performance and how it affects efficiency and productivity (James et al, 1996). On the other hand, Chinese enterprises are burdened with not only the economic consequence, but also the social consequences of their decision (Wall, 1990). Leaders in collective cultures have a moral responsibility to take care of their subordinates, to help them prepare a career development plan. In return, subordinates have a moral obligation to reciprocate with unquestioning loyalty and obedience. This means Chinese managers must take a holistic approach to look after employees and their families. Therefore, compare to leaders of North American companies, there is a much heavier emphasis on dependability of the Chinese leaders (Wang et al, 1998). In other words, dependability is a much emphasized leadership quality in the Chinese culture. It is reasonable to infer that, in order to carry out their obligation of taking care of subordinates' needs, Chinese leaders must practice more of individualized consideration, an important dimension of the transformational leadership. The possible correlation between dependability and transformational is a result of the special cultural characteristic of China. Chinese leaders



are obligated with leadership responsibilities that predispose them to be related to the individualized consideration dimension of the transformational leadership. Based on this linkage between hallmark of the conscientiousness and dimension of the transformational leadership, I expect it to translate into a positive relationship between the overall construct of conscientiousness and transformational leadership.

Hypothesis 3: In the Chinese culture, conscientiousness is positively related with transformational leadership behavior. In particular, conscientiousness is expected to positively relate to individualized consideration dimension of transformational leadership. Judge and Bono (2000) did not explore this relationship in their study.

### **Neuroticism**

Transformational leaders are likely to challenge the status quo and take risk, which requires a high degree of self-confidence. Leaders who have high level of self-confidence are likely to set high performance standard and convince their subordinates the possibility of attaining these goals. Transformational leaders are role models and symbols of success for the subordinates. They instill faith in the heart of subordinates. Leader' self-confidence plays an important role in gaining subordinates trust.

Individuals exhibiting neurotic characteristics, such as worry, nervousness, high-strungness, and self-pity, will tend to be the ones lack self-confidence (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Consequently, less transformational leadership behavior is expected to exhibit than by emotion- stable individuals. Transformational leaders must show confidence in trying to rally the support of subordinates (Bass, 1985). They must be motivators who

can be role models for their subordinates. Individuals who are neurotic lack the necessary personal characteristics that the transformational leadership requires. They are not confident, and unsure of the future (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Thus, these traits of neurotic individuals tend to weaken rather than augment the quality of leadership. If a leader is not sure of what decision to make, or expresses a high degree of doubt, the followers are less likely to be committed to leader's vision. Transformational leaders are calm, confident, and predictable, even during crisis (Bass, 1985; Avolio et al, 1991). They consider stressful events interesting, as opportunities for development, and believe that they can influence the outcomes. Their confidence would ensure the subordinates of the vision and will promote the positive reaction among the subordinates. Emotional stable leaders are more likely to exhibit their strong wills and perseverance to overcome obstacles. These are personalities that transformational leaders often exhibit. In contrast, leaders who are high in neuroticism are not likely to exhibit the above personalities. Consequently, neuroticism may negatively correlate to transformational leadership.

As we have discussed before, Chinese culture highly values stability and predictability. Subordinates exchange loyalty and commitment to organization for stable future and paternalistic cares from the leaders (Wang et al, 1998). Subordinates look for a dependable, self-confident leader to ensure them of the stability and predictability they seek. Any leaders with neuroticism personality, that suggest unpredictability, would severely ruin the trust and confidence in their followers. Subordinates will feel unsure with these leaders. Therefore, these leaders will have difficulties to convince subordinates to work toward their vision for the organization. Moreover, neurotic leaders that may lead to instability will be viewed as ineffective leaders and lose the trust of their

followers. Trust is essential to transformational leadership's ability to exercise idealized influence, as well as to motivate the subordinates to strive for high vision (Podsakoff et al, 1990). The loss of trust will negatively impact the ability of the leaders to lead. Because Chinese culture is also characterized as high uncertainty avoidance, this loss of trust may affect the relationship between neuroticism and transformational leadership more negatively than in the Western culture.

Hypothesis 4: In the Chinese culture, neuroticism is negatively related with transformational leadership behavior. In particular, neuroticism is expected to negatively relate to idealized influence and inspirational motivation dimensions of transformational leadership. They are the same as the findings in Judge and Bono (2000) study in U.S. culture.

### **Agreeableness**

Positive linkages were reported between several hallmarks of agreeableness, such as courtesy, compassion, nurturance, and transformational leadership (Ross & Offerman, 1991). Courtesy was identified as one of the skills needed for excellent leadership (Northhouse, 1997).

Judge and Bono (2000) hypothesized that agreeableness would positively predict transformational leadership. Indeed, their result showed that it was the strongest and most consistent predictor of transformational leadership behavior. The results reflect the importance of agreeableness in the North America culture. The North America culture is characterized as individualism, where the individual achievement is highly encouraged

(Hofstede, 1980b). In the US, leadership success is usually measured by the economic performance of the organization he or she leads (Nevis, 1983). Leaders spend most of their time on profit issues. Their exhibition of individualized consideration towards their subordinates' needs is not expected. Under this circumstance, agreeable leaders, who are more likely to display individualized concerns on their subordinates, would be highly appreciated by subordinates. China has a culture that is both paternalistic and high power distance (Wang et al, 1998). Rigid hierarchy between the leader and the led is regarded as natural and proper (Hofstede, 1980b), which means subordinates accept the unequal distribution of power. However, the rigid hierarchical relationship between leaders and subordinates is based on the mutual understanding that leaders have the social obligation to show kindness to the subordinates and take care of their interest and needs. In return, subordinates are expected to show respect and loyalty to the leaders (Wang et al, 1998). Under the Chinese culture, agreeable leaders that are more approachable in the eyes of subordinates are more likely to carry out this social obligation expected by the subordinates. Nonetheless, in a hierarchical culture, the subordinates do not expect their leaders to be courteous, easy-going and approachable. Sometimes the agreeable leaders may appear out of the norm. There seems to be conflicting evidences that both argue for and against a positive correlation between agreeableness and transformational leadership in the Chinese culture. I will not offer a hypothesis on their relationship, but rather study it on an exploratory basis.

## **Big Five facets versus overall construct in predicting transformational leadership behavior**

One question that has arisen out of the research field is whether the overall construct of Big-Five personality construct is too broad of a measure for personality. In another words, whether the specific facets of the Big-Five personality are better predictor of the transformational leadership than the overall construct. Results in Judge and Bono (2000) study showed that the overall personality traits were as good as the Big-Five facets at predicting transformational leadership. Since my study was conducted in Chinese culture, whether individual facets of the Big-Five personality have any advantages over the overall construct are unknown. I will have an exploratory examination of the relations between the facets and transformational leadership, in the hope that data generated by this exploratory examination will offer direction in future research on this subject.

## **Relationship between transformational leadership and Leader outcomes**

In Judge and Bono' (2000) study, they measured the correlations between transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness with the effect of transactional leadership controlled for. It was found that transformational leadership was positively associated to measures on leadership effectiveness, such as subordinates' satisfaction with leader, subordinate organizational commitment, subordinate work motivation, and leadership effectiveness. No significant relationship was identified between transformational leadership and subordinate overall job satisfaction.

The measures of leadership effectiveness in China, such as subordinate satisfaction with leaders and subordinate organizational commitment, are highly

dependent on how the leaders to carry out the culturally prescribed responsibilities. They must fulfill the social contract, in which they must take care of the extended personal needs of the subordinates and their families in exchange for subordinates' loyalty and commitment to the organization. Since transformational leaders are more likely to fulfill these responsibilities, I predict that transformational leadership is positively correlated to both subordinate satisfactions with leader and subordinate organizational commitment. Another measure of the leadership effectiveness, subordinates overall job satisfaction, is dependent on more than the leadership itself. As noted by Judge and Bono (2000), organizational factors (such as business conditions, organizational strategy) and subordinates characteristics (such as personality of followers) are beyond the control of the leaders. It might influence the subordinates' rating on overall job satisfaction. In the Chinese culture, leaders are involved in many aspects of subordinates' life. Subordinates overall job satisfaction relies on leaders' ability to create a favorable work environment and consider the personal development needs of the subordinates. These needs are more likely to be met under the leadership of transformational leaders. Thus, I predict that transformational leadership will be positively related to subordinate overall job satisfaction. Transformational leaders are capable of motivating subordinate to strive for a high goal that is beyond immediate personal interest. Although loyalty and respect are cultural expectation that the Chinese leaders enjoy, in order to motivate the subordinates to perform beyond expectation, the Chinese leaders cannot simply rely on the loyalty and respects from the subordinates. They must increase their personal appeal and try to achieve charismatic leadership. Subordinate work motivation often results from leader's

charismatic personal appeal (Bass, 1985). I predict that transformational leadership will positively relate to subordinate work motivation.

Hypotheses:

5(a): In the Chinese culture, transformational leadership behavior is positively correlated to subordinate satisfaction with leader, the same as the finding in the US culture.

(5b): In the Chinese culture, transformational leadership behavior is positively correlated to subordinate overall job satisfaction, the same as the finding in the US culture.

(5c): In the Chinese culture, transformational leadership behavior is positively correlated to subordinate organizational commitment, the same as the finding in the US culture.

(5d): In the Chinese culture, transformational leadership behavior is positively correlated to subordinate work motivation, the same as the finding in US culture.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Participants and procedure**

Participants in Judge and Bono' study (2000) were currently enrolled students or alumni of community leadership programs throughout the Midwest in the U.S. The participants for the program were selected annually from a pool of leaders nominated by local businesses. In general, participants are individuals who currently hold management or leadership positions. The sample for the study was drawn from 11 such programs throughout the Midwest. The average age of participants was 39 years, and 88% had a bachelor's degree or higher. Fifty-seven percent of the sample was women. Participants

had been in their current position for 6.7 years and had been with the current organization for 8.2 years. Fifty-two percent of the participants supervised 4 or fewer subordinates. Seventeen percent of the participants had 10 or more subordinates directly reported to them. The median size organization has 100 employees. Participants were from a wide range of industries and held a wide range of positions.

The choice of participants in terms of average age, education degree, gender, years in the specific position, years in the organization, organization size, number of direct subordinates, range of industries and position was tried to match the participants selected by Judge and Bono (2000).

Participants in my study are current students from series of intensive business administration programs and alumni of leadership programs at Shanghai Economic Management College. It is a leading training center for leaders and managers from Shanghai, China. Its main objective is to offer managers and senior executive officers the latest knowledge of current practices in international management as well as to provide intensive training course for professionals, such as CEO (Chief Executive Officer), CMO (Chief Marketing Officer), CFO (Chief Finance Officer) and CHRO (Chief Human Resource Officer), help them adapt themselves successfully to their own business environment, and eventually make continuous contribution to the business communities. Some of the students were sent by the organization and some of them are voluntary. All of them have to meet the admission criterion set by the college.

A pilot study was carried out in advance of the large-scale research to identify any potential problems with all the questionnaires used in this study, such as the meaning of each question and the answer. The participants in the pilot study are ten students



randomly selected from the EMBA class with the help of the administrative supervisor in this class. The results show that the questionnaires are understandable and easy to complete.

The survey procedure followed Judge and Bono design as well. The survey package was distributed among 200 leaders. Eighty of them are the currently enrolled part-time students from two MBA classes and two EMBA classes. They received the survey package at their first orientation class from their administrative supervisor. One hundred and twenty alumni members from other leadership programs received the package through mail. A cover letter accompanied with each survey package to clarify the intent and instruction of the research (see appendix 1 for the content of the cover letter). In the letter, it was emphasized that the participation was entirely based on the participants' own willingness and there was not any imposed obligation. Besides, all the responses were ensured to be completely confidential and for the research purpose only. Students and alumni members were in charge of distributing the survey to their direct subordinates and superiors. To match the responses from subordinates and superiors to the participants, an identifying number was randomly assigned on the related questionnaires. All the responses were directly returned to me in sealed envelopes with prepaid postage. Each package contained personality survey and questionnaires on transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness. The leaders were in charge of answering the personality survey. They also took responsibilities to distribute the questionnaires on transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness to two of their subordinates, and the questionnaire on leadership effectiveness to one of their superiors.

All the leaders, their subordinates, and superiors received a little souvenir for their time and cooperation with this research, which was a Chinese way to show my appreciation of their collaboration, time and contribution. Therefore, participants were expected to be motivated to complete the survey carefully and seriously. In addition, once the study is done, the participants could obtain feedback on their personality if they expressed interest.

Questionnaires with more than 50% missing data were eliminated from the analysis. Five personality questionnaires and nine subordinate questionnaires were rejected. Since the meaningful questionnaires must include the leaders' personality test, subordinates' rating on the transformational leadership behavior and superior's rating on the leadership effectiveness. If one questionnaire was incomplete or missing, the whole set was not used. Four out of the nine rejected questionnaires were due to this reason. Totally, there are eight hundred people participated in the study, and the useful questionnaire was 764 (95.5%). Comparing with the 181 useful questionnaires out of the 556 participants (32.4%) in the U.S. sample, the response rate in the Chinese sample was quite high. The high response rate might be due to the high power distance cultural characteristic in China, where the inequity between teacher and student is deeply rooted in both parties' minds. The Chinese educational process is teacher-centered. Teacher outlines the intellectual paths for the students to follow. In classrooms there is a strict order with the teacher initiating all the communication. Students in class can speak up only when they are invited to. Teachers are never publicly contradicted or criticized and are treated with deference even outside schools.

The profile of all the participants could be summarized as follows: their average age is 38 years old with average 12 years working experience in median to large size organizations from a wide range of industries. They hold a wide range of management positions; 80% of the participants have college degree, bachelor degree or higher; most of them have 5 or more direct subordinate; 40% of the participants are women.

## **Measures**

All the measures completely followed the questionnaires adopted by Judge and Bono (2000). The Professional Chinese version for each questionnaire was prepared for the participants. The Chinese version questionnaire on Big Five personality traits and transformational leadership were purchased directly from two different authorized publishing houses. Questionnaires on subordinate satisfaction with leader, subordinate overall job satisfaction, subordinate organizational commitment, subordinate work motivation, and leadership effectiveness were provided by Judge and Bono (2000). I translated them into Chinese. Two students from Master of Science in Administration program were asked to translate them back to English to identify any meaning discrepancy between the two languages. Since each leader was rated by two subordinates, his or her score was the average of the two subordinates' ratings.

Big Five personality traits. The Big Five personality traits were measured by the 240-item revised NEO PI-R Personality Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992) with the permission of the Psychological Assessment Resources. It was reported as the most widely used validated measure of the big five-factor model of personality. The reliabilities for the neuroticism, extraversion and openness to experience domain scales

were .87, .91, and .86, respectively (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Each domain factor has six facets and each facet is measured with eight items. The reliability for the facet scales ranged from .66 to .92 (Costa & McCrae, 1992). A 5-point scale was adopted ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Transformational leadership behaviors. Transformational leadership behaviors were measured by the MLQ-Form 5X with the permission of Mind Garden. The MLQ-5X assesses four dimensions of the transformational leadership as aforementioned in the literature review: idealized influence/charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and idealized consideration. Each dimension is assessed with four items. Reliabilities for the total items and for each leadership factor scale ranged from .74 to .94 (Bass & Avolio, 1995). The subordinates were required to respond on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always). The score on idealized influence/charisma was averaged across the attribute and behavior, because the correlation between charismatic attribution items and charismatic behavioral items are high enough to be treated as one (Howell & Avolio, 1991).

Transactional leadership behaviors. Transactional leadership dimensions were measured by the MLQ-Form 5X as well. Four dimensions of transactional leadership were assessed: contingent reward, management by exception-active, management by exception-passive, and laissez-faire. Each dimension is assessed with four items. The subordinates were required to respond on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always).

Subordinate satisfaction with leader. Three items from Hackman and Oldham's (1980) Job Diagnostic Survey were adopted to measure subordinate satisfaction with

leader. A 7-point scale was taken ranging from 1 (strongly disagreed) to 7 (strongly agreed). The three items were averaged for each subordinate.

Subordinate overall job satisfaction. Five items on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) from Brayfield-Rothe's (1951) measure of Overall Job Satisfaction were taken to measure subordinate overall job satisfaction. Two items need to be reverse scored first, then average the total five items for each subordinate.

Subordinate organizational commitment. Seven items from Allen and Meyer (1990) measure of Affective Commitment were taken to measure subordinate's organizational commitment. A 7-point scale was taken ranging from 1 (strongly disagreed) to 7 (strongly agreed). Three items need to be reverse scored first, then average the total five items for each subordinate.

Subordinate work motivation. Three items from the MLQ-Form 5X that assess subordinate willingness to exert extra motivation were taken to measure subordinate work motivation. The subordinates were required to respond on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always).

Leadership effectiveness. Five items to measure leadership effectiveness were obtained from Judge and Bono (2000). A 7-point scale was taken ranging from 1 (strongly disagreed) to 7 (strongly agreed). The five items were taken average for each subordinate.

## RESULTS

### **Descriptive Statistics, Correlations and dimensionality of transformational leadership**

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the study variables were calculated as Judge and Bono (2000) did. All the results were compared with theirs to identify the differences (see Table 2). I found that, in the Chinese sample, the means for transformational leadership behaviors in terms of its four dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration, were lower than those reported in the U.S. sample. In addition, the means in Chinese sample were lower than the norms identified by Avolio et al (1995)<sup>1</sup>. Judge and Bono (2000) results were quite similar to the norms. Specifically, the Chinese leaders show their idealized influence ( $\bar{x}=2.23$ ) and inspirational motivation ( $\bar{x}=2.36$ ) with a frequency of 'sometimes' on a 5-point scale from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always), and intellectual stimulation ( $\bar{x}=1.83$ ) and individualized consideration ( $\bar{x}=1.65$ ) less often, which fall between 'once in a while' and 'sometimes'. Meanwhile, U.S. leaders exhibit their idealized influence ( $\bar{x}=2.83$ ), inspirational motivation ( $\bar{x}=3.03$ ), intellectual stimulation ( $\bar{x}=2.63$ ) and individualized consideration ( $\bar{x}=2.71$ ) on a 'fairly often' basis.

In contrast, the Chinese leaders' mean scores on exhibition of transactional leadership behavior were quite higher than those of the U.S. counterparts, except the dimension of contingent reward ( $\bar{x}=2.08$ ) in the Chinese sample and in the U.S. sample

( $\bar{x}=2.64$ ). The data showed that Chinese leaders exhibit management by exception – active ( $\bar{x}=2.01$ ) or passive ( $\bar{x}=2.16$ ), laissez-faire ( $\bar{x}=1.88$ ) on a ‘sometimes’ basis, while the U.S. leaders exhibit the corresponding behavior on a ‘once in a while’ basis or in the middle between ‘not at all’ and ‘once in a while’: management by exception-active ( $\bar{x}=1.28$ ) or passive ( $\bar{x}=0.89$ ), laissez-faire ( $\bar{x}=0.66$ ). In the U.S. sample, contingent reward was reported as “higher than most of the studies in the MLQ database, whereas, the other transactional dimensions were somewhat lower than the MLQ norms.” (Judge & Bono, 2000, p. 757)

Because Judge and Bono (2000) adopted the 7-point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”, while I used the 5-point scale provided by the publisher, I cannot directly compare the scale of the big five personality between the U.S. sample and Chinese group. But after converting the numerical points to corresponding verbal level, such as “agree” or “strongly agree”, the results provide a clear picture of personality for each group. According to the Chinese leaders’ self-rating on their personalities, they think they display low degree of neuroticism ( $\bar{x}=2.76$ ). Meanwhile, they think they are high in openness to experience ( $\bar{x}=3.16$ ), extraversion ( $\bar{x}=3.17$ ), agreeableness ( $\bar{x}=3.31$ ) and conscientiousness ( $\bar{x}=3.47$ ). U.S. sample possessed a low level of neuroticism ( $\bar{x}=3.17$ ) and exhibited high level in openness to experience ( $\bar{x}=4.89$ ), extraversion ( $\bar{x}=5.07$ ), agreeableness ( $\bar{x}=5.17$ ), and conscientiousness ( $\bar{x}=5.23$ ). Interestingly, both the Chinese people and U.S. people exhibit similar characteristics in

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors of the transformational leadership measure were contacted to obtain normative data from previous Chinese samples. However, they reported not having access to such information. Therefore, comparison with other Chinese samples is not possible.

these big five personalities.

### **Personality and transformational leadership**

The most important part of this study is to measure the relationship between the Big-Five personality and transformational leadership behavior. As Judge and Bono did in their study, I calculated both the simple (zero-order) correlation and the standardized regression coefficient to identify the link between Big-Five personality traits and transformational leadership (see Table 3). The simple correlation was to test how well each Big Five personality trait predicts the transformational leadership behavior. Standardized regression coefficient was calculated to observe to what extent the effect of one trait was adjusted by the influence of other traits. Judge and Bono (2000) found that, out of the Big-Five traits, agreeableness displayed the strongest relationship with transformational leadership ( $r=.27$ ,  $\beta=.23$ ). Extraversion also displayed significant relations with transformational leadership in both estimations ( $r=.22$ ,  $\beta=.15$ ). The simple correlation between openness to experience and transformational leadership was significant ( $r=.20$ ), but the standard regression coefficient was not significant ( $\beta=.07$ ). Neither neuroticism nor conscientiousness displayed any significant relationship with transformational leadership. According to the results showed in the Chinese sample, none of the Big-Five personality traits showed any simple (zero-order) correlation with transformational leadership behavior. However, after adjusting for the influence of other traits, neuroticism displayed a significantly negative relationship with transformational leadership ( $\beta=-.22$ ) as I expected in Hypothesis 4. Extraversion showed a marginally significantly negative relationship with transformational leadership after adjusting for the influence of other traits ( $\beta=-.17$ ), which is opposite to Hypothesis 1. As to the



personality traits of conscientiousness, agreeableness, and openness to experience, they didn't exhibit any relationship with transformational leadership even with the influence of other traits had been controlled for.

Given that the broad Big Five constructs showed few significant relationships with transformational leadership. I decided to focus on the specific facets that made up each construct. As aforementioned, each Big-Five trait constitutes six facets. The predictive power of the six facets for each Big-Five trait and the overall construct-level (the six facets added together) were calculated to see whether the Big-Five facets were better predictors of transformational leadership than the overall traits (see Table 4). Two sets of regressions were obtained. One was obtained by inputting the six facets as a set into a regression equation to predict the transformational leadership. The other was obtained by inputting the overall unit-weighted trait into a separate regression equation. The multiple correlation coefficient ( $R$ ), an index of the degree of association between the personality and transformational leadership, and the squared multiple correlation coefficient ( $R^2$ ), the proportion of variance in the transformational leadership behavior accounted for by its relationship with the personality, were calculated. In both studies, regression-weighted multiple correlations with the facets of each Big Five trait are typically higher than the multiple correlations with the unit-weighted construct. However, the differences are fairly small. Only the square multiple correlation of openness to experience for the six facets was statistically significant in the U.S. sample. In addition, in the U.S. sample, the facets of the extraversion, openness to experience and agreeableness showed significant relationship with transformational leadership as the overall traits did. In the Chinese sample, activity ( $r = -.17$ ), a facet of extraversion;

values ( $r = -.13$ ) and fantasy ( $r = .15$ ), the facets of openness to experience showed relationship with the transformational leadership. Extraversion and openness to experience did not exhibit significant relationship with transformational leadership when they were treated as overall traits.

### **Transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness**

The linkage between leadership behavior and leadership effectiveness is another concern in this study. Leadership effectiveness was measured from five outcomes: subordinate satisfaction with leader, subordinate overall job satisfaction, subordinate organizational commitment, subordinate work motivation, and leader effectiveness (see Table 5). Transformational leadership and transactional leadership were compared to see which one was more effective in the outcomes of leadership practices.

In the Chinese sample, transformational leadership behavior only showed significantly positive relationship with subordinate work motivation. As to the predictive power of transactional leadership on leadership effectiveness, only contingent reward displayed significant positive relationship with subordinate work motivation. In the U.S. sample (Judge & Bono, 2000), when the transactional leadership behavior was controlled, transformational leadership behavior significantly and positively predicted all the outcomes, with the exception of subordinate overall job satisfaction. Meanwhile, most of the transactional leadership behavior did not significantly predict leadership effectiveness, yet some dimensions did. Specifically, contingent reward positively predicted subordinate satisfaction with the leaders; management by exception-active negatively predicted subordinate satisfaction with the leaders and subordinate overall job

satisfaction; laissez-faire leadership negatively predicted subordinate satisfaction with the leader and subordinate organizational commitment.

## **DISCUSSION**

This study was designed to test the validity of transformational leadership theory in the Chinese culture. Personality traits is purported to be strongly linked to transformation leadership theory, and is thought to be applicable from one culture to another: not only in the US, but also in countries such as China (Bass, 1997). Nonetheless, it is recognized that contextual factors, such as the cultural variables, may moderate the linkage between personal traits and leadership behaviors (Stogdill, 1948). Comparing the correlations found between personality traits and leadership behavior in Judge and Bono study (2000) in the US culture, the corresponding relationship could not be established based on the current study in the Chinese culture.

This study showed marginally significant negative relation between extraversion and transformational leadership when other traits were controlled. It was opposite to the finding in Jude and Bono (2000) study. Leaders high in extraversion are active, assertive and have high positive emotion. These facets of the extraversion personality are associated with exceptionally expressiveness, and strong inclination to take leadership role in groups. One possible explanation for the negative link between extraversion and transformational leadership lies in the collective Chinese culture. As I have discussed, the collective Chinese culture favors a non-competitive relationship. The group orientation of the Chinese culture discourages active seeking of personal development in

a group environment. Thus, anyone that tries to assert himself or herself in a group may be disliked by those who subscribe to the non-competitive code of conduct. Also, although decisions are made by the leaders, it is often made collectively by the top leaders. Even so, almost every decision is consulted with every party involved to make sure the collective interest have been taken into consideration. The collective interest is the yardstick that measures the soundness of any decision. An extravert that actively seeks leadership position and asserts himself or herself in group decision making process is certainly to be ill regarded, by both his or her peers and subordinates. This negative reaction was demonstrated by the negative link between activity, a facet of extraversion, and transformational leadership ( $r=-.17$ ) in the Chinese findings. Specifically, activity was also negatively linked to the inspirational motivation dimension of the transformational leadership ( $r=-.16$ ). A leader high in activity is usually seen in rapid tempo and vigorous movement, in a sense of energy, and in a need to keep busy. This facet of the extraversion personality does not fit well in the collective Chinese culture. Compare with the Western culture, where individualism is highly encouraged and active seeking of leadership role is well regarded, the Chinese culture is a negative moderator of the relationship between extraversion and transformational leadership.

Organization structure is another factor that negatively moderates the relationship between extraversion and transformational leadership. In China, most organizational structures are vertically implemented. Decisions are made at the top, and leader's responsibility is highly centered. There is a strictly hierarchical command structure. While leadership positions are earned by work performance, more importantly is the seniority. Promotions are based on seniority. Everyone should await his or her turn,

rather than actively seeks to surpass his or her peers. Based on the hierarchical structure, everyone has his or her own proper place in an organization. In Chinese organizations, a leader high in activity that actively seeks leadership role may appear to have stepped out of his place and the cultural norm. This behavior may be disliked by the subordinates who would view the leader as selfish and outcast of the organizational culture. In addition, Chinese leaders may not like anyone that seeks to surpass them in the hierarchical scale (Wang et al, 1998; Child, 1994).

Although a leader's positive emotion, another facet of extraversion, showed a positive correlation with the idealized influence dimension of the transformational leadership ( $r=.17$ ), its correlation with individualized consideration dimension of the transformational leadership was negative ( $r=-.17$ ). This again can be explained from the cultural differences between China and U.S. The individualized consideration leaders are characterized as treating each of their subordinates differently but equitably (Bass, 1985). As aforementioned, in the penetrated paternalistic Chinese culture, leaders place high priority on taking care of the personal needs of their subordinates (Child, 1994; Wang et al, 1998). They allocate considerable more time on taking good care of their subordinates in every aspect than their counterparts in North America culture (Child, 1994). Nonetheless, their efforts are expected by the subordinates within the Chinese culture and regarded as must-have behaviors (Wang et al, 1998). This is reflected by the lower mean of the individualized consideration in Chinese sample ( $\bar{x}=1.65$ ) as compared to the U.S. sample ( $\bar{x}=2.71$ ). Therefore, even if the Chinese leaders exhibit the transformational behavior in terms of the exert efforts on individualized consideration during their interaction with the subordinates, the subordinates would view this as a basic requirement

on managers, and would not give extra credit on it. In summary, the Western culture is much more acceptable towards extraversion personality traits than the Chinese culture, which explains the positive relationship found in Judge and Bono (2000) study and the negative relationship found in this study.

In Judge and Bono (2000) study, the overall construct of openness to experience had a positive correlation with transformational leadership ( $r=0.20$ ). However, when the other four traits are controlled, the relationship was not significant ( $\beta=0.07$ ). Meanwhile, the facets of openness to experience had high positive correlation to dimension of transformational leadership in Judge and Bono (2000) study. In Chinese sample, openness to experience did not display any significant relation with transformational leadership, neither in the simple correlation nor in the partial correlation. Yet, some of its facets displayed varying degrees of links with transformational leadership. Fantasy, a facet of openness to experience, was found to have a negative relationship with the transformational leadership as a whole ( $r= -.13$ ). This negative relationship was further evidenced in its negative relationship with both the intellectual stimulation ( $r= -.19$ ), and the individualized consideration dimensions of the transformational leadership ( $r= -.24$ ). Intellectual stimulation requires that the transformational leaders encourage followers to question their own way of doing things. In addition, followers are supported for questioning not only their own values, beliefs, and expectations, but also those of the leader and organization (Bass, 1985). The individuals who are open to fantasy have vivid imaginations and active fantasy life. They daydream not simply as an escape but as a way of creating for themselves an interesting inner world (Costa & McCrae, 1992). They elaborate and develop their fantasies and believe that imagination contributes to a rich

and creative life (Costa & McCrae, 1992). All these behaviors are positive contributors to promoting intellectual stimulation, yet are contrary to the preferences in the Chinese culture (Judge & Bono, 2000). In China, both the leaders and subordinates prefer persons with low openness to experience, who are conventional in behavior and conservative in outlook, and prefer the familiar to the novel (Wang et al, 1998). Also, in the high uncertainty avoidance Chinese culture, even the leaders themselves are afraid of implementing ideas that are beyond the routine ones and try to avoid uncertainties (Wang et al, 1998). There are little chances that they will encourage their subordinates to challenge the status quo. Instead, subordinates are appreciated for their obedience to the existing policies. Consequently, fantasy is a personal trait that is less appreciated by Chinese leaders' subordinates. Those leaders with such traits may be rated lower by their subordinates on the exhibition of transformational leadership, which may explain the negative correlation shown in this study. Another facet of the openness to experience trait, value, was positively related to the transformational leadership as a whole ( $r = .15$ ) in the Chinese finding. Although I originally expected openness to experience to negatively relate to the overall transformational leadership, the lack of any link is not so surprising. One facet, fantasy, was negatively related to transformational leadership ( $r = -.13$ ), and another facet, value, showed positive linkage ( $r = .15$ ). Because these facets are intercorrelated, it is difficult to gauge their individual relationship with transformational leadership. Questions that may arise out of this study are that, whether the Big Five personality model is too broad of a construct to be used in the study of relationship with transformational leadership in the Chinese culture, and whether the hallmarks of the

personality traits are better predictors of transformational leadership than the overall construct. As noted by Judge and Bono (2000), this is an ongoing argument.

Neuroticism was not related to transformational leadership in Judge and Bono study (2000). In this study, it had a significant negative relationship with transformational leadership. This significant correlation was measured with the other personality traits controlled. Neuroticism consists of personality traits that include anxiety, vulnerability, angry hostility, depression, self-consciousness, and impulsiveness. While these traits are generally associated with negative emotions, and thus would elicit negative rating by subordinates if they were displayed by any leaders, they are even more negatively regarded in the collective and risk avoidance Chinese culture. Neurotic individuals have high level of anxiety, and vulnerability (Costa & McCrae, 1992). According to this study, anxiety, one facet of neuroticism, was negatively related to intellectual stimulation ( $r = -.18$ ) dimension of the transformational leadership. Vulnerability was negatively related to idealized influence ( $r = -.16$ ), another dimension of transformational leadership. Anxious and vulnerable leaders lack self-confidence and self-esteem (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Transformational leadership requires the leaders to display high level of confidence and self-esteem to inspire the subordinates to share a common vision (Bass, 1985). If the leaders appear lacking confidence, they could not inspire their subordinates. They would appear weak in the eyes of the subordinates, and certainly would not have much idealized influence. The Chinese culture places much more emphasis on stability and dependability of a leader than the Western culture does. Same degree of anxiety and vulnerability on a Chinese leader would affect his subordinates' rating much more than that of a Western leader. This could explain why Judge



and Bono (2000) did not find a negative relationship between neuroticism and transformational leadership, yet my study indicates a significant negative relationship between them. In fact, of the Big-five traits, neuroticism has the strongest link with transformational leadership. Of all the Chinese cultural values, dependability and stability are two of the most important. For millenniums, Chinese people have endured extreme hardship and dictatorship for the sake of stability and avoidance of chaos (Wang et al, 1998). Even today, Chinese officials justify some of the harsh rules and lack of freedom for the Chinese people by claiming that loosening up will lead to chaos and destroy stability. This line of reasoning is widely accepted among the Chinese people. The Chinese people have been culturally programmed to seek stability. Leader with personality traits that suggest instability and undependability will receive strong disapproval. This may be the reason why neuroticism had the strongest negative linkage with transformational leadership. It is the least liked trait in a leader because it is linked to dependability and stability; the two most desired Chinese cultural values. In Chinese culture, in order to earn the respect of subordinates, the leaders must embody those values that are important to the subordinates. Neurotic individual is the least like candidate to embody those values. Thus, neuroticism demonstrated the most significant negative relationship with transformational leadership in this study.

Prior to this study, no empirical data had directly linked neuroticism to transformational leadership. The negative finding in this study not only validated the claim made in the hypothesis, but might also shed more light as to why agreeableness, extraversion, and openness to experience did not show any positive correlation to transformational leadership in Chinese culture. Chinese culture seems to act as a

negative moderator of the correlation between Big-Five traits and transformational leadership. It weakens the positive links, such as the correlation between agreeableness, extraversion, and transformational leadership identified in the North America culture, to non-significant. While neuroticism did not negatively relate to transformational leadership in the North America culture, the negative link became obvious under the Chinese cultural conditions. Of course, more studies are needed to clear the overall cultural impact, as well as identifying the specific cultural characteristics that influence such impact.

Judge and Bono (2000) did not offer a hypothesis on the correlation between conscientiousness and transformational leadership. Because of the high value the Chinese society places on dependability, one facet of conscientiousness, I hypothesized that conscientiousness would have a positive relationship with transformational leadership. Result in this study did not support that hypothesis. Neither did any facets of the conscientiousness show any correlation with either the overall construct of transformational leadership or any of its dimensions. Since most empirical data do not support a relationship between conscientiousness and transformational leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000), result in this study only confirmed the lack of links. More research is needed to resolve the issue.

In Judge and Bono study (2000), agreeableness was discovered to be the strongest and most consistent predictor of transformational leadership. All four facets of the agreeableness trait, trust, straightforwardness, altruism, and tender-mindedness, showed positive correlations with transformational leadership. These correlations are insignificant in the Chinese sample. One possible explanation for the lack of significant

relations maybe that agreeableness is an inherent social traits. It offers less appeal to subordinates when it is practiced by Chinese leaders, because it is expected by the subordinates that leaders would have this personality trait. There are no evidence correlating agreeableness and transformational leadership in Chinese culture. Further study is needed to reveal the relationship.

Many of the results in this study differed from the findings in Judge and Bono study (2000), particularly either the lack of or the reversal of significant correlations between the overall Big Five traits and transformational leadership. In addition, fewer of the specific facets of the Big Five in this study showed linkages to transformational leadership. One explanation is that, under the Chinese cultural condition, while some specific facets have relationships with transformational leadership, either positive or negative, other facets within the same personality traits do not. In other words, compared to their North America counterparts, fewer facets of the Chinese leaders' personality traits are linked to transformational leadership. Thus, the overall construct would have less relationship with transformational leadership and the correlation between the overall construct and transformational leadership would be non-significant. This theory needs to be tested with more studies.

The last relationship investigated in this study is between leadership behavior and organizational outcomes. Results showed that transformational leadership was not significantly associated with leadership outcomes. Of the measures of leadership outcome, transformational leadership has significant positive relationship with subordinates' work motivation. It had non-significant association with subordinate satisfaction with leader, subordinate overall job satisfaction, or subordinate

organizational commitment. In Judge and Bono study (2000), transformational leadership has significant positive relationship with the measures on leadership effectiveness, with the only exception of subordinate work motivation. It is difficult to explain why transformational leadership has significant positive relationship with work motivation in Chinese culture, while it has no significant association with other measures on leadership effectiveness. But, the positive association with subordinate work motivation in this study was weaker compared with the relationship identified between contingent reward, a dimension of transactional leadership. In other words, the participants in this study reported that they would be more motivated to do their jobs when contingent reward was offer to them, compared with the influence of transformational leadership. Combining this result with many negative correlations between personal traits and transformational leadership found in this study, I would suggest that transformational leadership is less valued and consequently less practiced in Chinese organizations. In addition, even when transformational leadership is practiced by leaders, it does not have a significant effect on subordinates. It could be inferred from this study that the Chinese culture discouraged the cultivation of transformational leadership and limit the effect of transformational leadership on the subordinates. Of course, it is possible that the data collected are not representative of China as a whole. Participants in self-reporting studies have tendencies to report desired states or express “correct” answers rather than an actual states or answers (Adler, Campbell & Laurent, 1988). They are likely to fill in middle-range answers and may find it difficult to distinguish among various items. This tendency would certainly negatively skew the

result of the study.

## **Conclusion**

An overview of the impact of Chinese culture on the relationship between personality traits and transformational leadership starts with its characteristics of high power distance, high uncertainty avoidance and collectivism. These characteristics fundamentally reinforce the hierarchical and conformist attributes of the top-down command structure that China's economy has acquired under socialism. They emphasize a unified leadership and authority, mutual dependence and moral incentive. These characteristics are in sharp contrast to that of the successful North America industrialization: the pluralism of ownership, competition, individualistic entrepreneurship, economic incentive and innovation. These characteristics cause problems for the improvement and reform of Chinese management.

The structure and culture of the organization are also factors that help mould leadership behavior. Highly structured, rule-bound organizations make it more difficult for innovative, transformational leaders to emerge. The more rule-bound the system, the more difficult it becomes for the leader to question the system and the methods of solving problems. Transformational leadership is less likely to emerge in settings where managers fear that proficient employees may replace them. In contrast, organizational cultures that value and reward innovation, change, development, and respect for the individual will have a more facilitative influence on the development of transformational leaders.

Therefore, it is fair to conclude that both the culture and the system are powerful

forces shaping Chinese organizational behavior, both leading to similar managerial characteristics and tending to work against the development of a more effective leadership style (Child, 1994), the transformational leadership.

## **LIMITATION**

Despite that a nation is regarded as a meaningful unit of cultural analysis, for it being the most 'complete' human groups that exist (Bjerke, 1999), most nations are very complex from a culture point of view. Heterogeneous subcultures exist, especially in big nations such as U.S. and China. While the population may generally share the core elements of a common culture, they will also exhibit contrast in attitudes and behaviors resulted from the large and diverse background of a country (Bjerke, 1999). Take China for example, the enormous regional diversity, in terms of religion, economic conditions, and local political leadership, calls into question the validity of taking national culture as a unit to analyze its impact on the relationship between personality traits and transformational leadership. Shanghai, the selected research site, is hardly representative of China as a whole. The organizations in Shanghai are more exposed to management concepts from the West. Thus, the study result of organizations in Shanghai may not represent the other regions, which are more influenced by traditional Chinese culture and concepts.

The focus of this study is on national culture, yet it is conducted at the organizational level. National and organizational cultures are both seen as important factors in determining the shape of organizations, as well as their performances and problems (Lockett, 1988). Organizational culture may very well affect the outcome of

the study. For example, the state-owned enterprises have different organizational structures and cultures from collective-owned enterprises in China. Ignoring the effect of organizational culture in the study, and attributing the result to national culture alone pose another limitation on the study. In addition, other than the impact from the cultural characteristics, the context also shapes the transformational leadership. The contexts of organizations could be divided into an outer and an inner context. The outer context is the environment beyond the organization: an environment in crisis is indeed more receptive to leadership in general and is more likely to be open to proposals (Eisenbach et al, 1999). The inner context includes the organization's culture, structure, power distribution, which will influence an individual's latitude to take initiative and to build personal relationships.

Culture is an inseparable entity from social and political environment; they influence each other. The socialistic political system in China determines the ownership status of the organizations in China. The ownership status of the firm could also affect the norms and behaviors of Chinese managers (Lin et al, 1998; Child, 1994). Leaders in the state-owned enterprises, where all the participants in this study came from, have pressure not only from within the organization to effectively manager the organization and take care of the needs of the subordinates, but also have political pressured to comply with political and government agendas. All these pressure, which to a certain extent, might restrict their exhibition of transformational leadership behavior (Lin et al, 1998).

Another category of limitation of this study is the measurement. There is no existing data that provides us with a comprehensive and accurate picture of China today. The descriptions of business leadership in both Chinese and U.S. cultures are based on

the assumption that leaders in both cultures are true to their type-behaving logically and naturally, and consistent as a consequence of their particular cultural norms, values and assumptions (Bjerke, 1999). Actually, business leadership will rarely, if ever, appears in such pure form in reality. When nations are studied from a cultural point of view, it is suggested to bear in mind that this can only be meaningfully done with a limited group and a few phenomena. In my case, I limit the study to the leaders and followers from the state-owned enterprises in Shanghai.

Since I have no normative data for these questionnaires that had been conducted in China in the previous research to compare with, it is hard to conclude how the result represents the true picture in the Chinese leaders. Usually, I should take into consideration the following aspects when interpreting the results of the North America developed questionnaires adopted in the non-western societies. First, most western instruments do not measure the constraints within which the Chinese employees operate. For example, North America questionnaires applied to the study of the managerial role do not include items pertaining to the Chinese manager's role. Second, North America questionnaires are not easily translated into Chinese. The meaning attached to a question may vary from one culture to another. Third, Chinese are not accustomed to completing a multiple-choice format questionnaire. They have a tendency to fill in middle-range answers and may find it difficult to distinguish among various items. Besides, Chinese have a tendency to report a desired state or express a "correct" answer rather than an actual state (Adler et al, 1988). An important limitation of the self-report study is the possibility of systematic biases. In self-reports, respondents might exaggerate their use of socially desirable influence tactics and understate the use of less acceptable tactics.



The properness of importing tests developed out of a North America cultural logic into alien cultural systems is always a concern among cross-cultural researchers (Bond, 2000). As Mishra and Gergen (1993) rhetorically asked, “How much understanding of culture will result if this vast and intricately interwoven composite is translated into the language of linear dimensions?” (p230). The imported instrument is always questioned on its lack of encompassing the local reality associated with a concept. Take the Big-Five personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992) for example, despite that McCrae and Costa (1997) provided empirical evidence showing that the factor structure and facet composition of the Big Five measure of personality were similar across seven different language groups, including Chinese, its universality is still suspected (Bond, 2000). “One can never prove a universal, but few would doubt the defensibility of applying a carefully translated version of the NEO-PI-R in one of the plant’s remaining 600 or so languages.” (Bond, 2000, p63). He suggested not to rely exclusively on supposedly comprehensive measures that have been shown to be multicultural equivalent, such as the NEO-PI-R, but to use indigenous factor of Chinese tradition as complement to universal personality dimensions in predicting Chinese personality traits.

Finally, even if the Big-Five personality model is a suitable tool for the Chinese culture, it is still questionable whether it is too broad of a construct to measure the relationship between personality and transformational leadership in Chinese culture. Although, Judge and Bono (2000) suggested Big-Five personality model is not too broad of a construct for the North American culture. Considering the fact that many hallmarks of the Big-Five personality traits related to transformational leadership differently in Chinese culture, it is reasonable to ask whether the specific hallmarks of the personality

are better predictors of the transformational leadership than the overall construct. This question can only be answered with more studies.

## **IMPLICATION**

At present, more and more foreign companies are entering the Chinese market with the intention to establish formal business partnerships. In China, successful joint ventures are usually those that have combined both Chinese and Western managerial models (Wang et al, 1998; Weldon & Vanhonacker, 1999). On the other hand, the companies that have failed are usually those that have insisted on following their own particular management style and culture to the exclusion of the other (Child & Lu, 1996). Practical knowledge of the general characteristics of Chinese corporate culture is essential for those foreign companies that want to conduct business successfully in China (Wang et al, 1998; Yang, 1995; Fan, 1995).

Chinese government statistics indicate that the establishment and development of the joint ventures in China have been dramatic. In 1982, there were 282 foreign manufacturing ventures operating in China, employing some 78,000 people. By 1995 the number had reached 59,311 firms, an increase of 200 times in 13 years. The gross industrial product of the joint ventures in 1985 was US\$2.71 billion. It had increased to US\$1202.11 billion by 1995, an increase of 500%. Furthermore, between 1980 and 1997, the Chinese government approved 300,000 discrete foreign investment projects, with a total actual foreign investment of US\$212.2 billion (Wang et al, 1998).

The rapid increase in joint venture partnerships in China in the past 10 years indicates that China both welcomes and needs foreign investment (Weldon & Vanhonacker, 1999). Yet, business reality in China is not simple at all (Child & Lu, 1996). The fact that Chinese culture is so different from the culture of other countries has an impact on the management of all joint ventures (Child & Lu, 1996).

In the research field, China presents a challenge to the management and organization study because it is so different from the situations normally encountered in other countries (Shenkar, 1994). It is therefore not surprising to find that the Chinese modes of management and organization do not match Western patterns. The fact that present analyses of management derive so much from Western theories and experience is problematic (Hofstede, 1980a). Meanwhile, to a considerable extent, Western thinking does offer concepts and theoretical perspectives, which can be used to analyze Chinese management and organization, and to draw out its distinctive features (Shenkar, 1994).

China as an international management site represents an attractive management site for research (Shenkar, 1994). More people work in Chinese organizations than in the enterprises of any other nation. In addition, China belongs to a group of countries that have consistently displayed work attitudes and behavior radically different from those common in the West. This means that existing theories and models cannot be considered universal until they have been tested on Chinese employees in Chinese organizations (Shenkar, 1994). Hence, China represents a major challenge to managerial paradigms developed in the West.

The findings of this study suggest that certain personality traits positively associated with transformational leadership identified in the U.S. context (Judge & Bono,

2000) are not displayed in the Chinese environment. In addition, the linkages between the transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness do not exhibit the same positive degree as in the U.S. This again enhances the idea that is concerned by most researches: the generalizability of the U.S. development theories in other cultural contexts.

## Bibliography

- Antoniou, P.H. & Whitman, K. (1998). Understanding Chinese interpersonal norms and effective management of Sino-Western joint ventures. Multinational Business Review, Spring, 53-62
- Adler, N.J., Campbell, N. & Laurent, A. (1988). In search of appropriate methodology: from outside the People's Republic of China looking in. Journal of International Business Studies, Spring, 61-74.
- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63, 1-18.
- Avolio, B.J., Waldman, D.A. & Yammarino, F.J. (1991). Leading in the 1990's: The four I's of transformational leadership. Journal of European Industrial Training, 15(4), 9-16.
- Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., & Jung, D.I. (1995). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire technical report. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Avolio, B. J., Dionne, S., Atwater, L., Lau, A., Camobreco, J., Whitmore, N., & Bass, B. (1996). Antecedent predictors of a "full range" of leadership and management styles (Tech. Rep. 1040). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Avolio, B.J. (1999). Full Leadership Development: building the vital forces in organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of Transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 44, 1-26.
- Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M.K. (1991). The big five personality dimension and Performance: a meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44, 1-26.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership and Performance beyond Expectation. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1995). MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Permission Set. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden

- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend Organizational and national boundaries? American Psychologist, 52, 130-139.
- Bass, B.M. (1998). Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational Impact. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bjerke, B. (1999). Business Leadership and Culture: National Management Style in the Global Economy. Northhampton, Mass.: Edward Elgar Publications.
- Block, J. (1995). A contrarian view of the five-factor approach to personality description. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 117, 187-215.
- Blunt, P & Jones, M. L (1996). Exploring the limits of Western leadership theory in East Asia and Africa. Personal Review, 26 (½), 6-23.
- Bond, M.H. & Forgas, J.P. (1984). Linking person perception to behavioral intention across cultures. The role of cultural collectivism. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15, 337-352.
- Bond, M.H. (2000). Localizing the imperial outreach: the Big Five and more in Chinese Culture. American Behavioral scientist, 44 (1), 63-72
- Brayfield, A. H. & Rothe, H.F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 35, 307-311.
- Bryman, A. (1992). Charisma and Leadership in Organization. London: Sage Publications.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Child, J. (1994). Management in China during the Age of Reform. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Chemers, M.M. & Ayman, R. (1993). Leadership Theory And Research: Perspectives And Directions. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Child, J. & Lu, Y. (1996). Management Issues in China (Volume II): International Enterprises. New York, NY: Routledge.
- 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). Charismatic Leadership: the Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publisher.

- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). Charismatic Leadership in Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Costa, P.T. Jr. & McCrae, R.R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual, Odessa, FL:PAR.
- Earley, C. (1989). Social loafing and collectivism: a comparison of the United States and People's Republic of China. Administrative Science Quarterly, 34, 565-581.
- Earley, C. (1997). Face, Harmony, and Social Structure: An Analysis of Organizational Behavior Across Culture. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Eisenbach, R., Watson, K. & Pillai, R. (1999). Transformational leadership in the context of organizational change. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 12(2), 80-88.
- Erez, M. (1994). Towards a model of cross-cultural I/O Psychology. In M.D. Dunnette & L. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (559-607), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychology Press.
- Fan, X. (1995). The Chinese culture system: implications for cross-cultural management. Sam Advanced Management Journal, Winter, 14-20.
- Fukuda, J. (1989). China's management: tradition and reform. Management Decision, 27(3), 45-49.
- Groeschl, S. & Doherty, L. (2000). Conceptualizing culture. Cross Cultural Management – An International Journal, 7(4), 12-17.
- Hackman, J.R. & Oldman, G.R. (1980). Work Redesign. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Hater, J.J. & Bass, B.M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73, 695-702.
- Heck, R. H. (1996). Leadership and culture: conceptual and methodological issues in comparing models across cultural settings. Journal of Educational Administration, 34 (5), 74-97.
- Hofstede, G. (1980a). Motivation, leadership and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? Organizational Dynamics, 2 (Summer), 98-122.
- Hofstede, G. (1980b). Culture's consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Hofstede, G. (1991). Cultures and organizations: software of the mind. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofsted, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. Academy of Management Executive, 7(1), 81-94.
- Hogan, R. T. & Shelton, D. (1998). A socioanalytic perspective on job performance. Human Performance, 11, 129-144.
- House, R. J. & Howell, J.M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 3, 81-108.
- Howell, J.M. & Frost, P.J. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 43, 243-269.
- 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.
- Ireland, J. (1991). Find the right management approach: US firms have difficulty adapting American techniques to Chinese reality. China Business Review, 18 (Jan/Feb), 14-17.
- Jacobs, L., Gao, G. P. & Herbig, P. (1995). Confucian roots in China: a force for today's business. Management Decision, 33 (10), 29-34.
- Jaeger, A.M. (1986). Organizational and national culture: where's the fit? Academy of Management Review, 11(1), 178-190.
- Jaeger, A.M. (1990). The applicability of western management techniques in developing Countries: a culture perspective. In Jaeger, A.M. and Kanungo, R.N. (Eds), Management in Developing Countries, Routledge, London, 131-145.
- James, K., Chen, D.L. & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Culture and leadership among Taiwanese and US workers. Do values influence leadership ideals? In Ruderman, M.N., Hughes-James, M.W. and Jackson, S.E. (Eds), Selected Research on Work Team Diversity. Center for Creative Leadership, American Psychological Association Press: Washington, DC.
- Judge, T.A. & Bono, J.E. (2000). Five-Factor model of personality and transformational Leadership, Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(5), 751-765.



- Jung, D. I., Bass, B.M. & Sosik, J. (1995). Bridging leadership and culture: a theoretical consideration of transformational leadership and collective cultures. Journal of Leadership Studies, 2, 3-18.
- Jung, D.I. & Avolio, B.J. (1999). Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural Orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions. Academy of Management Journal, 42(2), 208-218.
- Jung, D. I. & Avolio B.J. (2000). Opening the black box: an experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21, 949-964.
- Kalma, A.P., Visser, L. & Peeters, A. (1993). Sociable and aggressive dominance: personality differences in leadership style? Leadership Quarterly, 4, 45-64.
- Keller, R.T. (1992). Transformational leader and the performance of research and design project groups. Journal of Management, 18, 489-501.
- Kirkpatrick, S.A. & Locke, E.A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? Academy of Management Executives, 5, 48-60.
- 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.
- Lim, B. (1997). Transformational leadership in the UK management culture. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 18 (6), 283-289.
- Lin, J.Y., Cai, F. & Li, Z. (1998). Competition, policy burdens, and state-owned enterprise reform. The American Economic Review, 88 (2), May, 422-427.
- Lindsay, C. P. & Bobby, L.D. (1985). Experience in training Chinese business people to use US management techniques. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 21 (1), 65-78.
- Lockett, M. (1988). Culture and the problems of Chinese management. Organizational Studies, 9, 475-496.
- McCrae, R.R. & Costa, P.T. Jr. (1987). Validation of the Five-Factor model of Personality across instruments and observers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52(1), 81-90.
- McCrae, R.R. & Costa, P.T. Jr. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. American Psychology, 52, 509-516.

- Mishra, G. & Gergen, K. J. (1993). On the place of culture in psychological science. International Journal of Psychology, 28, 225-243.
- Mount, M.K., Barrick, M.R. & Stewart, G. L. (1998). Five-factor model of personality and performance in jobs involving interpersonal interactions. Human Performance, 11, 145-165.
- Nevis, E. C. (1983). Using an American perspective in understanding another culture: toward a hierarchy of needs for the People's Republic of China. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 19(3), 249-264.
- Northhouse, P.G. (1997). Leadership: Theory and Practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pasa, S. F. (2000). Leadership influence in a high power distance and collectivist Culture. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 21(8), 414-426.
- Pawar, B.S. & Eastman, K.K. (1997). The nature and implications of contextual influences on transformational leadership: a conceptual examination. Academy of Management Review, 22, 80-109.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B., Moorman, R. & Fetter. R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. Leadership Quarterly, 1, 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S. B. & Boomer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Journal of Management, 22 (2), 259-299.
- Ralph. J. Masi & Robert, A. (2000). Effects of transformational leadership on subordinate motivation, empowering norms, and organizational productivity, International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 8(1), 16-47.
- Redding, S. G. & Michael Ng. (1982). The role of face in the organizational perceptions of Chinese managers. Organization Studies, 3(3), 201-209.
- Ross, S. M. & Offerman, L.R. (1991). Transformational leaders: measurement of personality attributes and work group performance. Paper Presented at the Sixth Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, St. Louis, MO.
- Russell L.A. (1999). Transformational leadership, Strategy & Leadership, 27(1), 20-25.
- Salgado, J.F. (1997). The Five Factor model of personality and job performance in the European Community. Journal of Applied Psychology. 82 (1), 30-43.

- Shenkar, O. (1994). The People's Republic of China-raising the bamboo screen through international management research. International Studies of Management and Organization, 24(1-2), 9-34.
- Stewart, S. & Him, C.C. (1991). Chinese winners: views of senior PRC managers on the reasons for their success. International Studies of Management and Organization, 20, 57-68.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: a survey of the literature. Journal of Psychology, 25, 35-71.
- Tabak, F., Solomon, J.S. & Nielsen, C. (1998). Managerial success: a profile of future managers in China. Sam Advanced Management Journal, Autumn, 18-26.
- Triandis, C.H. (1993). The contingency model in cross-cultural perspective, in M.M. Chemers and Ayman R (Eds), Leadership theory and research perspective and Directions: 167-188. Academic Press: San Diego.
- Vertinsku, I., Tse, D.K. & Wehrung, D.A. (1990). Organizational design and management norms: a comparative study of managers' perceptions in the People's Republic of China, Hong Kong, and Canada. Journal of Management, 16 (Dec.), 853-867.
- Wall, J.A. (1990). Managers in the People's Republic of China. Academy of Management Executive, 4 (May), 19-32.
- Wang, Y., Zhang, X. S. & Goodfellow, R. (1998). Business Culture in China. Singapore: Butterworth-Heinemann Asia
- Weldon, E. & Vanhonacker, W. (1999). Operating a foreign-invested enterprise in China: challenges for managers and management researchers. Journal of World Business, 34(1), Spring, 94-107.
- Wiggins, J.S. (Ed). (1996). The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Witley, R.D. (1991). The social construction of business system in East Asia. Organization Studies, 12, 1-28.
- 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.B. Clark (Eds.), Measures of Leadership, (151-169). NJ: West Orange.
- Yang, J. Q. (1995). ABC of Chinese Culture – Overcome Hidden Barriers to Success in China's Market. Toronto: Canada China Market Development Corp.

**Table 1**

The Studies of Transformational Leadership

<b>Year</b>	<b>Article</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Sample</b>
2001	Value systems of transformational leaders	Krishnan, V.R.	This study attempted to draw a value profile of a transformational leader.	95 pairs of leaders and subordinates of a non-profit organization in the <b>U.S.</b>
2000	Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership	Judge, T. A. & Bono, J. E.	This study linked the traits from the 5-factor model of personality to transformational leadership behavior.	316 class participants and 240 alumni from leadership program throughout the Midwest of <b>U.S.</b>
2000	Ethical preferences of transformational leaders: an empirical investigation	Banerji, P. et al.	This study looked at the relationship between the four factors of transformational leadership and the leader's preference for unethical behavior.	100 pairs of managers and subordinates from four multinational organizations in <b>India</b>
2000	Effects of transformational leadership on subordinate motivation, empowering norms and organizational productivity	Masi, R.J. et al.	Transformational leadership was proposed to be related to subordinates' motivation and commitment to quality, the strength of empowering norms at the subunit level, organizational productivity and the self-image of leaders.	2596 regular army personnel from the <b>U.S.</b> army recruiting command
2000	Enhancing transformational leadership: the roles of training and feedback	Kelloway et al.	This paper investigated the effect of leadership training and counseling feedback on subordinates' perceptions of transformational leadership.	40 department managers and 180 subordinates from a provincial health care corporation in Eastern <b>Canada</b>

Year	Article	Author	Purpose	Sample
2000	Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: an exploratory study	Barling, J. et al.	This paper investigated whether emotional intelligence was associated with the transformational leadership	60 managers of a large pulp and paper organization in <b>Canada</b>
2000	Opening the black box: an experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership	Jung, D.I. & Avolio, B. J.	This experimental study examined the causal effects of transformational and transactional leadership and the mediating role of trust and value congruence on follower performance.	194 students from upper business courses at a public university in the Northeastern <b>U.S.</b>
2000	Women civil servants and transformational leadership in Bangladesh	Amos-Wilson, P.	This article explored the issues of women and leadership style in a context that is neither commercial nor western.	49 women in <b>Bangladeshi</b> Civil Service
1999	Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: a two-sample study	Pillai, R. Et al.	This study presented a comprehensive model of relationships between transformational and transactional leadership, procedural and distributive justice, trust, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior.	192 and 155 matched leaders and subordinates from a <b>U.S. corporation</b>
1999	Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions	Jung, D.I. & Avolio, B.J.	Manipulated transformational and transactional leadership styles and compared them in individual and group task conditions to determine whether they had different impacts on individualists and collectivists performing a brainstorming task.	347 students with business major in the school of management of a large public university in the northeastern <b>U.S.</b> 27 out of the 347 students from 2 Korean language courses

<b>Year</b>	<b>Article</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Sample</b>
1996	Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants for employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organizational citizenship behaviors	Podsakoff, P.M. et al.	This study examined the effects of transformational leadership behaviors within the context of Kerr and Jermier's (1978) substitutes for leadership.	1539 employees across a wide variety of different industries, organizational settings, and job levels in <b>U.S.</b>
1996	Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and fiscal outcomes: a field experiment	Barling, J. et al.	A pretest-posttest control-group design was used to assess the effects of transformational leadership training.	20 managers with 9 and 11 assigned randomly to training and control group from 20 branches of the 5 largest banks in one region of <b>Canada</b>
1994	Transformational leadership theory: using levels of analysis to determine boundary conditions	Yammarino, F.J. & Dubinsky, A.J.	The purpose of this study was to refine understanding of transformational leadership theory by a specification and test of boundary conditions.	105 salespersons and their 33 sales supervisors in <b>U.S.</b>
1993	Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support of innovation: key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance	Howell, J.M. & Avolio, B.J.	The authors used measures of leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation to predict the consolidated-unit performance.	78 managers representing the top four levels of management in a large <b>Canadian</b> financial institution

<b>Year</b>	<b>Article</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Sample</b>
1990	Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior	Podsakoff, P.M. et al	This study examined the impact of transformational leader behaviors on organizational citizenship, and the potential mediating role played by subordinates' trust and satisfaction in that process.	Exempt employees of a diversified petrochemical company. The company's corporate offices are in U.S. Divisions throughout the U.S.(95%), Canada, and Europe were represented
1990	An investigation of transformational leadership among UK managers	Lim, B.	This paper reported an exploratory investigation on the relevance and nature of transformational leadership within a UK management context.	25 senior managers from a pharmaceutical company in U.K.
1988	Superiors' evaluation and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership	Hater, J.J. & Bass, B.M.	This study replicated the previous augmentation effects using subordinates' effectiveness rating.	54 managers from a U.S. corporation specializing in the door-to-door express delivery of goods and information

**Table 2**

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among Big Five Traits, Leadership Behaviors, and Leader Effective Variables for Chinese and U.S. Samples

	Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Neuroticism	2.76	0.30	-								
		3.17	0.66	-								
2	Extraversion	3.17	0.27	-.51*	-							
		5.07	0.62	-.22*	-							
3	Openness to Experience	3.16	0.24	-.32*	.48*	-						
		4.89	0.67	-.07	.38*	-						
4	Agreeableness	3.31	0.26	-.37*	.16*	.14*	-					
		5.17	0.57	-.20*	.20*	.30*	-					
5	Conscientiousness	3.47	0.34	-.57*	.51*	.17*	.48*	-				
		5.23	0.53	-.42*	.19*	-.09	.17*	-				
6	Idealized Influence	2.23	0.60	-.10	.05	.09	.08	.04	-			
		2.83	0.58	.01	.22*	.18*	.28*	-.04	-			
7	Inspirational motivation	2.36	0.68	-.07	.02	.13	.05	.03	.72*	-		
		3.03	0.58	-.03	.24*	.22*	.21*	-.06	.77*	-		
8	Intellectual Stimulation	1.83	0.72	-.09	-.11	-.04	.03	-.07	.18*	.18*	-	
		2.63	0.59	.07	.14+	.10	.24*	-.10	.70*	.54*	-	
9	Individualized consideration	1.65	0.86	-.07	-.14	-.03	.03	-.07	.11	.11	.73*	-
		2.71	0.64	.01	.19*	.21*	.23*	.01	.78*	.58*	.70*	-
10	Contingent reward	2.08	0.68	-.08	-.10	.02	.02	-.12	.66*	.47*	.50*	.52*
		2.64	0.57	.09	.10	.11	.20*	-.06	.76*	.59*	.66*	.71*
11	MBE-active	2.01	0.58	-.01	.03	-.06	.01	-.03	.36*	.27*	.20*	.26*
		1.28	0.68	-.04	-.06	-.02	-.02	.02	-.08	-.13+	-.06	-.08
12	MBE-passive	2.16	0.74	-.01	.07	-.04	.09	.06	.04	.06	-.23*	-.28*
		0.89	0.57	-.08	-.08	-.10	-.15*	-.14+	-.44*	-.31*	-.40*	-.41*
13	Laissez-faire	1.88	0.77	.02	.07	-.06	.06	.11	.05	.09	-.19*	-.07
		0.66	0.52	-.07	-.07	-.03	-.15*	-.18*	-.53*	-.35*	-.41*	-.46*



	Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14	Satisfaction with supervision	4.97	1.00	.11	-.07	-.09	-.03	-.09	-.11	-.12	.00	.07
		5.85	0.95	.03	.13+	.02	.13+	.00	.65*	.48*	.49*	.59*
15	Overall job satisfaction	4.52	0.80	.04	-.05	-.04	-.03	-.01	-.02	-.04	-.00	.01
		5.89	0.64	.02	.06	.02	-.09	-.06	.29*	.24*	.22*	.26*
16	Organizational commitment	4.13	0.95	-.03	-.08	.02	-.03	-.06	-.10	-.04*	-.04	-.05
		5.11	0.80	.00	.11	.05	-.03	-.08	.38*	.29*	.35*	.36*
17	Work motivation	2.02	0.74	-.20*	.04	.14*	.16*	.07	.37*	.20*	.38*	.50*
		2.78	0.91	-.02	.14+	.12	.11	.01	.59*	.52*	.48*	.58*
18	Leadership Effectiveness	4.88	0.78	.11	-.13	-.14	-.02	-.09	-.03	-.05	.03	.07
		5.46	0.85	-.16*	.19*	.27*	.03	-.04	.23*	.24*	.11	.15+

	Variable	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
11	MBE-active	.38*	-							
		.01	-							
12	MBE-passive	-.13	.05	-						
		-.47*	.07	-						
13	Laissez-faire	-.04	.12	.54*	-					
		-.58*	-.02	.64*	-					
14	Satisfaction with supervision	-.02	-.02	.03	.03	-				
		.59*	-.22*	-.43*	-.53*	-				
15	Overall job satisfaction	.01	-.09	-.01	-.06	.62*	-			
		.29*	-.18*	-.12	-.21*	.49*	-			
16	Organizational commitment	-.07	-.13	-.05	-.11	.48*	.56*	-		
		.38*	-.09	-.19*	-.31*	.48*	.65*	-		
17	Work motivation	.45*	.18*	.08	.13	.06	.02	-.03	-	
		.52*	-.06	-.34*	-.38*	.46*	.30*	.40*	-	
18	Leadership Effectiveness	.04	.02	.07	.06	.91*	.70*	.51*	.11	-
		.09	-.11	-.04	-.04	.11	.01	.01	.11	-

**Note:**

- The first line presents Chinese sample statistics and the second line presents U.S. sample statistics
- The idealized influence is treated as a whole instead of as two separate aspects: attribute and behavior, for the correlation between charismatic attribution and charismatic behavioral items are as high as the items' reliabilities (Howell and Avolio, 1991)
- The Chinese sample takes the 5-point scale for the big-five personality measurement, which the U.S. sample takes the 7-point scale
- MBE = Management By Exception
- In the Chinese sample, +p<.10 (two-tailed) \*p<0.05 (two-tailed); in the U.S. sample, +p<.05 (one tailed), \*p<.05 (two-tailed)

**Table 3**

Relationship between Big Five Traits and Transformational Leadership Behavior

<b>Big Five Trait</b>	<b>r</b>	<b><math>\beta</math></b>
<b>Neuroticism</b>	<b>.11</b>	<b>-.22*</b>
	.02	.07
<b>Extraversion</b>	<b>.07</b>	<b>-.17<sup>+</sup></b>
	.22**	.15 <sup>+</sup>
<b>Openness to Experience</b>	<b>.04</b>	<b>.06</b>
	.20**	.07
<b>Agreeableness</b>	<b>.06</b>	<b>.04</b>
	.27**	.23**
<b>Conscientiousness</b>	<b>.03</b>	<b>-.10</b>
	-.05	-.06
<b>R</b>		<b>.21</b>
		.34**
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>		<b>.04</b>
		.12**

**Note:**

- The first line presents Chinese sample statistics and the second line is the U.S. sample statistics
- r = simple (zero-order) correlation
- $\beta$  = standardized regression coefficient

**Table 4**

Big Five Facets Versus Overall Construct in Predicting Transformational Leadership Behavior

Facet and construct	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Significant facet	
			Chinese Sample	U.S. Sample
Neuroticism				
Facet	.20	.04		
	.12	.01		
Overall construct	.11	.01		
	.02	.00		
Extraversion				
Facet	.20	.04		Assertiveness (r=.16*)
	.22	.05		Positive emotions (r=.15*)
Overall construct	.07	.01	Activity (r=-.17*)	Activity (r=.13 <sup>+</sup> )
	.22	.05**		
Openness to Experience				
Facet	.22	.05		Feelings (r=.17*)
	.29	.09*		Actions (r=.14 <sup>+</sup> )
Overall construct	.04	.00	Fantasy (r=-.13 <sup>+</sup> )	Ideas (r=.15 <sup>+</sup> )
	.20	.04**	Value (r=.15*)	Values (r=.17*)
Agreeableness				
Facet	.16	.03		Trust (r=.15 <sup>+</sup> )
	.23	.05		Straightforwardness(r=.16*)
Overall construct	.06	.00		Altruism (r=.14 <sup>+</sup> )
	.27	.07**		Tender-mindedness (r=.13 <sup>+</sup> )
Conscientiousness				
Facet	.13	.02		
	.25	.06		
Overall construct	.03	.00		
	.05	.00		

Note:

- The first line presents Chinese sample statistics and the second line is the U.S. sample statistics
- R= multiple correlation when six facets were entered individually into regression or when single unit-weight construct was entered into regression

**Table 5**

Relationship between leadership behaviors and measures of leadership effectiveness

<b>Leadership Behavior</b>	<b>Subordinate Satisfaction With leader</b>	<b>Subordinate Overall job Satisfaction</b>	<b>Subordinate Organizational Commitment</b>	<b>Subordinate Work Motivation</b>	<b>Leader Effectiveness</b>
<b>Contingent reward</b>	<b><i>-.01</i></b>	<b><i>.05</i></b>	<b><i>-.03</i></b>	<b><i>.47**</i></b>	<b><i>.06</i></b>
	<i>.17<sup>+</sup></i>	<i>.18</i>	<i>.13</i>	<i>.05</i>	<i>-.16</i>
<b>MBE-active</b>	<b><i>-.01</i></b>	<b><i>-.10</i></b>	<b><i>-.11</i></b>	<b><i>-.01</i></b>	<b><i>-.01</i></b>
	<i>-.21**</i>	<i>-.18*</i>	<i>-.08</i>	<i>.00</i>	<i>-.07</i>
<b>MBE-passive</b>	<b><i>.01</i></b>	<b><i>.04</i></b>	<b><i>.02</i></b>	<b><i>.08</i></b>	<b><i>.07</i></b>
	<i>-.01</i>	<i>.12</i>	<i>.11</i>	<i>-.04</i>	<i>.02</i>
<b>Laissez-faire</b>	<b><i>.02</i></b>	<b><i>-.06</i></b>	<b><i>-.11</i></b>	<b><i>.12</i></b>	<b><i>.02</i></b>
	<i>-.24**</i>	<i>-.11</i>	<i>-.17<sup>+</sup></i>	<i>-.06</i>	<i>.04</i>
<b>Transformational</b>	<b><i>-.04</i></b>	<b><i>-.04</i></b>	<b><i>-.11</i></b>	<b><i>.38**</i></b>	<b><i>-.01</i></b>
	<i>.35**</i>	<i>.13</i>	<i>.26**</i>	<i>.54**</i>	<i>.35**</i>
<b>R</b>	<b><i>.05</i></b>	<b><i>.11</i></b>	<b><i>.18</i></b>	<b><i>.55**</i></b>	<b><i>.10</i></b>
	<i>.71**</i>	<i>.37**</i>	<i>.44**</i>	<i>.63**</i>	<i>.26*</i>
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b><i>.00</i></b>	<b><i>.01</i></b>	<b><i>.03</i></b>	<b><i>.30**</i></b>	<b><i>.01</i></b>
	<i>.51**</i>	<i>.14**</i>	<i>.19**</i>	<i>.40**</i>	<i>.07*</i>
<b>N</b>	<b><i>764</i></b>	<b><i>764</i></b>	<b><i>764</i></b>	<b><i>764</i></b>	<b><i>764</i></b>
	<i>181</i>	<i>181</i>	<i>181</i>	<i>181</i>	<i>156</i>

Note:

- The first line presents Chinese sample statistics and the second line is the U.S. sample statistics.
- With the exception of R and R<sup>2</sup> values, table entries are standardized regression (β) coefficients.
- MBE=Management by Exception
- +p<.05 (one-tailed) \*p<.05 (two-tailed) \*\*p<.01 (two-tailed)

## **Appendix 1**

### **Letter of Intention to Leaders**

Dear participant,

Thank you for your time today.

The purpose of the research is to understand the linkage between the personality and leadership behavior in the Chinese culture. Your professor has partnered with me to achieve this object. Your participation is critical to the success of this research. Please take 40 minutes to complete the personality survey and distribute the other survey packages to two of your direct subordinates and one of your direct superiors respectively. Please mail your response directly to me with the attached envelop.

Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw your participation at any time. All information gathered in this study will be coded so that you cannot be personally identified. You can put your contact information on the return envelop if you are interested in the result of your personality

This research is being conducted by Lian Shao, Student of Master of Science in Administration, John Molson School of Business, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada.

Again, thank you for your time and support; wish you every success in your career.

Lian Shao [lian\\_shao@hotmail.com](mailto:lian_shao@hotmail.com) (1 514) 484-9204

## **Letter of Intention to Subordinates and Superior**

Dear participant,

Thank you for your time today.

The purpose of the research is to understand the linkage between the personality and leadership behavior in the Chinese culture. Your colleague has partnered with me to achieve this object. Your participation is critical to the success of this research. Please take 30 minutes to complete the survey. Please mail your response directly to me with the attached envelop.

Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw your participation at any time. All information gathered in this study will be coded so that you cannot be personally identified.

This research is being conducted by Lian Shao, Student of Master of Science in Administration, John Molson School of Business, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada.

Again, thank you for your time and support; wish you every success in your career.

Lian Shao [lian\\_shao@hotmail.com](mailto:lian_shao@hotmail.com) (1 514) 484-9204

1. I am not a worrier.
2. I really like most people I meet.
3. I have a very active imagination.
4. I tend to be cynical and skeptical of others' intentions.
5. I'm known for my prudence and common sense.
6. I often get angry at the way people treat me.
7. I shy away from crowds of people.
8. Aesthetic and artistic concerns aren't very important to me.
9. I'm not crafty or sly.
10. I would rather keep my options open than plan everything in advance.
11. I rarely feel lonely or blue.
12. I am dominant, forceful, and assertive.
13. Without strong emotions, life would be uninteresting to me.
14. Some people think I'm selfish and egotistical.
15. I try to perform all the tasks assigned to me conscientiously.
16. In dealing with other people, I always dread making a social blunder.
17. I have a leisurely style in work and play.
18. I'm pretty set in my ways.
19. I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them.
20. I am easy-going and lackadaisical.
21. I rarely overindulge in anything.
22. I often crave excitement.
23. I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas.
24. I don't mind bragging about my talents and accomplishments.
25. I'm pretty good about pacing myself so as to get things done on time.
26. I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems.
27. I have never literally jumped for joy.
28. I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them.
29. Political leaders need to be more aware of the human side of their policies.
30. Over the years I've done some pretty stupid things.
31. I am easily frightened.
32. I don't get much pleasure from chatting with people.
33. I try to keep all my thoughts directed along realistic lines and avoid flights of fancy.
34. I believe that most people are basically well-intentioned.
35. I don't take civic duties like voting very seriously.
36. I'm an even-tempered person.
37. I like to have a lot of people around me.
38. I am sometimes completely absorbed in music I am listening to.
39. If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want.
40. I keep my belongings neat and clean.
41. Sometimes I feel completely worthless.
42. I sometimes fail to assert myself as much as I should.
43. I rarely experience strong emotions.
44. I try to be courteous to everyone I meet.
45. Sometimes I'm not as dependable or reliable as I should be.



46. I seldom feel self-conscious when I'm around people.
47. When I do things, I do them vigorously.
48. I think it's interesting to learn and develop new hobbies.
49. I can be sarcastic and cutting when I need to be.
50. I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion.
51. I have trouble resisting my cravings.
52. I wouldn't enjoy vacationing in Las Vegas.
53. I find philosophical arguments boring.
54. I'd rather not talk about myself and my achievements.
55. I waste a lot of time before settling down to work.
56. I feel I am capable of coping with most of my problems.
57. I have sometimes experienced intense joy or ecstasy.
58. I believe that laws and social policies should change to reflect the needs of a changing world.
59. I'm hard-headed and tough-minded in my attitudes.
60. I think things through before coming to a decision.
61. I rarely feel fearful or anxious.
62. I'm known as a warm and friendly person.
63. I have an active fantasy life.
64. I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them.
65. I keep myself informed and usually make intelligent decisions.
66. I am known as hot-blooded and quick-tempered.
67. I usually prefer to do things alone.
68. Watching ballet or modern dance bores me.
69. I couldn't deceive anyone even if I wanted to.
70. I am not a very methodical person.
71. I am seldom sad or depressed.
72. I have often been a leader of groups I have belonged to.
73. How I feel about things is important to me.
74. Some people think of me as cold and calculating.
75. I pay my debts promptly and in full.
76. At times I have been so ashamed I just wanted to hide.
77. My work is likely to be slow but steady.
78. Once I find the right way to do something, I stick to it.
79. I hesitate to express my anger even when it's justified.
80. When I start a self-improvement program, I usually let it slide after a few days.
81. I have little difficulty resisting temptation.
82. I have sometimes done things just for "kicks" or "thrills."
83. I enjoy solving problems or puzzles.
84. I'm better than most people, and I know it.
85. I am a productive person who always gets the job done.
86. When I'm under a great deal of stress, sometimes I feel like I'm going to pieces.
87. I am not a cheerful optimist.
88. I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues.
89. We can never do too much for the poor and elderly.
90. Occasionally I act first and think later.

91. I often feel tense and jittery.
92. Many people think of me as somewhat cold and distant.
93. I don't like to waste my time daydreaming.
94. I think most of the people I deal with are honest and trustworthy.
95. I often come into situations without being fully prepared.
96. I am not considered a touchy or temperamental person.
97. I really feel the need for other people if I am by myself for long.
98. I am intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature.
99. Being perfectly honest is a bad way to do business.
100. I like to keep everything in its place so I know just where it is.
101. I have sometimes experienced a deep sense of guilt or sinfulness.
102. In meetings, I usually let others do the talking.
103. I seldom pay much attention to my feelings of the moment.
104. I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.
105. Sometimes I cheat when I play solitaire.
106. It doesn't embarrass me too much if people ridicule and tease me.
107. I often feel as if I'm bursting with energy.
108. I often try new and foreign foods.
109. If I don't like people, I let them know it.
110. I work hard to accomplish my goals.
111. When I am having my favorite foods, I tend to eat too much.
112. I tend to avoid movies that are shocking or scary.
113. I sometimes lose interest when people talk about very abstract, theoretical matters.
114. I try to be humble.
115. I have trouble making myself do what I should.
116. I keep a cool head in emergencies.
117. Sometimes I bubble with happiness.
118. I believe that the different ideas of right and wrong that people in other societies have may be valid for them.
119. I have no sympathy for panhandlers.
120. I always consider the consequences before I take action.
121. I'm seldom apprehensive about the future.
122. I really enjoy talking to people.
123. I enjoy concentrating on a fantasy or daydream and exploring all its possibilities, letting it grow and develop.
124. I'm suspicious when someone does something nice for me.
125. I pride myself on my sound judgment.
126. I often get disgusted with people I have to deal with.
127. I prefer jobs that let me work alone without being bothered by other people.
128. Poetry has little or no effect on me.
129. I would hate to be thought of as a hypocrite.
130. I never seem to be able to get organized.
131. I tend to blame myself when anything goes wrong.
132. Other people often look to me to make decisions.
133. I experience a wide range of emotions or feelings.
134. I'm not known for my generosity.
135. When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through.

36. I often feel inferior to others.
37. I'm not as quick and lively as other people.
38. I prefer to spend my time in familiar surroundings.
39. When I've been insulted, I just try to forgive and forget.
40. I don't feel like I'm driven to get ahead.
41. I seldom give in to my impulses.
42. I like to be where the action is.
43. I enjoy working on "mind-twister"-type puzzles.
44. I have a very high opinion of myself.
45. Once I start a project, I almost always finish it.
46. It's often hard for me to make up my mind.
47. I don't consider myself especially "light-hearted."
48. I believe that loyalty to one's ideals and principles is more important than "open-mindedness."
49. Human need should always take priority over economic considerations.
50. I often do things on the spur of the moment.
51. I often worry about things that might go wrong.
52. I find it easy to smile and be outgoing with strangers.
53. If I feel my mind starting to drift off into daydreams, I usually get busy and start concentrating on some work or activity instead.
54. My first reaction is to trust people.
55. I don't seem to be completely successful at anything.
56. It takes a lot to get me mad.
57. I'd rather vacation at a popular beach than an isolated cabin in the woods.
58. Certain kinds of music have an endless fascination for me.
59. Sometimes I trick people into doing what I want.
60. I tend to be somewhat fastidious or exacting.
61. I have a low opinion of myself.
62. I would rather go my own way than be a leader of others.
63. I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce.
64. Most people I know like me.
65. I adhere strictly to my ethical principles.
66. I feel comfortable in the presence of my bosses or other authorities.
67. I usually seem to be in a hurry.
68. Sometimes I make changes around the house just to try something different.
69. If someone starts a fight, I'm ready to fight back.
70. I strive to achieve all I can.
71. I sometimes eat myself sick.
72. I love the excitement of roller coasters.
73. I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.
74. I feel that I am no better than others, no matter what their condition.
75. When a project gets too difficult, I'm inclined to start a new one.
76. I can handle myself pretty well in a crisis.
77. I am a cheerful, high-spirited person.
78. I consider myself broad-minded and tolerant of other people's lifestyles.
79. I believe all human beings are worthy of respect.
80. I rarely make hasty decisions.

81. I have fewer fears than most people.
82. I have strong emotional attachments to my friends.
83. As a child I rarely enjoyed games of make believe.
84. I tend to assume the best about people.
85. I'm a very competent person.
86. At times I have felt bitter and resentful.
87. Social gatherings are usually boring to me.
88. Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement.
89. At times I bully or flatter people into doing what I want them to.
90. I'm not compulsive about cleaning.
91. Sometimes things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me.
92. In conversations, I tend to do most of the talking.
93. I find it easy to empathize—to feel myself what others are feeling.
94. I think of myself as a charitable person.
95. I try to do jobs carefully, so they won't have to be done again.
96. If I have said or done the wrong thing to someone, I can hardly bear to face them again.
97. My life is fast-paced.
98. On a vacation, I prefer going back to a tried and true spot.
99. I'm hard-headed and stubborn.
100. I strive for excellence in everything I do.
101. Sometimes I do things on impulse that I later regret.
102. I'm attracted to bright colors and flashy styles.
103. I have a lot of intellectual curiosity.
104. I would rather praise others than be praised myself.
105. There are so many little jobs that need to be done that I sometimes just ignore them all.
106. When everything seems to be going wrong, I can still make good decisions.
107. I rarely use words like "fantastic!" or "sensational!" to describe my experiences.
108. I think that if people don't know what they believe in by the time they're 25, there's something wrong with them.
109. I have sympathy for others less fortunate than me.
110. I plan ahead carefully when I go on a trip.
111. Frightening thoughts sometimes come into my head.
112. I take a personal interest in the people I work with.
113. I would have difficulty just letting my mind wander without control or guidance.
114. I have a good deal of faith in human nature.
115. I am efficient and effective at my work.
116. Even minor annoyances can be frustrating to me.
117. I enjoy parties with lots of people.
118. I enjoy reading poetry that emphasizes feelings and images more than story lines.
119. I pride myself on my shrewdness in handling people.
120. I spend a lot of time looking for things I've misplaced.
121. Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up.
122. I don't find it easy to take charge of a situation.
123. Odd things—like certain scents or the names of distant places—can evoke strong moods in me.
124. I go out of my way to help others if I can.
125. I'd really have to be sick before I'd miss a day of work.

26. When people I know do foolish things, I get embarrassed for them.
27. I am a very active person.
28. I follow the same route when I go someplace.
29. I often get into arguments with my family and co-workers.
30. I'm something of a "workaholic."
31. I am always able to keep my feelings under control.
32. I like being part of the crowd at sporting events.
33. I have a wide range of intellectual interests.
34. I'm a superior person.
35. I have a lot of self-discipline.
36. I'm pretty stable emotionally.
37. I laugh easily.
38. I believe that the "new morality" of permissiveness is no morality at all.
39. I would rather be known as "merciful" than as "just."
40. I think twice before I answer a question.

# Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

## Rater Form

Name of Leader: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization ID #: \_\_\_\_\_ Leader ID #: \_\_\_\_\_

This questionnaire is used to describe the leadership style of the above-mentioned individual as you perceive it. Answer all items on this answer sheet. **If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.** Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

IMPORTANT (necessary for processing): Which best describes you?

- ☐ I am at a higher organizational level than the person I am rating.  
☐ The person I am rating is at my organizational level.  
☐ I am at a lower organizational level than the person I am rating.  
☐ I do not wish my organizational level to be known.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing. Use the following rating scale:

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

### THE PERSON I AM RATING. . .

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts.....0 1 2 3 4
2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate .....0 1 2 3 4
3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious .....0 1 2 3 4
4. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations  
from standards.....0 1 2 3 4
5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise .....0 1 2 3 4
6. Talks about their most important values and beliefs .....0 1 2 3 4
7. Is absent when needed .....0 1 2 3 4
8. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.....0 1 2 3 4
9. Talks optimistically about the future .....0 1 2 3 4
10. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her .....0 1 2 3 4
11. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets.....0 1 2 3 4
12. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action.....0 1 2 3 4
13. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished .....0 1 2 3 4
14. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.....0 1 2 3 4
15. Spends time teaching and coaching.....0 1 2 3 4

Continued ⇒

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always	
0	1	2	3	4	
16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved .....	0	1	2	3	4
17. Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." .....	0	1	2	3	4
18. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group .....	0	1	2	3	4
19. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group .....	0	1	2	3	4
20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action.....	0	1	2	3	4
21. Acts in ways that builds my respect.....	0	1	2	3	4
22. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures .....	0	1	2	3	4
23. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.....	0	1	2	3	4
24. Keeps track of all mistakes.....	0	1	2	3	4
25. Displays a sense of power and confidence .....	0	1	2	3	4
26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future .....	0	1	2	3	4
27. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards.....	0	1	2	3	4
28. Avoids making decisions .....	0	1	2	3	4
29. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others.....	0	1	2	3	4
30. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles .....	0	1	2	3	4
31. Helps me to develop my strengths .....	0	1	2	3	4
32. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.....	0	1	2	3	4
33. Delays responding to urgent questions .....	0	1	2	3	4
34. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.....	0	1	2	3	4
35. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations.....	0	1	2	3	4
36. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved .....	0	1	2	3	4
37. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs .....	0	1	2	3	4
38. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying.....	0	1	2	3	4
39. Gets me to do more than I expected to do .....	0	1	2	3	4
40. Is effective in representing me to higher authority .....	0	1	2	3	4
41. Works with me in a satisfactory way.....	0	1	2	3	4
42. Heightens my desire to succeed .....	0	1	2	3	4
43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements .....	0	1	2	3	4
44. Increases my willingness to try harder .....	0	1	2	3	4
45. Leads a group that is effective.....	0	1	2	3	4

## Questionnaire on Leadership Effectiveness

Instruction: please choose one scale that is most appropriately describe yourself and your leader from the following seven scales.

### Subordinate satisfaction with leader

1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7-----
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Disagree/Agree	Agree		Agree

I am satisfied with the overall quality of supervision I receive in my work.

I am satisfied with the amount of support and guidance I receive from my supervisor.

I am satisfied with the degree of respect and fair treatment I receive from my boss.

### Subordinate overall job satisfaction

1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7-----
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Disagree/Agree	Agree		Agree

I feel fairly satisfied with my present job.

Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.

Each day at work seems like it will never end.

I find real enjoyment in my work.

I consider my job to be rather unpleasant.



### Subordinate organizational commitment

1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7-----
Strongly	Disagree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Agree	Strongly
Disagree		Disagree	Disagree/Agree	Agree		Agree

I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.

I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.

I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.

I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization.

I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.

This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.

### Leader Effectiveness

1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7-----
Very	Poor	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Strong	Very
Poor		Poor	Poor / Strong	Strong		Strong

On his/her demonstrated ability to formulate and communicate a vision of the future for his/her work group.

On his/her demonstrated ability to promote cooperation toward group goals among his/her subordinates.

On his/her demonstrated ability to stimulate employees to think about problems in new ways.

On his/her ability to lead his/her subordinates to meet group performance goals.

Overall, as a leader