UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

EXCEPTIONAL LEADERS AND THEIR FOLLOWERS: AN IN-DEPTH LOOK AT LEADER-FOLLOWER INTERACTIONS

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Jill Mowry Strange
Norman, Oklahoma
2004

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/693

UMI Number: 3120032

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform 3120032

Copyright 2004 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© Copyright by JILL MOWRY STRANGE 2004
All Rights Reserved

EXCEPTIONAL LEADERS AND THEIR FOLLOWERS: AN IN-DEPTH LOOK AT LEADER-FOLLOWER INTERACTIONS

A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

BY

Michael D. Mumford, Ph.D.

Mary Shane Connelly, Ph.D.

Jorge Mendoza, Ph.D.

Ryan P. Brown, Ph.D.

Claudia C. Cogliser, Ph.D.

Acknowledgements

First, many thanks go out to Cassie Blair, Lesley Dailey, Sam Hunter, and Katrina Bedell for the hours and hours of data coding that they put into this project. It could never have been done without you!

Second, I would like to thank Ginamarie Ligon and Holly Osburn for their great amount of support and friendship throughout my time at the University of Oklahoma. I would have been lost without both of you to help me through the graduate school.

Third, I would like to thank my dissertation committee: Claudia Cogliser, Jorge Mendoza, Shane Connelly, and Ryan Brown. Your guidance has taught me so much and I can only hope to contribute as much to the field of psychology as you all have.

Fourth, I would like to thank my advisor, Michael Mumford. While I may not have been the best graduate student over the past 5 years, I feel confident that your continuing leadership, support, and instruction have given to me the tools that I need to become a high-performing industrial and organizational psychologist. I admire and respect you more than you can even fathom and I will work my hardest to make you proud.

My dad, mom, and sister, John, Kathleen, and Anne Mowry, are the best family in the world. I have never doubted for a minute that you have always loved me and wanted the best for me. I love you so much and am so proud to have such an intelligent, beautiful, and fun family as you. Thank you so much for everything.

Adam Strange, I love you with all my heart and I am so happy that you have been here with me every step of the way. You have helped me in times of need, laughed with me in times of joy, and have been the best friend I could possibly ever have. I am so lucky to have someone as wonderful as you to share my future with and I can't wait for all of the great things that are going to happen in our future. I love you.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....1
2. Theories of Outstanding Leadership.....1
3. Leader-member Exchange.....10
4. Leader-member Exchange at a High Level.....13
5. Method.....16
6. Results.....24
7. Discussion.....35
8. References.....43
9. Tables and Figures.....48
10. Appendices.....70

List of Tables and Appendices

Figure 1: Incidents of Leader-Follower Relationships
Figure 2: Sample Rating Scales from Normative, Higher-level, and LMX-7
Table 1: List of Outstanding Leaders Used in Study
Table 2: Mean, Standard Deviation, Interrater Agreement Coefficients, and Correlations for Interactional Dimensional Ratings
Table 3: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for General Measures of Leader Performance
Table 4: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Covariate Measures
Table 5: Means and Standard Deviations for All Measures of Leader-member Exchange Relationships
Table 6: Summary Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance
Table 7: Orientation Univariate Results for Normative Scales
Table 8: Orientation Univariate Results for Upper-Level Scales
Table 9: Style Univariate Results for Upper-Level Scales
Table 10: Orientation Univariate Results for LMX-7 Items
Table 11: Style Univariate Results for LMX-7 Items
Table 12: Significant Discriminant Functions for Style
Table 13: Significant Discriminant Functions for Orientation
Table 14: Correlations of Performance Criteria with Discriminant Functions Summarizing Differences among Leaders
Table 15: Summary of Regression Results
Appendix 1: Biographies Used in Present Study
Appendix 2: Leader-Member Exchange Rating Scales
Appendix 3: Outstanding Leader-Member Exchange Rating Scales
Appendix 4: Modified LMX-7 Scales
Appendix 5: Overall Outcome Scales

Abstract

In recent years there has been an increase in the study of outstanding leaders and the differences between outstanding leaders of different types and orientations. Very few studies, however, have been performed regarding how these outstanding leaders interact with their followers. The present study uses biographical information for 120 outstanding leaders and evaluates their relationships with their close followers based on normative and higher-level leader-member exchange (LMX) dimensions. Differences were found for the normative dimensions for leader orientation (socialized vs. personalized) with socialized leaders typically exhibiting better close follower interactions. Differences were found for the higher-level dimensions for both leader orientation and leader style (ideological, charismatic, and pragmatic) with socialized and ideological leaders typically exhibiting better close follower interactions. These differences and implications for the study of outstanding leadership are discussed.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt is considered by many to be one of the greatest leaders of the 20th century. As the 32nd President of the United States, not only did he bring his country out of the Great Depression through programs such as the New Deal and the Civilian Conservation Corps, his charisma and vision served to motivate and inspire his followers across the country in a time of great need. However, while FDR was undoubtedly an outstanding leader in his own right, it is important to recognize that his accomplishments may have never have been realized if not for his interactions with and the devotion of a few key close followers. These followers, while many may not know their names, served as close advisors and lieutenants and were, in part, responsible for assisting FDR in the development and implementation of his programs.

In recent years, an increasing amount of attention has been paid to the importance of studying outstanding leadership and how outstanding leaders, such as FDR, function within organizations (Strange & Mumford, 2002; Mumford & Van Doorn, 2001; House, 1977; Conger & Kanungo, 1987). However, very little research has been performed regarding the interactions of outstanding leaders with their very close followers as opposed to their general constituency. The intent of this study is to explore these interactions and relationships and determine how different types of outstanding leaders work with their close followers toward a more productive term of leadership.

Theories of Outstanding Leadership

Over the past 30 years, the concept of outstanding leadership has been of particular interest to researchers. As a result of this interest, several theories have

emerged to describe this phenomenon (House, 1995; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Bass, 1997). Much of the recent literature concerning outstanding leaders has focused on charismatic and transformational leaders. However, recent theories of pragmatic and ideological leadership have brought the concept of more problem- or belief-oriented outstanding leaders to the forefront (Mumford & Van Doorn, 2001; Strange & Mumford, 2002). While these theories account for outstanding leadership in very different ways and have very differing positive and negative aspects, they have all illustrated that through their varying tactics, outstanding leaders have a profound effect on organizations.

Vision and Charismatic Leaders

Nature and performance of type: Charismatic leaders provide a convincing vision of the future for followers and their organization and provide followers with motivation (Yukl, 2002; House & Howell, 1992). This vision is the driving force behind their leadership and they are able to affect profound change by communicating with their followers in language that is based on this vision (House, 1977). Charismatic leaders construct their vision through social feedback and their personal reflection on perceived social needs, resulting in an strong belief in this vision, complete confidence in it, and the ability to convey the vision to their followers (Mumford & Strange, 2002).

Several studies have illustrated that charismatic leadership and the use of charismatic behaviors will often lead to improved organizational performance and effectiveness. In two studies using information such as inaugural addresses or descriptions of former United States presidents, results demonstrated that consistent

with House's (1977) theory, presidents classified as charismatic used more direct action to deal with problems and were more associated with high performance (House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; Deluga, 2001). Additionally, a meta-analysis of 39 studies using the MLQ found the dimension of charisma was generally related to leader effectiveness and correlated very strongly with effective leadership (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubmaraniam, 1996).

Empirical studies testing House's theory demonstrated that subordinates of managers who exhibit charismatic traits such as vision articulation, desirable behavior modeling, and communication of high performance expectations trusted their managers more, had more loyalty toward their manager, and exhibited more organizational citizenship behaviors (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Several other studies of vision and charismatic leadership have shown that articulation of a vision is positively related to various indices of organizational performance (Deluga, 2001; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). In general, these studies have all illustrated that charismatic leaders enable their organizations to achieve more than would a more "run-of-the-mill" leader.

Key characteristics: Several characteristics enable charismatic leaders to stand out from others as outstanding leaders. However, the most important characteristic of a charismatic leader is that they will strongly advocate a vision that is not too radical, but calls for change while playing on ideas already present in the follower group (House, 1977). Once identifying this vision, the leader will act in unconventional and innovative ways to obtain it. Additionally, charismatic leaders

have a high degree of self-confidence, a strong need for power, and a strong belief in their vision. Without these traits, it is unlikely that the leader will be able to influence his followers in any meaningful way (Conger & Kunungo, 1987).

In addition to a strong vision for the future, several other key characteristics set charismatic leaders apart from their less outstanding counterparts and several theories have emerged over time to describe these unique aspects of charismatic leadership. Among these characteristics include very strong convictions and energy and a profound effect on the followers (Conger, 1989; House, 1977). The followers will accept the leader without question, feel emotionally attached to the leader, and believe strongly in that leader's professed vision. Additionally, charismatic leaders will exhibit a strong need for power and use their influence over people to gain this power.

Relationships and influence: Charismatic leaders have been shown to influence their followers for the good of the organization. By leading the followers in a way that strives toward the attainment of the vision, charismatic leaders will have a profound effect on their followers and they will accept the leader without question. To do this, the leader will focus on motivating the follower by establishing and affirming a sense of identity for the followers and tying their self-concepts to the goals and experiences of the group. This, in turn, will create a collective identity among the followers and heighten both individual and collective self-efficacy. Additionally, charismatic leaders will change the nature of work so that it appears meaningful and correct by de-emphasizing the extrinsic rewards and focusing on the

intrinsic. The rewards of the followers become group membership, self-worth, and self-efficacy. (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993; House, 1977)

The charismatic leader will also influence their followers through behavioral role modeling, impression management, and through the followers' internalization of the leader's beliefs and values (Yukl, 2002). Through these tactics, the leader is able to influence their close followers and elicit increased devotion from them. Additionally, the leader will influence followers through personal identification, which is based on the follower's desire to please and imitate their leader (Conger & Kanungo, 1987).

Ideological Leadership

Nature and performance of type: Strange and Mumford (2002), through a study of historical outstanding leaders, developed the basis for another type of outstanding leadership: ideological leadership. Ideological leadership is similar to charismatic leadership in that both use a strong vision to gain followers and guide their organization, but they develop their vision through their own personal values and standards. The result is a vision relating to a specific set of beliefs. Ideological leadership is also characterized by high performance for their organizations perhaps due to the presence of this vision (Mumford and Strange, 2001; Post, Ruby, & Shaw, 2002).

Key characteristics: Ideological leaders exhibit four key characteristics that distinguish them from charismatic leaders: 1) the leader has a limited set of extreme, consistent, strongly held beliefs and values, 2) the leader is inflexible about his beliefs/values and will stay committed to them throughout his leadership, 3) the

leader's beliefs/values determine the goals defined for the organization, and 4) leadership occurs though articulation and action in the leader's beliefs/values as opposed to charisma, intellectual stimulation, and vision construction. In addition to these core ideological characteristics, ideological leadership is also characterized by communication emphasizing the leader's beliefs and values and a strong propensity for self-sacrifice for his ideas (Strange & Mumford, 2002)

Relationships and influence: As the concept of ideological leaders is only recently receiving more attention, little empirical data has been collected regarding the leaders' relationships and influences on followers. In their study, however, Strange and Mumford (2002) described the ideological leader as one that would take no personal interest in a follower unless they are of use to him and will constantly push their beliefs and values on those around them. The leader will be highly selective in who they allow to become a close associate and will only appeal to those people who have the same beliefs and values.

While there is a distinct lack of research on ideological leaders, theories abound concerning the interactional styles of various types of fanatical, religious, or terrorist leaders that some might consider ideological (Hoffer, 1952; Post, 1997). These theories describe the followers of ideological leaders to be those who believe very strongly in the leader's vision for the organization and if challenged and will defend the leader and the vision, even to the point of self-sacrifice. However, these followers are generally dispensable and the leader will not hesitate to exile them from the organization if they are found to question the leader's belief and values.

Pragmatic Leadership

Nature and performance of type: Mumford and Van Doorn (2001) suggest that theories of outstanding leadership should not be limited to visionary leaders and could focus more on day-to-day leader performance. Through an analysis of multiple cases of leadership evidenced in Benjamin Franklin, they demonstrate that outstanding leadership can be attained through a pragmatic approach that appeals to an organizational interest in the common good. To do this, pragmatic leaders will observe the organization, analyze identified problems, and then develop and implement a strategy for solving the problem. While there is very little evidence regarding the performance of pragmatic leaders, there is some evidence that a distinction exists between pragmatic and other types of outstanding leaders.

Key characteristics: Pragmatic leaders, due to their knowledge and sensitivity to practical problems that face the organization, will actively search for solutions to these problems and will focus on addressing problems and possible solutions rather than appealing to followers through identity and personal meaning. Instead of providing a promising vision for the future, pragmatic leaders will concentrate on practical needs. In order to accomplish this, the leader will know a great deal about everyday problems presented to the organization. Upon identifying these problems, the leader will actively seek out ways in which to solve them, thus solving significant organizational problems through analysis of organizational requirements and constraints (Mumford & Van Doorn, 2001).

Relationships and influence: The exchange processes of pragmatic leaders differ significantly from those of the charismatic or ideological leaders (Mumford & Van Doorn, 2001). Since their main focus is on social utility and the solving of

overriding problems, they do not present a vision for overall organizational success to their followers and take actions based on this vision. As a result, they are less likely to receive the follower acclaim that other outstanding leaders enjoy (e.g. Benjamin Franklin vs. Thomas Jefferson).

Pragmatic leaders employ many tactics to influence followers. First, pragmatic leaders will use elite social relationships to set their plan in motion. Second, they will appeal to existing shared values and effectively communicate the merits of their solution to their followers. Third, they will use demonstration projects to persuade and negotiate with followers. Additionally, the pragmatic leader will effectively lay out paths to goals in a way that will evoke very little affective debate on the subject that they are addressing (Mumford& Van Doorn, 2001).

Socialized vs. personalized leadership

Nature of socialized and personalized leadership: Studies focusing on historical leaders have led to the observation that both positive and negative aspects of outstanding leadership exist, giving rise to two distinct types of affective orientation: socialized and personalized (Conger, 1989; House & Howell, 1992; Strange & Mumford, 2002). This distinction in leader orientation arose from the idea that leaders will react to organizational problems in one of two ways: in terms of their own needs or those of the organization (O'Connor, Mumford, Clifton, Gessner, & Connelly, 1995; McClelland, 1975). Those who act in terms of their own needs often have disastrous consequences and are termed "personalized" leaders. Those who act in terms of the organization have markedly better consequences and are "socialized" leaders.

Performance Effects: The differences between socialized and personalized leaders result in vast differences in organizational performance. In their study of historical ideological and charismatic leaders, Strange and Mumford (2002) identified organizational performance outcomes for 60 leaders and compared these outcomes across affective orientation. Their analyses demonstrated that socialized leaders outperformed personalized leaders in terms of contribution to society, specific numbers of positive contributions, and follower maintenance of the vision after the leader was out of power. Personalized leaders had an increased number of negative contributions to society, very little overall contribution to society, and their vision was less likely to be maintained after their fall from power. These findings were consistent with several other studies finding that socialized leaders generally have more stable, successful organizations than personalized leaders (O'Connor, Mumford, Clifton, Gessner, & Connelly, 1995).

Key Characteristics: Personalized leaders emphasize follower devotion and look upon their term of leadership as a means to gain power. Their decisions will tend towards personal glorification and the vision, in the case of charismatic and ideological leaders, may be arbitrarily changed to serve the leader's personal objectives. Not only are they narcissistic and authoritarian, they only hold goals that reflect their own self-interests often act in ways that are to the detriment of the organization to help themselves. Follower needs are merely a means to achieve their interests and they disregard established and legitimate channels of authority as well as the rights and feelings of others (Conger & Kanungo, 1989).

Socialized leaders, however, are more achievement-oriented and create a high performing organization. Their leadership style is based on egalitarian behavior, empowers followers, and provides a vision that is based on collective identity rather than the self-interest of the leader (Yukl, 2002). Additionally, these leaders will be highly motivated to maximize the gains for the organization rather than for themselves and due to this desire to serve the organization, socialized leaders seem to consistently outperform personalized leaders.

Leader-Member Exchange

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory describes the role-making processes between a leader and a subordinate and more specifically, how leaders develop different relationships with different subordinates. Additionally, LMX describes how leaders and followers influence each other, how their relationships change over time, and how they negotiate the follower's role in the organization (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). According to the theory, LMX relationships of high quality are characterized by trust, respect, rewards, mutual obligation, loyalty, and influence and are mediated by leader/follower value congruence and various demographic influences (House & Aditya, 1998; Steiner, 1988; Green, Anderson, & Shivers, 1996).

Graen and Cashman (1975) first conceptualized the basic premise of LMX in the form of Vertical Dyadic Linkage Theory (VDL). VDL observed that followers have differentiated relationships with leaders and that these relationships result in the follower being part of an in-group or an out-group. The in-group consists of a group of people close to the leader with whom they share a positive relationship. These

followers are the most likely to be promoted, consulted with, and helped by leader. On the other hand, the out-group consists of people with whom the leader has a negative relationship. In these relationships, there is a low level of mutual influence and the subordinate only receives standard benefits such as salary. These differences in the relationships of subordinates have been shown to lead to performance differences between the subordinates.

Graen and his colleagues (Graen, Scandura, and Graen, 1986; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) went on to further examine the relationship of the leader and the in-group members. They determined that the basis for these high exchange relationships are based on the leader's control over desirable outcomes such as interesting assignments, participative decision-making, tangible rewards, and personal support and approval. These relationships develop gradually over a period of time through reciprocal reinforcement of leader and follower behavior and eventually results in a relationship characterized by mutual dependence and respect, loyalty, and support.

With regard to individual performance, several studies have determined that high LMX relationships increase the performance of followers (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell 1993; Gerstner & Day, 1997). However, several studies of LMX have shown mixed results with regard to group performance. While the size of the workgroup may have a negative effect with LMX, the research generally indicates that in groups where there is a high level of LMX, the members are more likely to be more satisfied, more cohesive, and more committed to remaining in the group (Dansereau, Graen & Haga, 1975; Schriesheim, Cogliser, & Neider, 1998). Additionally, Cogliser and Schriesheim (2000) found that contextual

factors such as group cohesiveness, organizational climate, and leader power were all related to LMX quality.

LMX and Outstanding Leadership Types

The introduction of Leader-Member Exchange Theory was a great leap from previous theories of leadership, which largely focused on the belief that leaders would treat leaders basically the same with an "average leadership style" (Dancereau, Cashman, & Graen, 1973). However, while LMX has brought the study of leadership into a new era, there continue to be several drawbacks to the theory. First, in the past there has been little agreement as to what LMX is or how it should be measured, resulting in several different measures and scales used in studies of LMX. Second, the issue of potential multidimensionality of LMX has been raised by several researchers (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999; Dienisch & Liden, 1986). Third, and most important to the present study, the field studies that have been performed concerning LMX have focused largely on groups of middle managers and first-line supervisors, leaving one to questions how higher-level managers and leaders interact with their followers and if they interact differently than lower-level managers (Deluga, 1994; Green, Blank, & Liden, 1983).

While a majority of the research concerning LMX has focused on lower- and mid-level managers, some have theorized a possible relationship between transformational leadership and leader-member exchange (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). One of the few studies looking at the relationship between LMX and transformational outstanding leadership found the two to be positively

correlated, but at different levels given close or distant geographical distance (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999). This research is important because it illustrates that outstanding leaders do exhibit qualities of LMX relationships with their followers. However, this study and others do not provide evidence for differences between transformational leaders and other types of outstanding leaders, such as charismatic and ideological.

As stated before, most LMX research has illustrated the qualities of LMX in lower-level leaders and their subordinates (Graen & Uhl-Bein, 1995; Schreisheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999). Based on this research, one might assume that if lower-level leaders are able to exhibit these behaviors, then outstanding ones might also exhibit these behaviors regardless of style. Rather, since LMX behaviors lead to better performance and a leader's orientation also leads to performance differences, differences in the exhibition of leader-member exchange behaviors might be more expected when leader orientation (socialized and personalized) is taken into account. These assumptions lead us to our first two propositions:

> Proposition One: There will not be differences in the exhibition of leader-member exchange behaviors based on the outstanding leader.
>
> Proposition Two: Differences in the exhibition of leader-member exchange behaviors will be due to the orientation of the outstanding leader.

Leader-member exchange at a high level

With a few exceptions, studies of LMX in the past have largely focused on the interactions of lower- and mid-level managers with their subordinates. While these studies have offered a wealth of knowledge about how leaders differentiate and interact with their followers, some question still remains as to how very high-level

leaders, outstanding leaders, interact with their close followers. Upon first look, it may seem as if outstanding leaders would follow the same principles set forth by LMX theory, but previous theories of LMX have not been framed in terms of outstanding leadership and some key differences that exist between mid- and high-level leaders may make a difference in their interactional style.

As explained before, outstanding leaders manifest key characteristics that set them apart from non-outstanding leaders in terms of organizational performance (Mumford & Strange, 2002; House, 1977; Jaques, 1976). These same differences, along with the nature of the organizations run by outstanding leaders, lead to a few key differences in leader-follower interactions. First, the time frame in which the leader and follower interact is much longer than that of the typical manager/subordinate relationship. While lower-level leaders may only interact with their followers from a few months to years before changing jobs or getting promoted, outstanding leaders are often in power for a longer period of time or had contact with their close follower before ever obtaining power. The second key point that differentiates outstanding leader interactions is that their close followers have a great deal of power themselves and will often run a sub-organization within the main organization, as opposed to the small amount of power often afforded to the subordinates of lower-level leaders. Third, and resulting from the degree of power they often have, the close followers of outstanding leaders may enjoy a degree of joint leadership with the outstanding leader. By virtue of their relationship with the leader, they will serve as close advisors and often have the authority to make key organizational decisions without even consulting the leader beforehand.

Due to these key differences between outstanding leaders and their less outstanding counterparts, several higher-level interactional variables may emerge in addition to the generally accepted normative LMX variables. These variables may include more collegial interaction, competition management, and the follower's maintenance of their own sub-organization and imply a relationship vastly different from those discussed in research regarding LMX. Rather than reflect on the follower's role as subordinate, these variables focus more on the follower's role as advisor to the leader (Jaques, 1976; Mintzberg, 1979).

In addition to the notion that these higher-level variables may exist, there may be some evidence that outstanding leaders will differ on these higher-level variables (Jaques, 1976; Mumford et al, 2002). For one, outstanding leaders can differ on orientation, with some socialized and some personalized. As with the normative variables, one might expect some difference due to orientation for higher-level variables as well for the very same reason – orientation influences performance. This leads us to our third proposition:

> Proposition Three: Outstanding leaders will vary on their exhibition of higher-level behaviors depending on their orientation (socialized, personalized).

In addition to differences in higher-level behaviors based on orientation, there may also be some reason to suspect that outstanding leaders will differ in higher-level behaviors base on their leadership style. While we earlier posited that there would be no differences in normative LMX behaviors since they are behaviors that all leaders who attain the status of "outstanding" should be able to perform with ease, this may not necessarily hold true for higher-level behaviors. Additionally, outstanding leaders may use these interactional behaviors in different ways based on their leadership

style. For instance, ideological and charismatic leaders run their organizations according to a vision based on a positive future state or a set of beliefs and values. Their vision may determine how their organization is structured, their level of organizational involvement, and even the close followers that they choose. As a result of their vision, they may treat followers differently or be more involved with them than a pragmatic leader might and use the higher-level behaviors to a greater degree. A pragmatic leader, on the other hand, might not exhibit higher-level behaviors to a great degree based on their need to stay in the background and solve organizational problems. This leads us to our fourth proposition:

> Proposition Four: Outstanding leaders will vary on their exhibition of higher-level behaviors depending on their leadership style (ideological, charismatic, pragmatic)

METHOD

Sample

A sample of 120 historically notable leaders was used to test these propositions. All leaders included in this sample were selected under four primary limitations. First, the leader was required to fall into one of the six groupings for this study based on previous research or agreement by three independent raters. Second, an academic biography, in English, was required to be available for the leader that emphasized factual behavioral content, particularly those concerning leader/follower relationships. Third, all leaders included in this sample were required to have achieved power sometime during the 20th century due to the need for objective, verifiable biographical material.

Upon identifying these criteria, general history texts and biographical web sites were reviewed to identify leaders who might be included in this sample. Based on this review, 221 leaders were identified. A review of available summary information was then used to classify leaders into a set of a priori leadership style categories following the procedures utilized by Strange and Mumford (2002). The first set of categories reflected the charismatic/ideological/pragmatic distinction. Leaders were classified as ideological if they displayed a vision consistent with a set of strongly held personal beliefs and values. Leaders were classified as charismatic if they evidenced a future-oriented vision stressing the need for change. Leaders were classified as pragmatic if they used their knowledge to solve organizational problems, but did not appear to have an overarching vision for their organization. All leaders were also classified as socialized or personalized using the procedures applied by O'Connor, Mumford, Clifton, Gessner, & Connelly (1995). Table 1 provides a listing of the leaders included in this sample and their a priori style and orientation classifications.

Based on these criteria, 120 leaders were selected for examination in the present study, along with 20 more leaders to be set aside and used in the event that a suitable biography could not be found for the original set of 120 leaders. These leaders were selected under the constraint that 20 leaders would be selected that lay in each of the six categories defined by leader type (charismatic, ideological, or pragmatic) and leader orientation (socialized or personalized). In selecting this final set of leaders an attempt was made to cover leadership as exhibited in the business, political, military, and religious arenas. Due to the nature of the available sample,

most of the leaders identified were male. Evidence for the validity of this classification procedure was obtained by comparing the socialized and personalized leaders as well as charismatic and ideological leaders selected for the present study with those selected in previous studies (O'Connor et al, 1995; Strange & Mumford, 2002). The observed overlap was sufficient to suggest that the criteria described above resulted in a viable classification of sample members.

Preparation of Biographies

Upon selection of the sample, academic biographies were chosen for each leader. Biographies were selected for each leader that met the following criteria: 1) the biography must be factually-based and subjected to scholarly review before publication; 2) the biography must have received favorable academic reviews; and 3) the biography must include a prologue or epilogue in which the leader's accomplishments were reviewed and information pertaining to the leader's close followers and their interactions. In addition to ensuring that the biographies selected met these standards, three researchers also screened the biographies to assure similar writing style and length. Upon determining that the biographies did meet the required standards, one was selected for each leader. See Appendix 1 for a list of biographies used in this study.

To select the sections of the biography to be coded, three graduate student judges identified the time period when the leader was at his or her highest point of power based on consensus agreement. From the identified section of the biography, the judges selected the three closest followers based on a preliminary scan of the material. A close follower was defined as a person holding a high official or

unofficial place in the leader's organization with which the leader frequently interacted. If three close followers could not be identified, the leader was replaced by a leader previously set aside.

Once the three followers were selected for each leader, the index of each biography was consulted to determine the pages in the identified section that mentioned or detailed the actions of the three followers. A judge then selected the paragraphs on the pages indicated in the index of the biography where a meaningful interaction took place between the leader and the follower. A "meaningful interaction" was defined as an incident when the leader and the follower had a conversation or the author of the biography recounted the nature of the relationship between the leader and the follower. Examples of typical meaningful interactions may be found in Figure 1. Typically, 8 to 10 meaningful interactions were identified for each follower in the biography of a leader. A reliability check indicated an 85% agreement for 12 of the 120 biographies (10%) across three judges for meaningful interactions between leaders and followers. The remaining biographies were divided among two of the judges and meaningful follower interactions were selected for the other 108 leaders.

Content Coding of Biographies

Three sets of rating scales were constructed by which judges would evaluate the meaningful interactions of the leaders and their followers. The first set of scales was based on previous dimensions identified in the leader-member exchange literature (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Gerstner & Day, 1997) in an effort to determine if outstanding leader interact with their followers in the same way described in

previous theories of LMX. These normative dimensions included: 1) Attitudinal Similarity; 2) Loyalty; 3) Level of Trust; 4) Rewards; 5) Communication Style; 6) Relationship Stability; 7) Contact; 8) Collaboration; 9) Decision-making Participation; 10) Mutual Influence; 11) Work Autonomy; 12) Work Negotiation; 13) Effort; 14) Follower Innovation and Usefulness; 15) Follower Performance; and 16) Contractual Obligation. A sample rating scale is presented in Figure 2 and the additional rating scales associated with each of the dimensions may be viewed in Appendix 2.

The second set of dimensions was designed based on literature pertaining to bureaucracy and high-level leaders (Jaques, 1976; Buchen, 2001) to determine new ways in which outstanding leaders interact with their followers. These higher-level dimensions include: 1) Functional Autonomy; 2) Collegial Interaction; 3) Conflict Resolution; 4) Competition Management; 5) Sub-Organization Maintenance; 6) Respect for Subordinate Power Base; 7) Recognition of Representation Requirements; 8) Advisory Influence; 9) Dissemination of Leader Views; 10) Negotiation within System Structure; 11) Maintenance of Group Working Relationship; 12) Demonstration of System Commitment Requirements; 13) Adherence to the Normative Process; 14) Consensual Growth Creation; 15) Collaborative Issues Structure; 16) Overall Follower Influence; and 17) Overall Leader Influence. A sample rating scale is presented in Figure 2 and the additional rating scales associated with each of the dimensions may be viewed in Appendix 3.

The last set of rating scales were designed from the LMX-7 (Scandura & Graen, 1984; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), which was modified to be from the

standpoint of the judges rather than the standpoint of the follower. This measure is frequently used in studies of LMX and obtains high internal consistency and test-retest reliability as well as freedom from social desirability and acquiescence biases (Liden & Maslyn, 1998); other studies support its concurrent and predictive validity. (See Graen et al., 1995 for reviews). The version adopted for this study was recently revised the scale response anchors, changing the wording and increasing the number of anchors from four to five (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). A sample rating scale is presented in Figure 2 and the revised version of the LMX-7 used for the current study may be viewed in Appendix 4.

After the meaningful interactions were identified for each leader, they were presented to three judges. For each leader, the judges were asked to read through all of the material selected for that leader and then evaluate the material on the 40 dimensions with rating scales. These ratings, made on a 5-point scale, produced an average interrater agreement coefficient (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979) of .65 (See Table 1 for interrater agreement coefficients for all study ratings). Two measures, dimensions 1 and 3 on the modified LMX-7, were not used in the final analyses due to a lack of adequate reliability between the three judges. See Table 2 for correlations between all study ratings.

A total of 5 judges took part in the content coding process. Prior to making their ratings, judges took part in a two-week training program. In this training program, judges were familiarized with the nature of the task and were provided with illustrations of behaviors falling into the various categories. Subsequently, they were asked to practice making ratings using the meaningful interactions identified for four

training leaders. After making their initial ratings, the judges compared results and discussed observed discrepancies. At this time, additional feedback was provided concerning the nature of the rating scales. After all raters were trained, ratings of biographies proceeded with three raters per biography.

Outcomes and Controls

While the body of the biography was used to collect specific leader/follower interaction information, several outcome and control measures were also collected regarding the leader using the prologue or epilogue chapter of the biography. Selection of the prologue or epilogue chapter of the biography depended on the degree to which the author described the leader's overall accomplishments as well as their own evaluations in the chapter. Extracting the control and outcome information from the prologue or epilogue followed the procedures outlined by Strange and Mumford (2002).

The first set of outcome measures were based on those presented by Strange and Mumford (2002) and consisted of a set of counts. In these measures, a rater was asked to read the epilogue or prologue and count: 1) the number of positive contributions the leader made; 2) the number of negative contributions the leader made; 3) the number of different types of positive contributions the leader made; 4) the number of different types of negative contributions the leader made; and 5) the number of institutions established by the leader. In addition to these counts, the rater was also asked to make further evaluations of the outcomes of the leader by ratings, on a 5-point scale, 1) How much did the leader contribute to society; 2) How long did these contributions last; 3) How many people did this leader effect; 4) How favorably

did the author view the leader; 5) Did the leader maintain a positive relationship with the followers; 6) To what degree do the institutions established still exist; 7) Did they remain in contact after term of power was over; 8) Did the leader have a vision that was maintained after they were out of power; and 9) Did the leader effect mass movements. For a list of the scales associated with these outcome measures, please refer to Appendix 5. For means, standard deviations and correlations of the outcome measures see Table 3.

In addition to these outcome measures, several covariate controls were also collected using biographical information. The first set of covariates was designed to take into account temporal, historical and cultural differences in organizations, including the size of the organization, geographical region, and pre- or post-World War II. The second set of covariates were designed to take into account differences in the leaders, including the length of time (in years) that the leader was in power, the number of close followers with whom they were in contact, whether the leader was elected or appointed, their demographic similarity with close followers, and their demographic similarity with general followers. For a list of the scales associated with these outcome measures, please refer to Appendix 6. For means, standard deviations, and correlations of the covariate measures, see Table 4.

While one rater performed a majority of the outcome and covariate measure ratings, three raters were initially trained to perform these ratings. After training, each rater rated data from 18 leaders to determine reliability across 15% of the sample. The ratings for the outcome measures produced an average interrater

agreement coefficient (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979) of .83 and the ratings for the covariate measures produced an average interrater agreement coefficient of .94.

Analyses

Upon training of the raters, inter-class correlation was utilized to determine their interrater reliability. The reliabilities for each behavior may be viewed in Table 2. After the reliability was established for each behavior, an average across the three raters was determined for each behavior for use in further analyses.

The results were then analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance to determine significant behaviors and their descriptive statistics with significant covariate variables ($p \leq .05$). This was followed by a discriminant function analysis to determine optimal aggregations of behaviors vis-à-vis significant effects identified in multivariate analysis of variance. Discriminant function scores resulting from these analyses, along with unique items were correlated with outcome variables derived from final chapter of each biography. Additionally, outcome scores were regressed on the ideological and charismatic behaviors as well as each set of discriminant function scores in aggregate.

Results

Group Means

Before performing more extensive analysis on the gathered data, means and standard deviations for each leader grouping were found. These means showed a general tendency for socialized leaders to score higher than personalized leaders for LMX and higher-level variables and for ideological leaders to score higher than both charismatic and pragmatic leaders. These means and standard deviations for each group can be found in Table 5.

Multivariate Analyses

The results obtained from multivariate analyses of covariance of the 16 relational variables based on previous research regarding LMX, 17 higher-level variables, and 5 modified LMX-7 variables were used to identify differences in leader-member interactions between leadership style (ideological, charismatic, and pragmatic) and leader orientation (socialized and personalized) (See Table 6). Main effects were found with regard to leader orientation for the normative variables with a significant covariate of demographic similarity to close followers, and leader orientation and leader style for higher-level variables with no significant covariates. Additionally, main effects for leader orientation and leader style were found as well as an interaction between leader style and leader orientation for the modified LMX-7 variables with significant covariates of geographic region and translation of the biography to English.

Leader-member Exchange (LMX) Results

Following our second proposition, that socialized and personalized outstanding leaders would differ in their normative LMX behaviors, the multivariate analysis showed that significant differences existed between the two different orientations of leaders ($F(17, 98)=2.71$, $p \leq .001$), with a significant covariate of demographic similarity to close followers ($F(17, 97)=1.59$, $p \leq .10$). Further univariate analyses of normative behaviors with respect to the orientation of the leader yielded significant results on several accounts (See Table 7). Differences found for 12 of the 16 behaviors were for 1) Attitudinal Similarity ($F(1, 97)=2.97$, $p \leq .10$; Socialized: $x = 3.597$, $SE = .093$ vs. Personalized: $M=3.370$, $SE = .093$);

2)Loyalty ($F(1, 97)=3.36$, $p \leq .10$; $M=3.794$, $SE=.085$ vs. $M=3.573$, $SE=.085$); 3) Rewards ($F(1, 97)=6.95$, $p \leq .01$; $M=3.818$, $SE=.079$ vs. $M=4.115$, $SE=.079$); 4) Communication Quality ($F(1, 97)=5.59$, $p \leq .05$; $M=3.685$, $SE=.076$ vs. $M=3.943$, $SE=.076$); 5) Level of Contact ($F(1, 97)=4.86$, $p \leq .05$; $M=3.929$, $SE=.090$ vs. $M=3.648$, $SE=.090$); 6) Decision-making Participation ($F(1, 97)=2.84$, $p \leq .10$; $M=3.026$, $SE=.087$ vs. $M=3.235$, $SE=.087$); 7) Mutual Influence ($F(1, 97)=5.96$, $p \leq .01$; $M=2.748$, $SE=.104$ vs. $M=3.108$, $SE=.104$); 8) Professional Effort ($F(1, 97)=7.70$, $p \leq .01$; $M=3.974$, $SE=.090$ vs. $M=3.620$, $SE=.090$); 9) Personal Effort ($F(1, 97)=8.36$, $p \leq .01$; $M=3.867$, $SE=.093$ vs. $M=3.483$, $SE=.093$); 10) Follower Innovation and Usefulness ($F(1, 97)=9.11$, $p \leq .01$; $M=3.929$, $SE=.098$ vs. $M=3.509$, $SE=.098$); 11) Follower Performance ($F(1, 97)=6.43$, $p \leq .01$; $M=3.915$, $SE=.101$ vs. $M=3.551$, $SE=.101$); and 12) Contractual Obligation ($F(1, 97)=5.83$, $p \leq .01$; $M=3.920$, $SE=.081$ vs. $M=3.641$, $SE=.081$). For most of the behaviors, socialized leaders produced higher means. However, personalized leaders were higher on rewards, communication quality, decision-making participation, and mutual influence, possibly reflecting that if a person becomes a close follower of a personalized leader they will be very trusted by that leader, but will be rewarded in more extrinsic ways than the close followers of socialized leaders, who will focus more on intrinsic rewards.

Outstanding Leader-member Exchange (higher-level) Results

Main effects for the higher-level variables with respect to leader orientation also proved to be significant, $F(17, 98)=1.70$, $p \leq .05$. Further univariate analysis also yielded significant results for all 17 of the higher-level variables including 1)

Functional Autonomy (F(1, 98)=3.23, $p \leq .10$; Socialized: M=3.889, SE=.070 vs. Personalized: M=3.711, SE=.070); 2) Collegial Interaction (F(1, 98)=4.24, $p \leq .05$; M=3.906, SE=.067 vs. M=3.711, SE=.067); 3) Conflict Resolution (F(1, 98)=7.22, $p \leq .01$; M=3.817, SE=.067 vs. M=3.561, SE=.067); 4) Competition Management (F(1, 98)=10.16, $p \leq .01$; M=3.817, SE=.075 vs. M=3.478, SE=.075); 5) Sub-Organization Maintenance (F(1, 98)=12.83, $p \leq .001$; M=3.789, SE=.084 vs. M=3.361, SE=.084); 6) Respect for Subordinate Power Base (F(1, 98)=9.02, $p \leq .01$; M=3.600, SE=.089 vs. M=3.222, SE=.089); 7) Recognition of Representation Requirements (F(1, 98)=8.86, $p \leq .01$; M=3.583, SE=.098 vs. M=3.172, SE=.098); 8) Advisory Influence (F(1, 98)=8.89, $p \leq .01$; M=3.567, SE=.099 vs. M=3.150, SE=.099); 9) Dissemination of Leader Views (F(1, 98)=6.69, $p \leq .01$; M=3.550, SE=.102 vs. M=3.178, SE=.102); 10) Negotiation within System Structure (F(1, 98)=6.03, $p \leq .01$; M=3.517, SE=.098 vs. M=3.178, SE=.098); 11) Maintenance of Group Working Relationship (F(1, 98)=4.30, $p \leq .05$; M=3.411, SE=.098 vs. M=3.122, SE=.098); 12) Demonstration of System Commitment Requirements (F(1, 98)=3.83, $p \leq .05$; M=3.711, SE=.096 vs. M=3.444, SE=.096); 13) Adherence to the Normative Process (F(1, 98)=3.88, $p \leq .05$; M=3.828, SE=.094 vs. M=3.567, SE=.094); 14) Consensual Growth Creation (F(1, 98)=4.85, $p \leq .05$; M=3.961, SE=.091 vs. M=3.678, SE=.091); 15) Collaborative Issues Structure (F(1, 98)=12.27, $p \leq .001$; M=3.572, SE=.089 vs. M=3.133, SE=.089); 16) Overall Follower Influence (F(1, 98)=11.92, $p \leq .001$; M=3.344, SE=.093 vs. M=2.889, SE=.093); and 17) Overall Leader Influence (F(1, 98)=11.41, $p \leq .001$; M=3.194, SE=.106 vs. M=2.689, SE=.106) (See Table 8). For all of the higher-level behaviors, socialized leaders produced higher means than personalized

leaders, indicating that socialized outstanding leaders allow their close followers a greater degree of freedom to act within the organization without supervision, and show a greater confidence in the follower as well as a greater commitment to the follower's overall success within the organization.

In addition to a main effect for leader orientation, there was also a main effect with respect to leader style, $F(17, 99)=3.03$, $p \leq .001$, with univariate analyses giving significant results for the following behaviors: 1) Sub-organization Maintenance ($F(2, 99)=4.54$, $p \leq .01$; Ideological: $M=3.825$, $SE=.103$ vs. Charismatic: $M=3.408$, $SE=.103$ vs. Pragmatic: $M=3.492$, $SE=.103$); 2) Advisory Influence ($F(2, 99)=2.62$, $p \leq .10$; $M=3.583$, $SE=.121$ vs. $M=3.367$, $SE=.121$ vs. $M=3.225$, $SE=.121$); 3) Dissemination of Leader Views ($F(2, 99)=3.76$, $p \leq .05$; $M=3.633$, $SE=.125$ vs. $M=3.167$, $SE=.125$ vs. $M=3.292$, $SE=.125$); 4) Negotiation within System Structure ($F(2, 99)=3.45$, $p \leq .05$; $M=3.600$, $SE=.120$ vs. $M=3.183$, $SE=.120$ vs. $M=3.258$, $SE=.120$); 5) Maintenance of Group Working Relationship ($F(2, 99)=3.07$, $p \leq .05$; $M=3.508$, $SE=.121$ vs. $M=3.117$, $SE=.121$ vs. $M=3.175$, $SE=.121$); 6) Adherence to the Normative Process ($F(2, 99)=2.54$, $p \leq .10$; $M=3.908$, $SE=.115$ vs. $M=3.592$, $SE=.115$ vs. $M=3.592$, $SE=.115$); 7) Consensual Growth Creation ($F(2, 99)=2.59$, $p \leq .10$; $M=4.017$, $SE=.111$ vs. $M=3.667$, $SE=.111$ vs. $M=3.775$, $SE=.111$); 8) Collaborative Issues Structure ($F(2, 99)=7.21$, $p \leq .001$; $M=3.675$, $SE=.108$ vs. $M=3.108$, $SE=.108$ vs. $M=3.275$, $SE=.108$); 9) Overall Follower Influence ($F(2, 99)=7.09$, $p \leq .001$; $M=3.458$, $SE=.114$ vs. $M=2.875$, $SE=.114$ vs. $M=3.017$, $SE=.114$); and 10) Overall Leader Influence ($F(2, 99)=5.91$, $p \leq .01$; $M=3.300$, $SE=.130$ vs. $M=2.708$, $SE=.130$ vs. $M=2.817$, $SE=.130$) (See Table 9). For this set of

variables, ideological leaders produced consistently higher means, reflecting their ability to allow close follower more freedom within the organization than charismatic or pragmatic leaders. Additionally, these results illustrate that there is a greater amount of influence and collaboration between ideological leaders and their close followers.

LMX-7 Results

Multivariate analysis of the LMX-7 behaviors yielded a significant main effect with regard to the leader's orientation, $F(5, 108)=2.37$, $p \leq .05$, with significant covariates of 1) geographical region ($F(5, 108)=1.35$, $p \leq .30$) and 2) biography translation ($F(5, 108)=6.11$, $p \leq .001$). Further univariate analyses gave the following significant specific behaviors: 1) How well does the leader understand the followers' job problems and needs? ($F(1, 108)=4.65$, $p \leq .001$; Socialized: $M=3.583$, $SE=.085$ vs. Personalized: $M=3.189$, $SE=.085$); 2) Regardless of the amount of formal authority the leader has, what are the chances that he/she would "bail the followers out" at his/her expense? ($F(1, 108)=2.46$, $p \leq .05$; $M=3.485$, $SE=.09$ vs. $M=3.199$, $SE=.09$); and 3) The followers have enough confidence in their leader that they would defend and justify the leader's decision if he/she were not present to do so ($F(1, 108)=2.63$, $p \leq .10$; $M=3.351$, $SE=.123$ vs. $M=3.055$, $SE=.123$). These differences indicate that socialized leaders are more likely to understand and help their followers in times of need than personalized leaders, and that followers will more readily defend a socialized leader than a personalized one (See Table 10 for means and standard deviations).

Multivariate analysis demonstrated a main effects significant difference for leader style, $F(5, 109)=3.90$, $p \leq .001$. Specifically, significant differences occurred with the following behaviors: 1) Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that the leader would use his/her power to help the followers solve problems in their work? ($F(1, 108)=4.65$, $p \leq .001$; Ideological: $M=3.417$, $SE=.111$ vs. Charismatic: $M=3.528$, $SE=.11$ vs. Pragmatic: $M=3.09$, $SE=.112$); 2) Regardless of the amount of formal authority the leader has, what are the chances that he/she would "bail the followers out" at his/her expense? ($F(1, 108)=2.46$, $p \leq .05$; ; $M=3.419$, $SE=.131$ vs. $M=3.485$, $SE=.13$ vs. $M=2.996$, $SE=.132$); and 3) The followers have enough confidence in their leader that they would defend and justify the leader's decision if he/she were not present to do so ($F(1, 108)=2.63$, $p \leq .10$; $M=3.263$, $SE=.152$ vs. $M=3.471$, $SE=.151$ vs. $M=2.875$, $SE=.153$). The means for the ideological, charismatic, and pragmatic groups indicated that charismatic and ideological leaders will help and come to the defense of followers more than pragmatic leaders, perhaps resulting from the ideological and charismatic leaders' need for group cohesiveness and satisfaction among follower in order to attain their vision (See Table 11 for means and standard deviations).

Finally, the multivariate analysis for the modified LMX-7 behaviors yielded a significant interaction between leader orientation and leader style, $F(5, 109)=2.09$, $p \leq .01$. However, further univariate analyses failed to produce significant results for any of the LMX-7 items.

Discriminant Function Analyses

Discriminant function analyses were utilized to determine the optimal grouping of the normative, higher-level, and LMX-7 variables for those main effects and interactions that were significant. Several trends emerged that contributed to the separation of groups with respect to leadership style, leader orientation, and the interaction of leadership style and leader orientation. Functions were interpreted based on absolute correlations of .20 or higher and only those significant ($p \leq .05$) discriminant functions are reported.

Leadership Style: Discriminant function analysis of the higher-level behaviors and modified LMX-7 items with respect to leadership style yielded two functions (See Table 12). With a canonical correlation of .55, the one significant higher-level function suggested a trend toward Shared Direction based on the beliefs and values of the leader and the close followers. Behaviors with sizable loadings included Collaborative Issues Structure ($r \geq .48$), Dissemination of Leader Views ($r \geq .35$), Negotiation within System Structure ($r \geq .33$), Overall Follower Influence ($r \geq .47$), Overall Leader Influence ($r \geq .42$), and Sub-organization Maintenance ($r \geq .36$). Ideological leaders (M=.77) exhibited high scores on this dimension while charismatic leaders (M=-.83) obtained low scores. Pragmatic leaders lay between those extremes (M=.01). One would expect that with their emphasis on shared beliefs and values that ideological leaders would score high in this function, but the scores for charismatic and pragmatic leaders may be somewhat surprising. However, it should be borne in mind that charismatic leaders stress change in the organization based on their vision. As a result the leader provides direction through his or her vision rather than shared beliefs and values. Pragmatic leaders may not have

followers who share basic beliefs and values but due to their reliance on an elite group of people with whom they may have a great deal in common, they fall between these two extremes.

Correlations in discriminant function for the LMX-7 items with respect to leader style imply a Mutual Exchange of Support between the leader and their close followers ($r \geq .33$, $p \leq .05$). The behaviors comprising this function yielded high scores for charismatic leaders (M=.48) and lower scores for ideological (M=-.14) and pragmatic leaders (M=-.34), showing that charismatic leaders focus on people as opposed to the focus of ideological leaders and pragmatic leaders on ideas and problems respectively. The behaviors contributing to this function included 1) How would you characterize the followers' working relationships with the leader? ($r \geq .16$); 2) Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that the leader would use his/her power to help the followers solve problems in their work? ($r \geq .56$); and 3) The followers have enough confidence in their leader that they would defend and justify the leader's decision if he/she were not present to do so ($r \geq .59$).

Leader Orientation: Discriminant function analyses were also conducted on normative, higher-level, and LMX-7 variables with regard to leader orientation (See Table 13). For the normative behaviors ($r \geq .56$, $p \leq .001$), correlations demonstrate a tendency of socialized leaders (M=.66) to place differing emphases on Intrinsic Versus Extrinsic considerations in establishing relationships with followers than personalized leaders (M=-.66). In other words, socialized leaders stress the worth of the work in forming relationships while personalized leaders stress the worth of the

outcomes. Ratings of Contractual Obligation ($r \geq .33$), Follower Innovation and Usefulness ($r \geq .39$), Follower Performance ($r \geq .31$), Level of Contact ($r \geq .31$), Personal Effort ($r \geq .38$), and Professional Effort ($r \geq .392$) produced positive scores while Rewards ($r \geq -.36$), Communication Quality ($r \geq -.33$), and Mutual Influence ($r \geq -.39$) produced negative scores.

Discriminant analyses of the higher-level behaviors illustrated that socialized leaders are more likely than personalized leaders to collaborate in a collegial fashion with followers, respecting followers as leaders in their own right participating in the management team. Although the discriminant function associated with these differences was not significant, in part due to the relatively high correlations among the outstanding leadership dimensions, a sizable canonical correlation was obtained ($r \geq .43$). The sizable loadings of sub-organization maintenance ($r \geq .66$), collaborative issues structure ($r \geq .64$), overall follower influence ($r \geq .63$), overall leader influence ($r \geq .62$), competition management ($r \geq .60$), and respect for subordinate power base ($r \geq .57$) are consistent with this interpretation. More specifically, socialized ($M = .47$) leaders are more likely than personalized ($M = -.47$) leaders to apply a Team Leadership style in interacting with close followers.

With regard to the LMX-7 items, the function ($r \geq .31$, $p \leq .05$) illustrated that socialized leaders ($M = .32$) have a tendency to exhibit a greater degree of Follower Support than do personalized leaders ($M = -.33$). Behaviors contributing to this function included: 1) Regardless of the amount of formal authority the leader has, what are the chances that he/she would "bail the followers out" at his/her expense? ($r \geq .48$); 2) How well does the leader understand the followers' job problems and

needs? ($r \geq .95$); 3) How would you characterize the followers' working relationships with the leader? ($r \geq .31$); 4) Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that the leader would use his/her power to help the followers solve problems in their work? ($r \geq .64$); and 5) The followers have enough confidence in their leader that they would defend and justify the leader's decision if he/she were not present to do so ($r \geq .49$).

Correlation of Outcome Measures and Discriminant Functions

Upon obtaining the discriminant functions for the significant main effects and interactions, correlations were found using the leader outcome measure score and the significant discriminant function scores (See Table 14). For the criteria predicted, most significant correlations were related to the leader orientation functions. For the Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic function ($r \geq .557$), those outcomes that were positively correlated to the manipulation of others function were largely related to the degree of contributions that the leader made to the organization, where leaders high in this function generally had more positive outcomes of their leadership and kept in contact with their close followers more often after their term of leadership. Additionally, the negative correlations demonstrate that the leaders with low scores in this function tend to have more negative outcomes of their leadership and more severe conflicts. Similar results were found for the discriminant functions regarding Follower Support ($r \geq .309$) and Team Leadership ($r \geq .432$). As with the intrinsic vs. extrinsic function, those leaders who were classified as socialized had more positive outcomes and better lasting relationships with their followers than personalized leaders.

In addition to correlations found for the orientation-related discriminant functions, significant correlations were also obtained for one function regarding leader type. The Shared Direction function ($r \geq .555$) was correlated with several indicators of performance, indicating that a shared direction is related to more long-term visionary activities such as increased length of time that the contribution lasted, long term-agenda maintenance, and the number of institutions established by the leader. Additionally, this function was positively correlated with the number of types of positive contributions, was associated with better evaluations by the biographer, and negatively correlated to the number of negative contributions as well as the number of types of negative contributions.

Regression of Outcomes on Discriminant Functions

Table 15 presents the results obtained in the regression analyses examining the joint effects of these discriminating variables characterizing leader follower interactions. The stepwise method of regression was used and prior to examining the effects for the relationships, all significant ($p \leq .05$) covariates identified as relevant predictors in earlier analyses were entered as the first steps in the analyses. Thus in the present set of analyses, conclusions about relational variables are made only after taking relevant controls into account.

Perhaps the most clear cut conclusion that can be drawn from Table 16 is that relational variables do make a difference in accounting for the performance of outstanding leaders and that outstanding leadership appears to depend on the leader's ability to create a cadre of followers committed to the intrinsic rather than the extrinsic - to the vision or idea rather than rewards. The performance of socialized

leaders, in particular, may to a largely related to their ability to establish relationships with followers on an intrinsic as opposed to extrinsic basis.

While it does appear that leader orientation has a rather large impact on performance, other dimensions of exchange, such as team leadership, were found to contribute to the prediction of leader performance even when the intrinsic versus extrinsic relational orientation was taken into account. This finding is important because it points to the need to take upper-level as well as normative exchange dimensions into account in discussions of outstanding leadership. Second, as in the case with the shared direction function, relational differences are linked to leader type and can also make a unique contribution to the performance of the leader.

Discussion

While a great number of interesting conclusions can be drawn from the presented results, it is important to bear in mind some limitations that could have had an effect on the nature and outcome of the present study. While an attempt was made to sample an equal amount of leaders from different cultures and areas of the world, due to a lack of acceptable academic biographies, the sample of leaders used for this study focused on primarily western political leaders, most of whom were male. Additionally, all leaders studied were in power in the 20th century. The restricted nature of the leader sample allows for speculation concerning the generalizability of this study to female leaders and those in times before the 20th century (Simonton, 1991), but in comparing leaders from pre- and post-World War II, some generalization to earlier times can be made. Although every effort was made to construct a group of leaders representative of a variety of cultures and occupational

domains, in further studies, efforts should be made to build a more diverse and comprehensive sample of leaders.

In addition to sample limitations, limitations intrinsic to coding procedures should also be noted. Using the work of Graen and Uhl-Bein (1995) as well as Schriesheim, Castro, and Cogliser (1999), behavior lists were constructed that reflected key behaviors exhibited by leaders while interacting with their followers for both the normative and higher-level scales. While these lists were by no means comprehensive, both captured the essential behaviors that contribute to exchanges between leaders and their followers. This approach helped secure reliable coding of the biographical information, but also did not allow for all possible exchange behaviors to be observed.

In addition to these possible sample concerns, it also must be taken into account the limitation that we focused on the dimensions of interaction that characterize leaders' relationships with close followers, or lieutenants, when interpreting the results of this study. As a result, the conclusions obtained in this study do not take into account the interactions of leaders with more distant followers. Instead, following Graen and Uhl-Bein (1995), we have focused on a more narrow issue of how outstanding leaders interact with close followers.

While the present study was primarily interested in leader interactions, results obtained regarding leader orientation provided evidence for construct validity in the biographical coding. As expected through prior research, differences were found between the personalized and socialized behaviors with regard to performance outcomes (House and Howell, 1992; O'Connor et al, 1995). Specifically,

personalized leaders generally exhibited more negative performance outcomes and dealt with their followers in a more self-serving and manipulative way while socialized leaders were more likely to use their position of power to help others and exhibited more positive outcomes.

In outstanding leadership, the issue of performance is not so much based on the outstanding leader to lead their organization as it is based on their integrity. One could argue that all of the leaders used in the sample for the present study were outstanding due to their great influence on their organizations, but the distinguishing factor that separates personalized leaders from socialized leaders is their actions when faced with a crisis. While socialized leaders would find solutions that would contribute to organizational enhancement, personalized leaders would find solutions that contributed to their own personal gain at the expense of the organization.

In addition to differences in integrity, several other factors may be of importance in determining the performance differences between socialized and personalized leaders. First, outstanding leadership has been linked to the time frame of crisis resolution, with longer time frames being associated with better performance (Jaques, 1976). As a result, socialized leaders, with their ability to apply a longer time frame to crisis resolution, consistently perform better than personalized leaders. Second, personalized leaders may fail to identify the causes and requirements for effective crisis resolution due to their focus on personal concerns. Third, because they fail to look outside of their own personal concerns, they may have difficulty in identifying the events or actions needed to induce effective change in their organization.

In addition to providing evidence for the performance of socialized and personalized outstanding leaders, the present study is unique from other studies of leadership in that it examines traditional LMX dimensions in outstanding leader interactions with close followers, and also illustrates that outstanding leaders, in addition to more normative dimensions of LMX, may rely on other interactional strategies when relating to close followers. While previous studies of leader-member exchange have focused on dyadic relationships among lower- and mid-level leaders (Yukl, 2002), we found that the normative LMX dimensions (loyalty, trust, rewards, etc.) may be applied to outstanding leaders due to their typical scores on these dimensions as well as the differences observed between socialized and personalized leaders in their interactions with close followers.

Following our first proposition, different types of outstanding leaders, as expected, showed no difference in their LMX interactions with their followers. All groups, however, scored in the mid- to high-range for each dimension, illustrating that all effective leaders must to some extent manifest the behaviors associated with leader-member exchange in order to be successful. This lack of differentiation, coupled with the scores produced for the groups, suggests that each group, to some extent, used leader-member exchange behaviors in dealing with their followers. As previous LMX literature states that effective leaders will use specific behaviors (Schriesheim et al, 1999; Graen et al, 1995), it makes sense that all outstanding leaders in our sample, regardless of orientation, will use these behaviors as a result of their overall effectiveness in terms of organizational influence. In fact, in cases of

outstanding leadership, the ability to differentiate followers based on the normative LMX dimensions may be a prerequisite for becoming an outstanding leader.

Differences in normative leader-member exchange dimensions and effective interactions, however, do result from a difference in orientation. In line with Proposition 2, socialized leaders typically formed better relationships with their close followers than personalized leaders. Socialized outstanding leaders tend to focus on attitudinal similarity, loyalty, and follower performance while personalized leaders emphasized rewards and mutual influence. More specifically, socialized leaders focus more on intrinsic incentives by giving their followers a higher degree of contact, putting more effort into the followers' personal and professional needs, and allowing the followers' more opportunities to be innovative and useful in the organization. Additionally, socialized leaders will offer their followers more support in their endeavors. Personalized leaders, however, focus on extrinsic incentives such as monetary rewards and often withhold support of the close followers.

While it may be true that all outstanding leaders need to manifest the behaviors associated with LMX in order to be successful, it would appear that the formation of positive exchange relationships with followers is somewhat more complex for outstanding leaders than lower- or mid-level leaders. Outstanding leaders typically have more close followers, or lieutenants, who are noteworthy leaders in their own right, often have a high degree of autonomy within the organization, and may even be responsible for a sub-organization and followers of their own. As a result, outstanding leaders tend to interact with close followers on a collegial bases stressing alliance formation through dimensions such as recognition of

follower representation requirements, consensual growth creation, and collegial interaction, which were all found to be evident in outstanding leaders' interactions with close followers. Additionally, following our third and four propositions, these higher-level dimensions were found to differentiate with respect to leader orientation (socialized and personalized) as well as leader type (charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic). These findings are of some importance from a validation standpoint because one would expect to find differences in the higher-level dimensions in order to differentiate among different types of outstanding leaders.

Proposition Three stated that outstanding leaders would differ on the higher-level dimensions of exchange based on their orientation and the results illustrated that this indeed is the case. Socialized leaders evidenced higher degrees of collegial interaction, allowed their close followers more control in their own sub-organization, and a greater degree of respect for the subordinate's power based than did personalized leaders. As a result, the close followers of socialized leaders enjoyed more freedom to act within the organization and the leaders showed a greater commitment to the follower's success within the organization.

In addition to socialized leaders allowing their close followers more freedom to act within the organization, they also took a more team leadership approach when interacting with their followers than did personalized leaders. By relying on their close followers for collaboration and influence, the leaders interacted with their followers as a kind of management team, rather than the leaders controlling the organization by themselves. This team-oriented approach to leadership enabled the socialized leaders to have increased performances by affecting more people and

having a greater number of positive contributions to the organization as a whole. Personalized leaders, however, did not use a team-oriented approach to leadership and, as a result, did not affect as many people and had fewer positive contributions to the organization.

The conclusions drawn from the analyses regarding Proposition Four are important because they provide evidence that relational formation may be an unusually complex activity for outstanding leaders. In forming relationships outstanding leaders must consider the individual follower with respect to traditional LMX dimensions – their competence, loyalty, and trustworthiness (Graen & Uhl-Bein, 1995). However, in addition to these more traditional dimensions, outstanding leaders must be able to interact with their close followers on a set of dimensions more closely related to the followers' own leadership responsibilities such as sub-organization maintenance and system negotiation. Additionally, the outstanding leader's close followers will serve in a more collegial, advisory role than do the followers of lower- or mid-level leaders.

Ideological leaders, in particular, will rely on their close followers in an advisory role, but will also allow their followers a greater degree of freedom than charismatic and pragmatic leaders, perhaps due to their strong value-based vision. The ideological leader will select close followers based on their adherence to the vision and may be more confident that the follower will run their sub-organization in based on this shared vision, or shared direction. Charismatic and pragmatic leaders, however, will not have a shared direction with their followers based on beliefs and

values and in turn may have to exert more control over their close followers' activities.

These observations about the difference observed between ideological, charismatic, and pragmatic leaders in this regard point to several broad conclusions. First, in previous studies of outstanding leadership the role of the close follower or lieutenant in shaping the nature and success of the leader's efforts has been largely ignored. The present study sheds some light on the fact that leaders do not operate in a vacuum by themselves, but rather they rely on a close, tight network of followers that serve as advisors and leaders of sub-groups within the larger organization. Second, it is important to note that successful interactions are closely tied to the overall performance of the leader, whether it is through leader type or leader orientation. The present study has demonstrated that close followers are an integral part of the organization from a leadership and a performance standpoint. Hopefully, the conclusions drawn herein will create a new wave of research examining the role of close followers in creating the outcomes of and conditions needed for outstanding leadership.

References

Bass, B.M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? American Psychologist, 52, 130-139.

Buchen, I.H. (2001). The inner circle of the trusted adviser. Industrial and Commercial Training, 33, 94-99.

Cogliser, C. & Schriesheim, C.A. (2000). Exploring work unit context and leader-member exchange: A multi-level perspective. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21, 487-511.

Conger, J.A. (1989). The charismatic leader: Beyond the mystique of exceptional leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J.A. & Kanungo, R.N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. Academy of Management Review, 12, 637-647.

Dansereau, F., Cashman, J., & Graen, G. (1973). Instrumentality theory and equity theory as complementary approaches in predicting the relationship of leadership and turnover among managers. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 10(2), 184-200.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G. & Haga, W. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, 46-78.

Deluga, R.J. (1994). Supervisor trust-building, leader-member exchange, and organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 67, 315-326.

Deluga, R.J. (2001). American presidential Machiavellianism: Implications for charismatic leadership and rated performance. The Leadership Quarterly, 12(3), 339-363.

Dienisch, R.M. & Liden, R.C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. Academy of Management Review, 16, 619-632.

Gerstner, C. R. & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 827-844.

Graen, G. & Cashman, J.F. (1975). A role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J.G. Hunt and L.L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership frontiers. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.

Graen, G.B., Scandura, T., & Graen, M.R. (1986). A field experimental test of the moderating effects of growth need strength on productivity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 484-491.

Graen, G. B. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader—member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. Leadership Quarterly, 6, 219-247.

Green, S.G., Anderson, S.E., & Shivers, S.L. (1996). Demographic and organizational influences on leader-member exchange and related work attitudes. Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 66(2), May 1996, 203-214.

Green, S.G., Blank, W., & Liden, R.C. (1983). Market and organizational influences on bank employees' work attitudes and behaviors. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 66, 203-214.

Hoffer, E. (1952). The Ordeal of Change. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge (pp. 189-207. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University

House, R.J. (1995). Leadership in the twenty-first century: A speculative inquiry. In A. Howard (Eds.), Leadership: The Cutting Edge (pp.189-207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R.J. and Aditja, R.N. (1998). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? Journal of Management, 23(3), 409-473.

House, R.J & Howell, J.M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 3(2), 91-108.

House, R.J., Spangler, W.D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 36(3), 364-396.

Howell, J.W. & Hall-Merenda, K.E. (1999). The ties that bind: The impact of leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance of predicting follower performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84, 680-694.

Jaques, E. (1976). A general theory of bureaucracy. London: Heinemann.

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(1), 36-51.

Liden, R. & Maslyn, J.M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. Journal of Management, 24(1), 43-72.

Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., & Stilwell, D. (1993). A longitudinal study on the early development of leader-member exchanges. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78(4), 662-674.

Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K.G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. The Leadership Quarterly, 7, 385-425.

McClelland, D.C. (1975). Power: The inner experience. New York: Irvington.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). Managerial Work: Analysis by Observation. Management Science, 18, 97-110.

Mumford, M. D., & Strange, J. M. (2002). Vision and mental models: The case of charismatic and ideological leadership. In R. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The Road Ahead (pp. 109-142). Oxford, England: Elsevier.

Mumford, M.D. & Van Doorn, J.R. (2001). The leadership of pragmatism: Reconsidering Franklin in the age of charisma. The Leadership Quarterly, 12(3), 279-309.

O'Connor, J., Mumford, M.D., Clifton, T.C., Gessner, T.L., Connelly, M.S. (1995). Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: A historiometric study. The Leadership Quarterly, 6(4), 529-555.

Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. The Leadership Quarterly, 1(2), 107-142.

Post, J.M. (1997). Narcissism and the quest for political power. *In:* Ellman, C.S. & Reppen, J. (Eds); Omnipotent fantasies and the vulnerable self (pp. 195-232).

Post, J.M., Ruby, K.G., Shaw, E.D. (2002). The radical group in context: 1. An integrated framework for the analysis of group risk for terrorism. Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 25(2), 73-100.

Scandura, T.A. & Graen, G. (1984). Moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 428-436.

Schriesheim, C.A., Castro, S.L., Cogliser, C.C. (1999). Leader-member exchange (LMX) research: A comprehensive review of theory, measurement, and data-analytic practices. The Leadership Quarterly, 10(1), 63-113.

Schriesheim, C.A., Cogliser, C.C., & Neider, L.L. (1998). The Ohio State model. In: F. Dansereau & F.J. Yammarino (Eds.) Leadership: The multiple-level approaches: Classical and new wave.; p. 3-72; Stamford, CT, US : JAI Press, Inc.

Shamir, B., House, R.J., and Arthur, M.B. (1993). The motivational effect of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. Organization Science, 4(4), 577-594.

Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Interclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 420-428.

Simonton, D.K.(1991). Psychology, science, and history: An introduction to historiometry. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.

Strange, J. M., & Mumford, M. D. (2002). The origins of vision: Charismatic versus ideological leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 13, 343-378.

Strange and Mumford (in press).

Steiner, D.D. (1997). Attributions in leader-member exchanges: Implications for practice. European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology Special Issue: Explanations in organizations: An overview, 6(1), 59-71.

Yukl, G. (2002). Leadership in organizations. Prentice Hall: New Jersey.

Table 1: List of Outstanding Leaders Used in Study

	Ideological	Charismatic	Pragmatic
Socialized	Jane Addams Susan B. Anthony Deitrich Bonhoeffer Michael Collins Eugene Debs John Dewey W.E.B. du Bois Betty Friedan Indira Gandhi Mohandas Gandhi Charles de Gaulle Emma Goldman Dag Hammarskjold John L. Lewis Jwame Nkrumah Ronald Reagan Eleanor Roosevelt Theodore Roosevelt Lech Walesa Woodrow Wilson	Mustafa Kemal Ataturk David Ben-Gurion Cesar Chavez Winston Churchill Henry Ford Samual Gompers Lee Iacocca John F. Kennedy Jomo Kenyatta Martin Luther King, Jr. Fiorello H. LaGuardia Douglas MacArthur Louis B. Mayer J.P. Morgan Edward R. Murrow Gamel Abdel Nasser Sam Rayburn F.D. Roosevelt Anwar Sadat Margaret Thatcher	Warren Buffet Richard Daley Walt Disney John Foster Dulles Alfred Dupont Dwight D. Eisenhower Felix Frankfurter Barry Gordy Katherine Graham Oliver Wendell Holmes George Marshall Mikail Gorbechev Thomas Watson, Sr. H. George Rickover Erwin Rommel George Soros Josip B. Tito Harry S. Truman Sam Walton Booker T. Washington
Personalized	Lavrenti Beria Fidel Castro Georges Clemenceau Ferdinand Foch Francisco Franco Marcus Garvey Warren Harding Rudolf Hess Heinrich Himmler Ho Chi Minh Vladimir Lenin Joe McCarthy Pol Pot J.D. Rockefeller Joseph Stalin Leon Trotsky Wilhelm II Deng Xiaoping Emiliano Zapata Mao Ze-dong	Idi Amin Neville Chamberlain John Delorean Porfirio Diaz Francois Duvalier Herman Goring Asad Hafaz Adolf Hitler Jimmy Hoffa Herbert Hoover J.Edgar Hoover Huey Long Ferdinand Marcos Benito Mussolini Manuel Noriega Eva Peron Juan Peron Rafael Trujillo W.C. Westmoreland Malcolm X	Martha Stewart Al Capone Andrew Carnagie Otis Chandler Lyndon B. Johnson Al Dunlap Henry Ford II Carlo Gambino Leslie Groves Leona Helmsley Reinhjard Heydrich Horatio Kitchener Alfreid Krupp Robert Moses Rupert Murdoch George Patton Jackie Presser Richard Nixon David Sarnoff Lew Wasserman

Figure 1: Incidents of Leader-Follower Relationships

"Hess's chief of staff was a thirty-three-year-old man, heavyset and somewhat bull-like, who had been a party member since 1927. He proved to be a good bookkeeper, rude in handling subordinates but completely honest in money matters and a veritable workhorse with an astonishingly precise memory. He was assigned to the deputy's staff in July 1933 and Hess was happy to have him as his chief of staff, the 'deputy's deputy.' Hess trusted him because he never forced his way into the limelight, and gradually he gave the man more power."

--From Schwarzwaller (1988)

"Whitelaw and Parkinson, however, had something else in common: a particularly personal relationship with their leader. During both the preparations and the war itself, they could offer her a special kind of solace. They felt a desire to protect her...Whitelaw, with his Military Cross as proof of sometime gallantry in the Scots Guards, saw it as part of his job to remind this inexperienced lady, who had no first-hand knowledge of gunfire, that she must steel herself for casualties, prepare for bloodiness, not imagine that it could be a painless victory..."

--From Young (1989)

Figure 2: Sample Rating Scales from Normative, Higher-level, and LMX-7

Normative Dimension: Communication Quality

What is the quality (i.e. clarity, quantity, degree of follower input) of the communications between the leader and the follower?

1 – Quality of communications is very low. Leader will be ambiguous and followers will have not input into communications.

3 – Quality of communications vary. At times the leader will be ambiguous but at other times communications will be direct and understandable. Followers have some input during communications.

5 – Leader and follower have high quality communications where orders are direct and understandable. Followers have a great deal of input during communications.

Higher-level Dimension: Sub-organization Maintenance

To what degree does the leader allow close followers to control sub-organizations within the organization and support their decisions with regard to the sub-organization?

1 – The leader does not allow the followers to have any control over the sub-organization. They generally do not accept the input of the follower with regard to the sub-organization and change decisions made by the follower.

3 – The leader allows the followers to have some control over the sub-organization. They must approve the decisions of the followers, but allow followers some input in issues related to the sub-organization.

5 – The leader allows the followers to have complete control over the sub-organization. He will rarely question the decisions of the follower and gives the follower a great deal of support.

LMX-7 Item

How well does the leader understand the followers' job problems and needs?

_____ Not a bit
_____ A little
_____ A fair amount
_____ Quite a bit
_____ A great deal

Table 2: Mean, Standard Deviation, Interrater Agreement Coefficients, and Correlations for Interactional Dimensional Ratings

Normative		*M*	*SD*	r_{tt}	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1	Attitudinal Similarity	3.483	0.71	0.665	1.00	0.86	0.69	0.38	0.49	0.52	0.49	0.44	0.30	0.30	0.42	0.54	0.48	0.55	0.57	0.56	0.49
2	Loyalty	3.683	0.65	0.628		1.00	0.82	0.55	0.50	0.53	0.46	0.41	0.30	0.30	0.42	0.53	0.51	0.56	0.55	0.54	0.51
3	Level of Trust	3.794	0.62	0.688			1.00	0.85	0.73	0.49	0.33	0.37	0.34	0.34	0.33	0.33	0.26	0.34	0.36	0.35	0.34
4	Rewards	3.967	0.62	0.661				1.00	0.78	0.43	0.08	0.16	0.26	0.32	0.26	0.14	0.07	0.10	0.09	0.07	0.11
5	Communication Quality	3.814	0.59	0.678					1.00	0.77	0.46	0.35	0.36	0.36	0.33	0.24	0.17	0.23	0.24	0.20	0.20
6	Relationship Stability	3.850	0.54	0.711						1.00	0.81	0.60	0.34	0.29	0.39	0.45	0.44	0.47	0.45	0.39	0.34
7	Level of Contact	3.789	0.70	0.621							1.00	0.74	0.38	0.16	0.30	0.49	0.53	0.58	0.58	0.53	0.42
8	Level of Collaboration	3.519	0.63	0.729								1.00	0.74	0.53	0.39	0.46	0.40	0.45	0.46	0.49	0.40
9	Decision-making Participation	3.131	0.68	0.631									1.00	0.85	0.61	0.27	0.10	0.13	0.14	0.19	0.19
10	Mutual Influence	2.928	0.83	0.606										1.00	0.79	0.41	0.04	0.06	0.08	0.13	0.17
11	Work Autonomy	3.256	0.68	0.740											1.00	0.75	0.43	0.26	0.24	0.26	0.34
12	Work Negotiation	3.547	0.70	0.752												1.00	0.82	0.65	0.58	0.56	0.59
13	Professional Effort	3.797	0.71	0.608													1.00	0.84	0.74	0.65	0.66
14	Personal Effort	3.675	0.74	0.696														1.00	0.94	0.86	0.71
15	Follower Innovation and Usefulness	3.719	0.78	0.740															1.00	0.94	0.81
16	Follower Performance	3.733	0.79	0.684																1.00	0.87
17	Contractual Obligation	3.781	0.64	0.630																	1.00

Note r>.18 significant at .05 level

Table 2 Continued:

		18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39
	Attitudinal																						
1	Similarity	0.46	0.33	0.40	0.37	0.42	0.42	0.38	0.35	0.30	0.33	0.36	0.41	0.32	0.20	0.11	0.11	0.13	0.36	0.49	0.46	0.47	0.41
2	Loyalty	0.50	0.38	0.40	0.39	0.44	0.45	0.40	0.38	0.33	0.35	0.37	0.42	0.34	0.18	0.08	0.06	0.10	0.38	0.49	0.44	0.43	0.36
3	Level of Trust	0.33	0.25	0.19	0.20	0.24	0.27	0.21	0.17	0.14	0.18	0.21	0.27	0.19	0.05	-0.13	-0.17	-0.15	0.19	0.27	0.24	0.24	0.23
4	Rewards	0.19	0.18	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.13	0.06	0.02	0.03	0.07	0.10	0.10	0.03	-0.12	-0.30	-0.34	-0.33	-0.04	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.09
	Communication																						
5	Quality	0.25	0.25	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.27	0.21	0.19	0.11	0.14	0.18	0.28	0.22	0.11	-0.08	-0.13	-0.10	0.12	0.16	0.16	0.15	0.18
	Relationship																						
6	Stability	0.36	0.32	0.41	0.46	0.46	0.51	0.47	0.46	0.35	0.35	0.37	0.54	0.50	0.41	0.28	0.21	0.23	0.32	0.35	0.33	0.32	0.28
7	Level of Contact	0.33	0.24	0.42	0.50	0.54	0.56	0.56	0.57	0.44	0.43	0.44	0.64	0.63	0.64	0.55	0.48	0.47	0.55	0.43	0.41	0.36	0.30
	Level of																						
8	Collaboration	0.36	0.22	0.33	0.37	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.40	0.30	0.28	0.30	0.54	0.52	0.54	0.39	0.35	0.32	0.49	0.44	0.44	0.40	0.31
	Decision-making																						
9	Participation	0.21	0.13	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.32	0.25	0.23	0.16	0.20
10	Mutual Influence	0.25	0.21	0.11	0.02	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.02	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.16	0.15	0.09	-0.09	-0.06	-0.03	0.20	0.31	0.25	0.20	0.20
11	Work Autonomy	0.39	0.33	0.29	0.24	0.26	0.27	0.26	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.26	0.30	0.29	0.17	0.08	0.08	0.14	0.33	0.46	0.35	0.27	0.32
12	Work Negotiation	0.59	0.45	0.54	0.48	0.54	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.48	0.48	0.49	0.50	0.39	0.38	0.35	0.40	0.56	0.66	0.56	0.48	0.45
	Professional																						
13	Effort	0.62	0.41	0.56	0.60	0.69	0.65	0.64	0.67	0.66	0.62	0.60	0.58	0.56	0.47	0.53	0.51	0.53	0.62	0.63	0.59	0.56	0.53
14	Personal Effort	0.62	0.36	0.51	0.57	0.64	0.64	0.63	0.65	0.57	0.56	0.55	0.58	0.56	0.51	0.55	0.54	0.56	0.66	0.70	0.68	0.67	0.53
	Follower																						
	Innovation and																						
15	Usefulness	0.64	0.40	0.51	0.56	0.60	0.61	0.60	0.61	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.57	0.53	0.47	0.52	0.51	0.53	0.67	0.74	0.75	0.74	0.52
	Follower																						
16	Performance	0.69	0.36	0.48	0.53	0.55	0.55	0.52	0.52	0.43	0.43	0.44	0.54	0.52	0.44	0.46	0.44	0.48	0.63	0.72	0.75	0.75	0.52
	Contractual																						
17	Obligation	0.86	0.63	0.57	0.59	0.58	0.58	0.55	0.54	0.48	0.47	0.50	0.52	0.47	0.35	0.41	0.39	0.45	0.59	0.65	0.66	0.68	0.50

Note r>.18 significant at .05 level

Table 2 Continued:

Upper-Level		*M*	*SD*	rtt	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39
18	Functional Autonomy	3.800	0.55	0.621	1.00	0.82	0.74	0.62	0.60	0.59	0.53	0.50	0.48	0.46	0.49	0.46	0.41	0.25	0.29	0.28	0.35	0.46	0.60	0.59	0.60	0.53
19	Collegial Interaction	3.808	0.52	0.743		1.00	0.81	0.63	0.51	0.52	0.46	0.41	0.42	0.39	0.41	0.31	0.22	0.05	0.12	0.13	0.22	0.34	0.41	0.39	0.36	0.34
20	Conflict Resolution	3.689	0.53	0.618			1.00	0.85	0.78	0.71	0.64	0.60	0.58	0.55	0.56	0.49	0.42	0.26	0.36	0.36	0.41	0.43	0.51	0.52	0.50	0.44
21	Competition Management	3.647	0.61	0.636				1.00	0.92	0.84	0.75	0.75	0.72	0.69	0.70	0.63	0.53	0.39	0.52	0.51	0.54	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.49	0.46
22	Sub-organization Maintenance	3.575	0.71	0.624					1.00	0.92	0.86	0.83	0.80	0.78	0.77	0.71	0.63	0.48	0.58	0.56	0.57	0.53	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.50
23	Respect for Subordinate Power Base	3.411	0.72	0.665						1.00	0.95	0.92	0.81	0.78	0.78	0.74	0.64	0.49	0.60	0.58	0.57	0.55	0.54	0.49	0.50	0.47
24	Recognition of Representation Requirements	3.378	0.78	0.514							1.00	0.97	0.84	0.79	0.79	0.76	0.65	0.53	0.64	0.65	0.61	0.56	0.55	0.50	0.50	0.45
25	Advisory Influence	3.358	0.80	0.748								1.00	0.89	0.84	0.81	0.77	0.66	0.55	0.68	0.70	0.66	0.56	0.49	0.47	0.43	0.43
26	Dissemination of Leader Views	3.364	0.82	0.648									1.00	0.97	0.94	0.68	0.58	0.43	0.62	0.63	0.61	0.47	0.43	0.40	0.42	0.42
27	Negotiation within System Structure	3.347	0.78	0.588										1.00	0.96	0.70	0.55	0.40	0.58	0.59	0.58	0.46	0.43	0.39	0.37	0.39
28	Maintenance of Group Working Relationship	3.267	0.78	0.660											1.00	0.75	0.62	0.41	0.56	0.56	0.57	0.45	0.43	0.43	0.41	0.41
29	Demonstration of System Commitment	3.578	0.75	0.652												1.00	0.91	0.76	0.64	0.63	0.65	0.56	0.49	0.48	0.44	0.44
30	Adherence to the Normative Process	3.697	0.74	0.479													1.00	0.87	0.72	0.64	0.68	0.56	0.50	0.50	0.47	0.41
31	Consensual Growth Creation	3.819	0.72	0.645														1.00	0.83	0.75	0.68	0.56	0.39	0.38	0.35	0.30
32	Collaborative Issues Structure	3.353	0.75	0.643															1.00	0.94	0.87	0.59	0.43	0.41	0.40	0.32
33	Overall Follower	3.117	0.78	0.643																1.00	0.93	0.61	0.43	0.41	0.40	0.32
34	Overall Leader Influence	2.942	0.88	0.625																	1.00	0.69	0.46	0.47	0.47	0.35
LMX-7																										
35	Leader understanding of follower	3.386	0.67	0.588																		1.00	0.65	0.56	0.53	0.46
36	Leader use of power to help followers	3.342	0.73	0.587																			1.00	0.92	0.83	0.54
37	Leader defense of follower	3.300	0.84	0.574																				1.00	0.94	0.61
38	Follower defense of the leader	3.203	0.98	0.652																					1.00	0.66
39	Favorability of working relationships	3.369	0.97	0.678																						1.00

Note r>.18 significant at .05 level

Table 3 Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for General Measures of Leader Performance

		M	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1)	Number of Positive Contributions	5.30	5.07	1.00	-.12	.76	-.14	.28	.45	.42	.23	.13	.31	.39	.5
2)	Number of Negative Contributions	3.68	4.64		1.00	.13	.81	.05	.02	.25	.15	.11	-.38	-.26	-.49
3)	Number of Different Types of Positive Contributions	2.88	2.81			1.00	-.05	.31	.37	.25	.19	.05	.20	.28	.38
4)	Number of Different Types of Negative Contributions	2.22	2.52				1.00	-.04	.06	-.26	.18	.13	-.33	-.34	-.42
5)	Number of Institutions Established by the Leader	2.46	2.54					1.00	.15	.21	.07	.09	.43	.26	.12
6)	Amount of Leader Contribution to Society	2.84	1.35						1.00	.56	.62	.43	.51	.36	.36
7)	Length of Time Contribution Lasted	3.34	1.50							1.00	.39	.19	.68	.69	.51
8)	Number of People Effected by Leader	3.10	1.25								1.00	.24	.30	.22	.30
9)	Mass Movement Initiation	2.14	1.41									1.00	.37	.01	.10
10)	Long-term Agenda Maintenance	3.01	1.53										1.00	.50	.52
11)	Degree Institutions Established Still in Existence	2.98	1.72											1.00	.42
12)	Biographer's Evaluation of Leader	3.57	1.35												1.00

r>.17 significant beyond .05 level

Table 4: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Covariate Measures

	M	*SE*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1) Organizational Size	3.43	1.22	1.00										
2) Geographic Region	2.68	2.25	0.31	1.00									
3) Pre- or Post-World War II	1.58	0.50	0.06	-0.23	1.00								
4) Length of Power (years)	19.36	13.83	-0.32	-0.20	-0.05	1.00							
5) Close Follower Demographic Similarity	1.05	0.22	-0.02	0.05	0.12	0.00	1.00						
6) Method of Rise to Power	2.48	1.21	-0.44	-0.22	-0.19	0.41	0.04	1.00					
7) General Follower Similarity	1.09	0.29	-0.02	0.01	0.09	0.08	0.72	0.16	1.00				
8) Biography Translation	1.97	0.18	-0.13	-0.23	-0.06	0.03	0.04	0.11	0.06	1.00			
9) Amount of Political Conflict	2.20	0.83	0.38	0.52	-0.06	-0.40	-0.15	-0.31	-0.11	-0.18	1.00		
10) Extent of Industrialization	1.13	0.34	0.23	0.18	0.18	-0.07	-0.09	-0.02	0.05	-0.06	0.26	1.00	
11) Organizational Type (Business, Social, Country)	2.16	1.45	-0.57	-0.25	0.02	0.28	0.13	0.35	0.07	0.15	-0.26	-0.32	1.00

r>.20 significant beyond .05 level

Table 5: Means and Standard Deviations for All Measures of Leader-member Exchange Relationships

		Charismatic		Ideological		Pragmatic	
		M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
	Attitudinal Similarity	3.72	0.58	3.55	0.71	3.50	0.73
	Loyalty	3.92	0.47	3.77	0.55	3.70	0.72
	Level of Trust	3.83	0.41	3.65	0.55	3.73	0.68
	Rewards	3.95	0.38	3.72	0.68	3.80	0.57
	Communication Quality	3.70	0.46	3.68	0.71	3.68	0.52
	Relationship Stability	3.87	0.41	3.90	0.68	3.88	0.47
	Level of Contact	3.80	0.53	4.05	0.70	3.93	0.68
	Level of Collaboration	3.53	0.58	3.57	0.59	3.58	0.69
	Decision-making Participation	3.10	0.66	2.90	0.48	3.12	0.70
	Mutual Influence	2.92	0.70	2.53	0.63	2.85	0.85
	Work Autonomy	3.32	0.44	3.05	0.67	3.27	0.75
	Work Negotiation	3.67	0.52	3.60	0.74	3.62	0.85
	Professional Effort	4.03	0.49	4.03	0.65	3.87	0.85
	Personal Effort	3.97	0.57	3.90	0.61	3.70	0.88
	Follower Innovation and Usefulness	4.07	0.66	3.97	0.69	3.72	0.88
	Follower Performance	4.05	0.70	3.92	0.74	3.72	0.91
	Contractual Obligation	4.07	0.57	3.90	0.55	3.78	0.69
Socialized	Functional Autonomy	4.07	0.41	3.82	0.51	3.78	0.62
	Collegial Interaction	4.02	0.41	3.80	0.53	3.90	0.60
	Conflict Resolution	3.90	0.43	3.78	0.49	3.77	0.59
	Competition Management	3.87	0.49	3.90	0.60	3.68	0.60
	Sub-organization Maintenance	3.82	0.51	3.93	0.72	3.62	0.62
	Respect for Subordinate Power Base	3.67	0.55	3.70	0.67	3.43	0.67
	Recognition of Representation Requirements	3.58	0.67	3.70	0.67	3.47	0.78
	Advisory Influence	3.58	0.63	3.73	0.67	3.38	0.81
	Dissemination of Leader Views	3.45	0.70	3.75	0.78	3.45	0.73
	Negotiation within System Structure	3.43	0.65	3.70	0.78	3.42	0.73
	Maintenance of Group Working Relationship	3.32	0.70	3.62	0.77	3.30	0.76
	Demonstration of System Commitment Requirements	3.65	0.70	3.88	0.79	3.60	0.78
	Adherence to the Normative Process	3.70	0.67	4.03	0.73	3.75	0.72
	Consensual Growth Creation	3.77	0.75	4.15	0.59	3.97	0.76
	Collaborative Issues Structure	3.35	0.70	3.90	0.66	3.47	0.56
	Overall Follower Influence	3.10	0.78	3.72	0.66	3.22	0.58
	Overall Leader Influence	2.97	0.79	3.62	0.72	3.00	0.79
	How well does the leader understand the followers' job problems and needs?	3.57	0.58	3.68	0.56	3.50	0.67
	Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that the leader would use his/her power to help the followers solve problems in their work?	3.70	0.64	3.45	0.60	3.32	0.83
	Regardless of the amount of formal authority the leader has, what are the chances that he/she would "bail the followers out" at his/her expense?	3.62	0.67	3.50	0.80	3.17	0.90
	The followers have enough confidence in their leader that they would defend and justify the leader's decision if he/she were not present to do so.	3.62	0.75	3.40	0.98	3.05	1.07
	How would you characterize the followers' working relationships with the leader?	3.60	0.64	3.52	0.86	3.28	0.81

Table 5 Continued: Means and Standard Deviations for All Measures of Leader-member Exchange Relationships

		Charismatic		Ideological		Pragmatic	
		x	SD	x	SD	x	SD
	Attitudinal Similarity	3.32	0.60	3.30	0.81	3.52	0.82
	Loyalty	3.48	0.56	3.57	0.75	3.67	0.78
	Level of Trust	3.80	0.69	3.87	0.67	3.88	0.74
	Rewards	4.13	0.63	4.18	0.59	4.02	0.75
	Communication Quality	3.98	0.60	3.87	0.55	3.97	0.65
	Relationship Stability	3.82	0.58	3.73	0.62	3.90	0.50
	Level of Contact	3.53	0.80	3.58	0.69	3.83	0.68
	Level of Collaboration	3.52	0.75	3.35	0.55	3.57	0.68
	Decision-making Participation	3.30	0.84	2.95	0.53	3.42	0.75
	Mutual Influence	3.28	0.83	2.77	0.84	3.22	0.93
	Work Autonomy	3.23	0.77	3.22	0.74	3.45	0.68
	Work Negotiation	3.30	0.65	3.63	0.74	3.47	0.70
	Professional Effort	3.40	0.71	3.90	0.65	3.55	0.71
	Personal Effort	3.42	0.77	3.68	0.66	3.38	0.77
	Follower Innovation and Usefulness	3.53	0.87	3.68	0.63	3.35	0.75
	Follower Performance	3.62	0.97	3.65	0.58	3.45	0.74
	Contractual Obligation	3.68	0.72	3.75	0.51	3.50	0.67
Personalized	Functional Autonomy	3.73	0.55	3.78	0.46	3.62	0.64
	Collegial Interaction	3.73	0.44	3.68	0.45	3.72	0.62
	Conflict Resolution	3.40	0.53	3.68	0.38	3.60	0.65
	Competition Management	3.25	0.58	3.63	0.48	3.55	0.71
	Sub-organization Maintenance	3.00	0.73	3.72	0.61	3.37	0.70
	Respect for Subordinate Power Base	3.02	0.70	3.48	0.74	3.17	0.78
	Recognition of Representation Requirements	2.97	0.79	3.45	0.75	3.10	0.87
	Advisory Influence	2.95	0.76	3.43	0.77	3.07	0.92
	Dissemination of Leader Views	2.88	0.91	3.52	0.70	3.13	0.89
	Negotiation within System Structure	2.93	0.78	3.50	0.75	3.10	0.82
	Maintenance of Group Working Relationship	2.92	0.81	3.40	0.75	3.05	0.77
	Demonstration of System Commitment Requirements	3.45	0.81	3.62	0.69	3.27	0.69
	Adherence to the Normative Process	3.48	0.81	3.78	0.65	3.43	0.77
	Consensual Growth Creation	3.57	0.80	3.88	0.60	3.58	0.70
	Collaborative Issues Structure	2.87	0.69	3.45	0.67	3.08	0.82
	Overall Follower Influence	2.65	0.68	3.20	0.70	2.82	0.89
	Overall Leader Influence	2.45	0.83	2.98	0.87	2.63	0.91
	How well does the leader understand the followers' job problems and needs?	3.10	0.63	3.27	0.79	3.20	0.66
	Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that the leader would use his/her power to help the followers solve problems in their work?	3.32	0.81	3.33	0.68	2.93	0.65
	Regardless of the amount of formal authority the leader has, what are the chances that he/she would "bail the followers out" at his/her expense?	3.32	1.00	3.28	0.80	2.92	0.76
	The followers have enough confidence in their leader that they would defend and justify the leader's decision if he/she were not present to do so.	3.28	1.17	3.07	0.88	2.80	0.84
	How would you characterize the followers' working relationships with the leader?	3.32	0.91	3.10	0.82	3.40	1.55

Table 6: Summary Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance

	Normative				Upper-level				LMX-7			
Covariates	F	DF	P	n	F	DF	P	n	F	DF	P	n
Close Follower Demographic Similarity	1.586	17, 97	0.083	0.218	-	-	-	-				
Geographic Region	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.353	5, 108	0.248	0.059
Biography Translation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.112	5, 108	0.001	0.221
Main Effects												
Orientation (Socialized versus Personalized)	2.710	17, 97	0.001	0.322	1.695	17, 98	0.056	0.246	2.371	5, 108	0.044	0.099
Style (Charismatic, Ideological, Pragmatic)	1.524	17, 98	0.102	0.209	3.034	17, 99	0.001	0.355	3.902	5, 109	0.003	0.152
Interaction												
Orientation x Style	0.879	17, 98	0.559	0.132	1.058	17, 99	0.405	0.159	2.094	5, 109	0.072	0.088

Note:
F = F Ratio
DF = Degrees of Freedom
P = Significance Level (Determined by using Roy's Largest Root)
n = Effect Size

Table 7: Orientation Univariate Results for Normative Scales

		Socialized		Personalized					
		M	*SE*	*M*	*SE*	F	DF	P	η
1)	Attitudinal Similarity	3.597	0.093	3.370	0.093	2.97	1, 97	0.088	0.026
2)	Loyalty	3.794	0.085	3.573	0.085	3.36	1, 97	0.069	0.029
3)	Rewards	3.818	0.079	4.115	0.079	6.95	1, 97	0.010	0.058
4)	Communication Quality	3.685	0.076	3.943	0.076	5.59	1, 97	0.020	0.047
5)	Level of Contact	3.929	0.090	3.648	0.090	4.86	1, 97	0.030	0.041
6)	Decision-making Participation	3.026	0.087	3.235	0.087	2.84	1, 97	0.095	0.025
7)	Mutual Influence	2.748	0.104	3.108	0.104	5.96	1, 97	0.016	0.05
8)	Professional Effort	3.974	0.090	3.620	0.090	7.70	1, 97	0.006	0.064
9)	Personal Effort	3.867	0.093	3.483	0.093	8.36	1, 97	0.005	0.069
10)	Follower Innovation and Usefulness	3.929	0.098	3.509	0.098	9.11	1, 97	0.003	0.075
11)	Follower Performance	3.915	0.101	3.551	0.101	6.43	1, 97	0.013	0.054
12)	Contractual Obligation	3.920	0.081	3.641	0.081	5.83	1, 97	0.017	0.049

Table 8: Orientation Univariate Results for Upper-Level Scales

		Socialized		Personalized					
		M	*SE*	*M*	*SE*	F	DF	P	η
1)	Functional Autonomy	3.889	0.070	3.711	0.070	3.23	1, 98	0.074	0.02775
2)	Collegial Interaction	3.906	0.067	3.711	0.067	4.24	1, 98	0.042	0.03584
3)	Conflict Resolution	3.817	0.067	3.561	0.067	7.22	1, 98	0.008	0.05959
4)	Competition Management	3.817	0.075	3.478	0.075	10.16	1, 98	0.002	0.0818
5)	Sub-organization Maintenance	3.789	0.084	3.361	0.084	12.83	1, 98	0.001	0.10115
6)	Respect for Subordinate Power Base	3.600	0.089	3.222	0.089	9.02	1, 98	0.003	0.07334
7)	Recognition of Representation Requirements	3.583	0.098	3.172	0.098	8.86	1, 98	0.004	0.07214
8)	Advisory Influence	3.567	0.099	3.150	0.099	8.89	1, 98	0.004	0.0723
9)	Dissemination of Leader Views	3.550	0.102	3.178	0.102	6.69	1, 98	0.011	0.05546
10)	Negotiation within System Structure	3.517	0.098	3.178	0.098	6.03	1, 98	0.016	0.05024
11)	Maintenance of Group Working Relationship	3.411	0.098	3.122	0.098	4.30	1, 98	0.04	0.03638
12)	Demonstration of System Commitment Requirements	3.711	0.096	3.444	0.096	3.83	1, 98	0.053	0.03253
13)	Adherence to the Normative Process	3.828	0.094	3.567	0.094	3.88	1, 98	0.051	0.0329
14)	Consensual Growth Creation	3.961	0.091	3.678	0.091	4.85	1, 98	0.03	0.04081
15)	Collaborative Issues Structure	3.572	0.089	3.133	0.089	12.27	1, 98	0.001	0.0972
16)	Overall Follower Influence	3.344	0.093	2.889	0.093	11.92	1, 98	0.001	0.09465
17)	Overall Leader Influence	3.194	0.106	2.689	0.106	11.41	1, 98	0.001	0.09096

Table 9: Style Univariate Results for Upper-Level Scales

		Ideological		Charismatic		Pragmatic					
		M	*SE*	*M*	*SE*	*M*	*SE*	F	DF	P	η
1)	Sub-organization Maintenance	3.825	0.103	3.408	0.103	3.492	0.103	4.54	2, 99	0.013	0.07383
2)	Advisory Influence	3.583	0.121	3.267	0.121	3.225	0.121	2.62	2, 99	0.077	0.04395
3)	Dissemination of Leader Views	3.633	0.125	3.167	0.125	3.292	0.125	3.76	2, 99	0.026	0.06187
4)	Negotiation within System Structure	3.600	0.120	3.183	0.120	3.258	0.120	3.45	2, 99	0.035	0.05713
5)	Maintenance of Group Working Relationship	3.508	0.121	3.117	0.121	3.175	0.121	3.07	2, 99	0.050	0.05112
6)	Adherence to the Normative Process	3.908	0.115	3.592	0.115	3.592	0.115	2.54	2, 99	0.084	0.04259
7)	Consensual Growth Creation	4.017	0.111	3.667	0.111	3.775	0.111	2.59	2, 99	0.080	0.04341
8)	Collaborative Issues Structure	3.675	0.108	3.108	0.108	3.275	0.108	7.21	2, 99	0.001	0.11223
9)	Overall Follower Influence	3.458	0.114	2.875	0.114	3.017	0.114	7.09	2, 99	0.001	0.11059
10)	Overall Leader Influence	3.300	0.130	2.708	0.130	2.817	0.130	5.91	2, 99	0.004	0.09388

Table 10: Orientation Univariate Results for LMX-7 Items

	Socialized		Personalized					
	M	*SE*	*M*	*SE*	F	DF	P	η
1) How well does the leader understand the followers' job problems and needs?	3.583	0.085	3.189	0.085	4.65	1, 108	0.001	0.088
2) Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that the leader would use his/her power to help the followers solve problems in their work?	3.485	0.09	3.199	0.09	2.46	1, 108	0.05	0.043
3) The followers have enough confidence in their leader that they would defend and justify the leader's decision if he/she were not present to do so.	3.351	0.123	3.055	0.123	2.63	1, 108	0.1	0.025

Table 11: Style Univariate Results for LMX-7 Items

		Ideological		Charismatic		Pragmatic					
		M	*SE*	*M*	*SE*	*M*	*SE*	F	DF	P	η
1)	Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that the leader would use his/her power to help the followers solve problems in their work?	3.417	0.111	3.528	0.11	3.09	0.112	4.304	2, 109	0.010	0.071
2)	Regardless of the amount of formal authority the leader has, what are the chances that he/she would "bail the followers out" at his/her expense?	3.419	0.131	3.485	0.13	2.996	0.132	4.011	2, 109	0.05	0.067
3)	The followers have enough confidence in their leader that they would defend and justify the leader's decision if he/she were not present to do so.	3.263	0.152	3.471	0.151	2.875	0.153	3.88	2, 109	0.05	0.065

Table 12: Significant Discriminant Functions for Style

	Loading Scores
OLMX Variables	
Function 1: Shared Direction (.555, p≤.01)	
Collaborative Issues Structure	0.483
Collegial Interaction	- 0.158
Competition Management	0.208
Conflict Resolution	0.095
Consensual Growth Creation	0.300
Dissemination of Leader Views	0.352
Maintenance of Group Working Relationship	0.306
Negotiation within System Structure	0.327
Overall Follower Influence	0.471
Overall Leader Influence	0.419
Sub-organization Maintenance	0.361
Charismatic	**- 0.838**
Ideological	**0.770**
Pragmatic	**0.007**
LMX-7 Variables	
Function One: Mutual Exchange of Support (r≥.334, p ≤.033)	
How would you characterize the followers' working relationships with the leader?	0.169
Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that the leader would use his/her power to help the followers solve problems in their work?	0.559
The followers have enough confidence in their leader that they would defend and justify the leader's decision if he/she were not present to do so.	0.596
Charismatic	**0.481**
Ideological	**- 0.136**
Pragmatic	**- 0.344**

Table 13: Significant Discriminant Functions for Orientation

	Loading Scores
LMX Variables	
Function One: Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic ($r \geq .557$, $p \leq .001$)	
Attitudinal Similarity	0.225
Communication Quality	- 0.326
Contractual Obligation	0.329
Decision-making Participation	- 0.203
Follower Innovation and Usefulness	0.393
Follower Performance	0.311
Level of Collaboration	0.099
Level of Contact	0.305
Level of Trust	- 0.134
Loyalty	0.260
Mutual Influence	- 0.297
Personal Effort	0.378
Professional Effort	0.392
Relationship Stability	0.092
Rewards	- 0.361
Work Autonomy	- 0.098
Work Negotiation	0.173
Socialized	**0.664**
Personalized	**- 0.664**
OLMX Variables	
Function One: Team Leadership ($r \geq .432$, $p \leq .16$)	
Sub-organization Maintenance	0.660
Collaborative Issues Structure	0.645
Overall Follower Influence	0.636
Overall Leader Influence	0.627
Competition Management	0.606
Respect for Subordinate Power Base	0.571
Recognition of Representation Requirements	0.569
Advisory Influence	0.567
Conflict Resolution	0.517
Dissemination of Leader Views	0.488
Negotiation within System Structure	0.465
Consensual Growth Creation	0.420
Collegial Interaction	0.399
Maintenance of Group Working Relationship	0.395
Adherence to the Normative Process	0.377
Demonstration of System Commitment Requirements	0.376
Functional Autonomy	0.346
Socialized	**0.475**
Personalized	**- 0.475**

Table 13 Continued: Significant Discriminant Functions for Orientation

LMX-7 Variables

Function One: Follower Support ($r \geq .309$, $p \leq .05$)

Regardless of the amount of formal authority the leader has, what are the chances that he/she would "bail the followers out" at his/her expense?	0.475
How well does the leader understand the followers' job problems and needs?	0.948
How would you characterize the followers' working relationships with the leader?	0.312
Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that the leader would use his/her power to help the followers solve problems in their work?	0.637
The followers have enough confidence in their leader that they would defend and justify the leader's decision if he/she were not present to do so.	0.491
Socialized	**0.322**
Personalized	**- 0.322**

Table 14: Correlations of Performance Criteria with Discriminant Functions Summarizing Differences Among Leaders

Criteria	Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic	Team Leadership	Shared Direction	Leaders' Follower Support	Mutual Exchange of Support
1) Amount of leader contribution to society	0.09	0.11	0.16	-0.07	-0.05
2) Length of time contribution Lasted	0.14	0.26	0.18	0.23	0.01
3) Number of People Effected by Leader	0.03	0.17	0.09	-0.02	-0.05
4) Biographer's Evaluation of Leader	0.44	0.4	0.3	0.29	-0.03
5) Number of Positive contributions	0.29	0.22	0.13	0.12	0.06
6) Number of Negative Contributions	-0.35	-0.26	-0.23	-0.25	0.04
7) Number of different Types of Positive Contributions	0.21	0.24	0.24	0.15	-0.01
8) Number of Different Types of Negative Contributions	-0.31	-0.21	-0.18	-0.17	0.08
9) Degree Institutions Established Still in Existence	0.2	0.24	0.15	0.19	-0.05
10) Number of Institutions Established by the Leader	0.11	0.24	0.19	0.06	-0.04
11) Long-term Agenda Maintenance	0.19	0.33	0.23	0.26	-0.02
12) Mass Movement Initiation	0.01	0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.18
13) Post-power Relationship Maintenance	0.35	0.3	0.03	0.25	-0.04
14) Post-power Follower Contact and Communication	0.47	0.4	0.17	0.33	-0.03

Note $r \geq .18$ significant at .05 level

TABLE 15: Summary of Regression Results

	R	r2	P	Significant Functions	Beta Weight	High Group	Low Group
1) How much did the leader contribute to society?	-	-	-	None	-	-	-
2) How long did these contributions last?	0.23	0.050	0.01	Intrinsic vs Extrinsic	0.230	Socialized	Personalized
3) How many people did this leader effect?	0.26	0.07	0.01	Team Leadership	0.200	Socialized	Personalized
4) How favorably did the author view the leader?	0.98	0.23	0.001	Intrinsic vs Extrinsic Shared Direction	0.390 0.180	Socialized Ideological	Personalized Charismatic
5) How many positive contributions did the leader make?	0.29	0.08	0.001	Intrinsic vs Extrinsic	0.290	Socialized	Personalized
6) How many negative contributions did the leader make?	0.35	0.12	0.001	Intrinsic vs Extrinsic	-0.340	Socialized	Personalized
7) How many different types of positive contributions did the leader make?	0.24	0.05	0.008	Team Leadership	0.240	Socialized	Personalized
8) How many different types of negative contributions did the leader make?	0.31	0.1	0.001	Intrinsic vs Extrinsic	-0.300	Socialized	Personalized
9) To what degree do the institutions established still exist?	0.370	0.13	0.002	Intrinsic vs Extrinsic	0.220	Socialized	Personalized
10) How many institutions were established by the leader?	-	-	-	None	-	-	-

TABLE 15 Continued: Summary of Regression Results

	R	r2	P	Significant Functions	Beta Weight	High Group	Low Group
11) Did the leader have a vision that was maintained after they were out of power?	0.32	0.1	0.001	Intrinsic vs Extrinsic	0.230	Socialized	Personalized
				Shared Direction	0.190	Ideological	Charismatic
12) Did the leader effect mass movements?	0.26	0.06	0.016	Mutual Exchange of Support	0.210	Charismatic	Pragmatic
13) Did the leader maintain a positive relationship with the followers?	0.35	0.12	0.001	Intrinsic vs Extrinsic	0.350	Socialized	Personalized
14) Did they remain in contact after term of power was over?	0.5	0.25	0.001	Intrinsic vs Extrinsic	0.410	Socialized	Personalized
				Leader's Follower Support	0.190	Socialized	Personalized

Appendix One:

Biographies Used in Present Study

Alexander, R.J. (1979). Juan Domingo Peron: A history. Boulder: Westview Press.

Anderson, J. & May, R.W. (1952). McCarthy: The man, the senator, and the "ism." Boston: The Beacon Press.

Anthony, K. (1954). Susan B. Anthony: Her personal history and era. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Baker, L. (1969). Felix Frankfurter. New York: Coward-McCann, Inc.

Bar-Zohar, M. (1966). The armed prophet: A biography of Ben Gurion. London: Arthur Barker Limited.

Bennett, L. (1976). A biography of Martin Luther King, Jr. Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, Inc.

Bosanquet, M. (1968). The life and death of Dietrich Bonhoeffer. New York:Harper and Row, Publishers.

Bosch. A. (1988). Reagan: An American story. New York: TV Books.

Bosworth, R.J.B. (2002). Mussolini. London: Arnold.

Brands, H.W. (1997). T.R.: The Last Romantic. New York: BasicBooks.

Broderick, F.L. (1959). W.E.B. DuBois: Negro leader in a time of crisis. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Brunk, S. (1995). Emiliano Zapata: Revolution and Betrayal in Mexico. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Byrne, J.A. (1999). Chainsaw: The notorious career of Al Dunlap in the era of profit-at-any-price. New York: HarperBusiness.

Byron, C. (2002). Martha Inc.: The incredible story of Martha Stewart Living Omnimedia. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Calic, E. (1982). Reinhard Heydrich: The chilling story of the man who masterminded the Nazi death camps. New York: Military Heritage Press.

Caro, R.A. (1974). The power broker: Robert Moses and the fall of New York. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Chadha, Y. (1997). Gandhi: A life. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Chandler, D.P. (1999). Brother number one: A politial biography of Pol Pot.

Boulder: Westview Press.

Clark, C.M. (2000). Kaiser Wilhelm II. London: Longman.

Cohen, A. & Taylor, E. (2000). American pharaoh: Mayor Richard J. Daley: His battle for Chicago and the nation. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Coogan, T.P. (1990). Michael Collins: A biography. London: Hutchinson.

Cook, B.W. (1992). Eleanor Roosevelt: Volume One 1884-1933. New York: Viking.

Cook, B.W. (1999). Eleanor Roosevelt: Volume Two 1933-1938. New York: Viking.

Crassweller, R.D. (1966). Trujillo: The life and times of a Caribbean dictator. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Crozier, B. (1973). De Gaulle. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Davis, J.H. (1993). Mafia dynasty: The rise and fall of the Gambino crime family. New York: HarperPaperbacks.

Diederich, B. & Burt, A. (1991). Papa Doc: Haiti and its dictator. Maplewood: Waterfront Press.

Dinges, J. (1990). Our man in Panama: How General Noriega used the United States – and made millions in drugs and arms. New York: Random House.

Dubofsky, M. & Van Tine, W. (1986). John L. Lewis: A biography. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Duiker, W.J. (2000). Ho Chi Minh. New York: Hyperion..

Dykhuizen, G. (1973). The life and mind of John Dewey. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Falk, C.S. (1984). Love, anarchy, and Emma Goldman. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Feiling, K. (1946). The life of Neville Chamberlain. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd.

Felsenthal, C. (1993). Power, privilege and the Post: The Katherine Graham story. New York: G.P Putnam's Sons.

Ferrell, R.H. (1994). Harry S. Truman: A life. Columbia: University of Missouri

Press.

Fischer, L. (1964). The life of Lenin. New York: Harper and Row.

Fosdick, R.B. (1956). John D. Rockefeller, Jr.: A portrait. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers.

Frank, K. (2002). Indira: The life of Indira Nehru Gandhi. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Franz, U. (1988). Deng Xiaoping. Boston: Harcourt Brace Janovich, Publishers.

Fraser, D. (1993). Knight's cross: A life of Field Marshall Erwin Rommel. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Fraser, N. & Navarro, M. (1980). Eva Peron. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Garner, P. (2001). Profirio Diaz. London: Longman.

Gelderman, C. (1981). Henry Ford: The wayward capitalist. New York: The Dial Press.

Gilbert, M. (1991). Churchill: A life. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Griswold del Castillo, R. & Garcia, R.A. (1995). Cesar Chavez: A triumph of spirit. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Harlan, L.R. (1872). Booker T. Washington: The making of a black leader, 1856-1901. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hart, B.H.L. (1932). Foch: The man of Orleans. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Heckscher, A. (1991). Woodrow Wilson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Hennessee, J. (1999). Betty Friedan: Her life. New York:Random House.

Higham, C. (1993). Merchant of dreams: Louis B. Mayer, M.G.M., and the secret Hollywood. New York: Donald I. Fine, Inc.

Hirshson, S.P. (2002). General Patton: A soldier's life. New York: Harper Collins Publisher.

Hirst, D. & Beeson, I. (1981). Sadat. London: Faber and Faber Limited.

Irving, D. (1989). Goring: A biography. New York: William Morrow and Company,

Inc.

James, D.C. (1970). The years of MacArthur. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Kaufman, M.T. (2002). Soros: The life and times of a messianic billionaire. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Kaye, T. (1989). Lech Walesa. New York: Chelsea House Publishers.

Kessner, T. (1989). Fiorello H. La Guardia and the making of modern New York. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Knight, A. (1993). Beria: Stalin's first lieutenant. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kobler, J. (1992). Capone: The life and world of Al Capone. Greenwich: Fawcett Publications, Inc.

Krass, P. (2002). Carnegie. New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Lacouture, J. (1973). Nasser. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Lasky, V. (1981). Never complain, never explain: The story of Henry Ford II. New York: Richard Marek Publishers.

Lenin, H. (1983). Grand delusions: The cosmic career of John De Lorean. New York: The Viking Press.

Linn, J.W. (1935). Jane Addams: A biography. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc.

Lowenstein, R. (1995). Buffett: The making of an American capitalist. New York: Random House.

Lyon, P. (1974). Eisenhower: Portrait of the hero. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

Lyons, E. (1964). Herbert Hoover: A biography. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc.

Lyons, E. (1966). David Sarnoff. New York: Harper and Row.

Maclean, F. (1980). Josip Broz Tito: A pictorial biography. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Manchester, W. (1968). The arms of Krupp: 1587-1968. Boston: Little, Brown and

Company.

Mandel, B. (1963). Samuel Gompers: A biography. Yellow Springs: The Antioch Press.

Maney, K. (2003). The maverick and his machine: Thomas Watson, Sr. and the making of IBM. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Mango, A. (2000). Attaturk. New York: The Overlook Press.

McCauley, M. (1998). Gorbachev. London: Longman.

McDougal, D. (1988). The last mogul: Lew Wasserman, MCA, and the hidden history of Hollywood. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

McDougal, D. (2001). Privileged son: Otis Chandler and the rise and fall of the L.A. Times dynasty. New York: Perseus Publishing.

Morgan, T. (1985). FDR: A biography. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Mosely, L. (1982). Marshall: Hero for our times. New York: Hearst Books.

Mosely, L. (1985). Disney's World. New York: Stein and Day.

Moss, M. (1988). Palace coup: The inside story of Harry and Leona Helmsley. New York: Doubleday.

Murray, R.K. (1969). The Harding era: Warren G. Harding and his administration. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Murray-Brown, J. (1973). Kenyatta. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc.

Neff, J. (1989). Mobbed Up: Jackie Presser's high-wire life in the Teamsters, the Mafia, and the F.B.I. New York: The Atlantic Monthly Press.

Norris, R.S. (2002). Racing for the bomb: General Leslie R. Groves, the Manhattan Project's indispensable man. Vermont: Steerforth Press.

Padfield, P. (1990). Himmler: Reichsfuhrer-SS. London: MacMillan.

Payne, R. (1973). The life and death of Adolf Hitler. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Perret, G. (2001). Jack: A life like no other. New York: Random House.

Perry, B. (1991). Malcolm: The life of a man who changed black America. Barrytown: Station Hill Press.

Polmar, N. & Allen, T.B. (1982). Rickover. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Posner, G. (2002). Motown: Music, money, sex and power. New York: Random House.

Powers, R.G. (1987). Secrecy and power: The life of J. Edgar Hoover. New York: Free Press.

Preston, P. (1994). Franco: A biography. London: BasicBooks.

Pruessen, R.W. (1982). John Foster Dulles: The road to power. New York: Free Press.

Rooney, D. (1988). Kwame Nkrumah: The political kingdom in the third world. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Salvatore, N. (1982). Eugene V. Debs: Citizen and Socialist. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Schwarzwaller, W. (1988). Rudolf Hess: the last Nazi. Bethesda: National Press, Inc.

Seale. P. (1988). Asad of Syria: The struggle for the Middle East. Berkley: University of California Press.

Segal, R. (1979). Leon Trotsky: A biography. New York: Pantheon Books.

Shawcross, W. (1992). Murdoch: The making of a media empire. New York: Touchstone Press.

Short, P. (1999). Mao: A life. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Sloane, A.A. (1991). Hoffa. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Smith, G. I. (1980). Ghosts of Kampala. New York: St. Martin's Press. (Idi Amin)

Spence, H. (1969). Marcos of the Philippines. New York: The World Publishing Company.

Sperber, A.M. (1986). Murrow: His life and times. New York: Freundlich Books.

Stein, J. (1986). The world of Marcus Garvey: Race and class in modern society. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Steinberg, A. (1975). Sam Rayburn: A biography. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc.

Strouse, J. (1999). Morgan: American financier. New York: Random House.

Summers, A. & Swan, R. (2000). The arrogance of power: The secret world of Richard Nixon. New York: Viking.

Szulc, T. (1986). Fidel: A critical portrait. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Tilton, E.M. (1947. Amiable autocrat: A biography of Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes. New York: Henry Schuman.

Trimble, V.H. (1990). Walton: The inside story of America's richest man. New York: Dutton.

Ulam, A.B. (1989). Stalin: The man and his era. New York: The Viking Press.

Unger, I. & Unger, D. (1999). LBJ: a life. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Urquhart, B. (1971). Hammarskjold. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Wall, J.F. (1990). Alfred I. du Pont: The man and his family. New York: Oxford University Press.

Warner, P. (1986). Kitchener: The man behind the legend. New York: Atheneum.

Watson, D.R. (1974). Georges Clemenceau: A political biography. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Williams, T.H. (1969). Huey Long. New York: Vintage Books.

Wyden, P. (1987). The unknown Iacocca. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Young, H. (1989). One of us: A biography of Margaret Thatcher. London: Macmillan.

Zaffiri, S. (1994). Westmoreland: A biography of General William C. Westmoreland. New York:William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Appendix Two:

Leader-Member Exchange Rating Scales

1) **Attitudinal Similarity**
How similar are the ideas and attitudes concerning key organizational issues between the leader and the follower?
1-The beliefs of the leader and the follower completely oppose each other. Follower acts in such a way that this opposition is demonstrated.
3-Follower may sometimes disagree with the attitudes and beliefs of the leader. Leader will listen to follower point of view but will ultimately make own decision.
5-Attitudes of leader and follower are completely the same. Follower does not question the beliefs of the leader.

2) **Loyalty**
How important is follower loyalty to the leader?
1-Leader does not consider loyalty to be an important trait in a follower.
3-Leader is indifferent regarding follower loyalty. He will not care one way or the other whether the follower is loyal or not.
5-Loyalty is very important to the leader. Disloyal followers will be punished and very loyal followers will be rewarded.

3) **Level of Trust**
What is the degree of trust that the leader has in the follower to carry out everyday organizational activities?
1-Leader does not trust the follower at all in any capacity. Does not allow the follower to do anything on their own not because they are not capable of performing tasks, but because they are not trusted.
3-Leader trusts the follower to come extent but does not allow the follower to make any major decisions their own.
5-Leader completely trusts the follower to carry out any organizational activities on there own.

4) **Rewards**
How much does the leader rely on monetary bonuses or praise to reward followers?
1 - The leader does not provide his followers with any monetary bonuses or praise.
3 - The leader will sometimes provide followers with bonuses or praise for a job well done.
5 - The leader provides bonuses and praise on a regular basis to close followers.

5) **Communication Quality**
What is the quality (i.e. clarity, quantity, degree of follower input) of the communications between the leader and the follower?
1 – Quality of communications is very low. Leader will be ambiguous and followers will have not input into communications.
3 – Quality of communications vary. At times the leader will be ambiguous but at other times communications will be direct and understandable. Followers have some input during communications.
5 – Leader and follower have high quality communications where orders are direct and understandable. Followers have a great deal of input during communications.

6) **Relationship Stability**
How stable is the relationship between the leader and the follower?
1-The relationship is short-lived and only for the term of a single project.
3-Relationship lasts until term of leadership is over.
5-Relationships are long-term and continue long after the term of leadership is over.

7) **Level of Contact**
How much does the leader stay in contact with his followers?
1-The leader has a very small amount of contact with the follower.
3-The leader has a moderate amount of contact with the follower. They only speak a few times per month.
5-The leader is in constant contact with the follower. They speak to each other several times a day.

8) **Level of Collaboration**
How much does the leader collaborate with his followers?
1-The leader does not collaborate with the follower on any projects.
3-The leader has a moderate amount of collaboration with the follower. They only collaborate on projects where the follower has a direct interest in the outcome.
5-The leader collaborates with the follower on nearly every project, even if this project is technically outside of the follower's area of expertise.

9) **Decision-making Participation**
How much does the leader involve the follower in organizational decision-making?
1-The leader does not involve the follower in any organizational decision-making.
3-The leader involves the follower when making decisions that apply directly to the follower's interests or expertise.
5-The leader involves the follower in nearly every organizational decision, even if it is outside of the follower's area of expertise or interests.

10) Mutual Influence

How much do the leader and follower influence each other in everyday organizational and sub-organizational decision-making?

1-The follower is not influenced by the leader when making *everyday* sub-organizational decisions and the leader is not influenced by the follower when making overall organizational decisions. They do not act as advisers to each other at all.

3-The follower and the leader influence each other moderately when making *everyday* organizational and sub-organizational decisions. The follower will act as an advisor to the leader when the decision applies to the sub-organization of the follower

5-The follower and the leader influence each other greatly when making *everyday* organizational and sub-organizational decisions. They act as advisors to each other in all decisions.

11) Work Autonomy

To what degree does the leader allow the followers to determine their own day-to-day work and goals?

1 - The leader determines all follower activities. The follower has no input

3 – The leader allows the follower to determine some daily activities, but approves all activities.

5 – The leader allows the follower to determine his own daily activities. Approval for daily activities is not required.

12) Work Negotiation

To what degree does the leader negotiate the nature of work with the follower?

1 – The leader does not negotiate any work with the follower. The follower must perform all assigned work.

3 – The leader allows for some negotiation with followers. The follower is usually expect to perform all assigned work, but under special circumstances is allowed to negotiate.

5 – The leader allows the follower to negotiate all work. The follower takes an active role in determining the nature of their work.

13) Professional Effort

How much effort does the leader put into maintaining the follower relationship on a professional level?

1 – The leader puts little effort into maintaining follower relationships. He will not take a professional interest in the follower.

3 – The leader will put some effort into maintaining follower relationships. He will take some professional interest in the follower

5 – The leader puts a great deal of effort into maintaining follower relationships by taking a professional interest in the follower.

14) Personal Effort

How much effort does the leader put into maintaining the follower relationship on a personal level?

1 – The leader puts little effort into maintaining follower relationships. He will not take a personal interest in the follower.

3 – The leader will put some effort into maintaining follower relationships. He will take some personal interest in the follower

5 – The leader puts a great deal of effort into maintaining follower relationships by taking a personal interest in the follower.

15) Follower Innovation and Usefulness

To what degree do the followers come up with new and useful ideas that help the leader to attain organizational goals?

1 – The follower never comes up with any ideas to help the leader attain organizational goals.

3 – The follower comes up with some ideas to help the leader attain organizational goals, but they are not particularly new or very useful.

5 – The follower often comes up with new and useful ideas. These ideas are often implemented by the leader and have a very positive effect in the attainment or organizational goals.

16) Follower Performance

How successful is the follower in attaining organizational goals?

1 - The follower has trouble in attaining organizational goals and does not have high performance.

3 - The follower is able to attain some organizational goals and has a medium level of performance.

5 – The follower plays a critical role in the attainment of organizational goals and has a high level of performance.

17) Contractual Obligation

To what degree is the follower obligated by contract (legal or psychological) or some other agreement to work with the leader?

1 – The leader and follower have an informal agreement that they will work together. The expectations that the leader has about the follower's work are very loosely defined.

3 – The leader and the follower have a formal agreement to work together, but the leader's expectations about the follower's work are only somewhat defined.

5 – The follower is contractually obligated to the leader. The expectations that the leader has about the follower's work are very tightly defined in the contract.

Appendix Three:

Outstanding Leader-Member Exchange Rating Scales

1) **Functional Autonomy**

How much autonomy does the leader allow the follower to have when dealing with their sub-organization?

1 – The leader keeps tight control over the sub-organization and allows the follower to have very little autonomy. All decisions must be cleared by the leader before implementation

3 – The leader allows the follower autonomy, but stays informed of all follower actions with regard to the sub-organization. At times, the leader may take over operations or make decisions for the sub-organizations in times of great conflict or need.

5 – The leader allowed the follower complete autonomy in dealing with the sub-organization. He will never take any kind of control over the sub-organization.

2) **Collegial Interaction**

To what degree do the leader and the follower treat each other as equals?

1 – The leader and the follower are not equals in the eyes of the leader. The leader believes that he is very much above the follower. He does not go to the follower for advice and does not value or solicit the opinion of the follower.

3 – The leader does not believe that he and the follower are equals, but will value the followers opinion and advice to some degree.

5 – The leader treats the follower as his equal. He goes to the follower for advice on organizational matters and values the opinion of the follower.

3) **Conflict Resolution**

Does the leader help the follower work out conflicts with other followers?

1 – The leader does not help the follower to work out conflicts with other followers in any way.

3 – The leader will help the follower to work out conflicts with followers to some extent. While he will expect followers to work out conflicts on their own, he will give advice if approached.

5 – The leader will help the follower to work out conflicts with other followers to a great extent. He will take an active part in conflict resolution by offering advice, facilitating negotiations, and helping followers to reach a compromise.

4) **Competition Management**

How competitive are the followers with each other and with the leader?

1 – The followers and the leader are not competitive at all. The followers respect the leader's position and do not compete with him in any way because of this respect.

3 – The leader and followers compete to some degree, but do not attempt to put others out of power.

5 – The leader and the followers are in constant competition. The leaders do not respect the leader's position and try to devise ways to put the leader out of power so that they can take over control of the organization.

5) **Sub-organization Maintenance**
To what degree does the leader allow close followers to control sub-organizations within the organization and support their decisions with regard to the sub-organization?
1 – The leader does not allow the followers to have any control over the sub-organization. They generally do not accept the input of the follower with regard to the sub-organization and change decisions made by the follower.
3 – The leader allows the followers to have some control over the sub-organization. They must approve the decisions of the followers, but allow followers some input in issues related to the sub-organization.
5 – The leader allows the followers to have complete control over the sub-organization. He will rarely question the decisions of the follower and gives the follower a great deal of support.

6) **Respect for Subordinate Power Base**
How much does the leader show respect for the follower's sub-organization?
1 – The leader shows no respect for the follower's sub-organization. He never talks about it publicly or acts as if it is an important part of the organization.
3 – The leader shows a moderate amount of respect for the follower's sub-organization. He will talk about it in public at times, but will never seem to view it as a very important part of the organization.
5 – The leader shows a great deal of respect for the follower's sub-organization. He often references it in speeches and in everyday work and talks about it as if it were a very important part of the organization.

7) **Recognition of Representation Requirements**
To what degree does the leader expect and allow the follower to publicly represent their sub-organization?
1 – The leader neither expects nor allows the follower to publicly represent the sub-organization. The leader will represent the sub-organization in all circumstances.
3 – The leader expects and allows the follower to publicly represent the sub-organization in some circumstances, but in cases of extreme importance will choose to represent the sub-organization himself.
5 – The leader expects and allows the follower to publicly represent the sub-organization in all circumstances.

8) **Advisory Influence**
To what degree do the followers act as an advisor to the leader?
1 – The follower does not act as an advisor to the leader in any way. The leader never approaches the follower for advice.
3 – The follower acts as an advisor to the leader when dealing in matters regarding the follower's sub-organization, but not any other organizational matters. The leader occasionally approaches the follower for advice.
5 – The follower acts as an advisor to the leader in all matters of the organization. The leader frequently approaches the follower for advice.

9) **Dissemination of Leader Views**
How much are the followers used to disseminate leader's vision/policies?
1 – The followers do not and are not expected to disseminate the leader's vision or policies to other followers.
3 – The followers are occasionally expected to disseminate leader vision and policies to followers, but do not on a regular basis.
5 – The leader expects ad the followers do take an active role in disseminating the leader's vision or policies to other followers.

10) **Negotiation within System Structure**
To what degree do the leader and follower engage in deal-making and negotiation activities regarding systems issues such as resources and direction to further the sub-organization?
1 – The leader and follower engage in no negotiation activities. The leader makes all decisions with regard to systems issues and does not allow the follower to have any input.
3 – The leader and follower engage in a moderate amount of negotiation. The leader allows the follower to negotiation to a moderate degree regarding systems issues in sub-organizations, but generally does not make deals with followers.
5 – The leader and follower engage in a high degree of negotiation regarding sub-organization systems issues.

11) **Maintenance of Group Working Relationship**
To what degree does the leader encourage collaborative efforts among followers?
1-The leader does not encourage the followers to collaborate on any type of projects.
3-The leader encourages followers to collaborate on projects that will help their sub-organizations.
5-The leader encourages followers to collaborate on all organizational projects.

12) **Demonstration of System Commitment Requirements**
To what degree does the leader require public displays of organizational and leader alliance from his close followers?
1-The leader does not require or expect followers to publicly display their organizational and leader alliance.
3-The leader will expect public displays of organizational and leader alliance in certain situations, but not all. Failure to demonstrate alliance will not result in punishment.
5-The leader requires and expects public displays of organizational and leader alliance. Failure to do so will result in punishment for the follower or the follower's sub-organization.

13) Adherence to the Normative Process

To what degree is the follower expected to respect the bounds of authority placed upon him by the leader?

1 – The follower is not expected to respect the bounds of authority placed upon him by the leader. He never has to go to the leader for approval of anything and is allowed to do anything he wants.

3 – The follower is somewhat expected to respect the bounds of authority places upon him by the leader. Approval must be sought for very important things and while the follower has a certain degree of freedom, he is not allowed to do whatever he wants.

5 – The follower is very much expected to respect the bounds of authority placed upon him by the leader. He has to go to the leader for approval of everything, including routine daily activities and the leader dictates everything he does.

14) Consensual Growth Creation

To what degree does the leader expect the followers to place emphasis on the overall growth of the organization rather than their own and their organization's needs?

1 – The leader expects the follower to place emphasis on the growth and needs of their own sub-organization rather than the whole organization.

3 – The leader will expect the follower to place equal emphasis on the growth and needs of the organization and the sub-organization.

5 – The leader will expect the follower to place a great emphasis on the growth and needs of the organization over those of the sub-organization.

15) Collaborative Issues Structure

To what degree does the leader collaborate with the follower when determining key priorities and issues?

1-The follower is not influenced by the leader when making *key* sub-organizational priorities and issues and the leader is not influence by the leader when making *key* organizational priorities and issues. They do not act as advisers to each other at all.

3-The follower and the leader influence each other moderately when making *key* organizational and sub-organizational priorities and issues.

5-The follower and the leader influence each other greatly when deciding *key* organizational and sub-organizational priorities and issues.

16) Overall Follower Influence

To what degree does the follower influence the leader in overall organizational matters?

1 – The follower does not influence the leader in overall organizational matters at all.

3 – The follower influences the leader in overall organizational matters to a moderate degree.

5 – The follower has great influence in overall organizational matters.

17) Overall Leader Influence

To what degree does the leader influence the follower in sub-organizational matters?

1 – The leader does not influence the follower in sub-organizational matters at all.

3 – The leader influences the follower in sub-organizational matters to a moderate degree.

5 – The leader has great influence over the follower in sub-organizational matters.

Appendix Four:

Modified LMX-7 Scales

1. Do the followers know where they stand with their leader…do they usually know how satisfied their leader is with what they do?

_____ Rarely
_____ Occasionally
_____ Sometimes
_____ Fairly often
_____ Very often

2. How well does the leader understand the followers' job problems and needs?

_____ Not a bit
_____ A little
_____ A fair amount
_____ Quite a bit
_____ A great deal

3. How well does the leader recognize the followers' potential?

_____ Not at all
_____ A little
_____ Moderately
_____ Mostly
_____ Fully

4. Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that the leader would use his/her power to help the followers solve problems in their work?

_____ None
_____ Small
_____ Moderate
_____ High
_____ Very high

5. Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority the leader has, what are the chances that he/she would "bail the followers out" at his/her expense?

_____ None
_____ Small
_____ Moderate
_____ High
_____ Very high

6. The followers have enough confidence in their leader that they would defend and justify the leader's decision if he/she were not present to do so.

_____ Strongly disagree
_____ Disagree
_____ Neutral
_____ Agree
_____ Strongly agree

7. How would you characterize the followers' working relationships with the leader?

_____ Extremely ineffective
_____ Worse than average
_____ Average
_____ Better than average
_____ Extremely effective

Appendix Five:

Overall Outcome Scales

1. How much did the leader contribute their society?
   1 – Very little
   3 – A moderate amount
   5 – A great deal

2. How long did these contributions last?
   1 – Contributions ended immediately after the leader was out of power
   3 – A moderate amount of time - over 10 years
   5 – A long time; still continue today – 20 + years

3. How many people did this leader effect?
   1 – Very few people – Less than 100
   3 – 1000-10,000 people
   5 – Entire countries, Over 50, 000 people

4. How favorably did the author view the leader?
   1 – Not at all favorably
   3 – Neutral
   4 – Very Favorably

5. How many positive contributions did the leader make? (count)
6. How many negative contributions did the leader make? (count)
7. How many different types of positive contributions did the leader make? (count)
8. How many different types of negative contributions did the leader make? (count)
9. Did the leader maintain a positive relationship with the followers throughout their term of leadership?
   1 – Positive relationships were not maintained at all
   3 – Relationships were neither positive nor negative – leader treated followers neutrally
   5 – Very positive relationships were maintained with the followers

10. To what degree do the institutions established still exist?
    1 – All institutions dissolved immediately after the leader was out of power
    3 – Most institutions lasted a moderate amount of time - over 10 years
    5 – Most institutions existed for a long time – 20 + years

11. How many institutions were established by the leader? (count)
12. Did the leader and close followers remain in contact after term of power was over?
    1 – All relationships dissolved immediately after the leader was out of power
    3 – Most relationships lasted a moderate amount of time - over 10 years
    5 – Most relationships existed for a long time – 20 + years

13. Did the leader have a vision that was maintained after they were out of power?
    1 – Vision and ideas were thrown out immediately after the leader was out of power
    3 – Vision and ideas lasted in the organization for a moderate amount of time - over 10 years
    5 – Vision and ideas lasted in the organization for a long time – 20 + years

14. To what degree did the leader effect mass movements?
    1 – The leader did not effect mass movements at all
    3 – The leader effected mass movements to a moderate degree
    5 – The leader effected mass movements to a very high degree