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by
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Until recently, the vast majority of leadership research has been leader-focused, examining leader characteristics and behaviors that make for effective leadership. A more recent shift towards followership “reverses the lens” by focusing on how followers’ perceptions of their role in the leadership process affects the leaders’ effectiveness. Servant leadership is a follower-focused leadership style in which the leader’s main goal is to selflessly serve followers’ needs first and foremost. This study examined the relationships between five personal characteristics and preference for servant leadership, and the mediating effect of followers’ implicit leadership theories (ILT) and implicit followership theories (IFT) on those relationships. Participants included undergraduate and graduate students who participated as part of an extra credit class assignment. Data were gathered in three phases, each of which were two weeks apart, with the personality characteristic variables being collected in phase 1, the implicit leadership and followership theories at phase 2, and the dependent variable, preference for servant leadership, collected at phase 3.

After conducting a factor analysis to evaluate the co-production of leadership scale developed for this thesis, multiple regression analyses were conducted to test hypotheses concerning direct predictors of servant leader preference, and bootstrap analyses were used to test the mediation hypotheses. Additional exploratory analyses included data on the dichotomous choice of the servant leader versus the other leadership styles presented. The results of this study showed limited support that personal characteristics and values are useful in predicting servant leadership preference. Nevertheless, some insights were gained regarding personal characteristics that predicted preference for servant leadership, particularly with regard to proactive personality. In addition, the findings clarified the relationship between co-production of leadership beliefs (IFT) and prototypical ILTs and anti-prototypical ILTs. Followers who held strong co-production of leadership beliefs also held prototypical ILTs. Conversely, those who held weaker co-production of leadership beliefs held anti-prototypical ILTs. Results suggest that although the characteristics examined in this study were not strong predictors of preference for servant leadership, some characteristics are important and should be examined further. Additional research in this area will expand our understanding of how follower characteristics and context impact preference for a leadership style, allowing for a more holistic understanding of the leadership process.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is prevalent in all human societies and is a universal phenomenon that interests researchers and the popular press (Shamir, 2007). This interest is supported with the long history of the leadership literature in organizational studies. Until recently, the majority of leadership theories focused on the leaders themselves and proposed that it is in response to the actions, behaviors, and qualities of leaders that subordinates or followers passively behave (Baker, 2007). The research surrounding this view of leadership as a “unidirectional model of what a leader does to subordinates” (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992, p. 186) has focused on understanding the background characteristics, personality traits, perceptions, and behaviors of leaders. While this view of leadership was sufficient for the stable, vertical organizational hierarchies in the preindustrial era, as flatter organizational structures became more common in the 1980s and 1990s, more responsibilities and power were delegated to followers (Baker, 2007). Although this time was conducive and optimal for research on the role of followers in leadership to flourish, the primary focus continued to be leaders and how leadership skills could be brought out and taught (Berg, 1998). Recently, researchers have recognized the gap in the literature and began to examine followers’ complex role in the leadership process (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). Much of this research has been captured under the label of followership, which is defined as “the extent to which individuals believe that follower role involves partnering with leaders to advance the mission and achieve optimal levels of productivity” (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012, p. 211).

The goal of this thesis is to extend recent developments in the followership literature by focusing specifically on servant leadership. Like followership, the concept of servant leadership has been the target of growing interest by leadership researchers. Servant leadership posits that leaders themselves should be servants first, seeking to fulfill their followers’ needs and develop them into servant leaders (Greenleaf, 1977). The concept of servant leadership shares many characteristics with followership, as the focus is placed on the followers and “de-emphasizes the glorification of the leader” (Hale & Fields, 2007, p. 397).
In this thesis, I will examine the personal characteristics of followers that are related to a preference for servant leadership. Specifically, I will empirically test the relationships between a variety of followers’ characteristics, implicit followership and leadership theories, and preference for servant leadership. The proposed model assists in “reversing the lens” of leadership (Shamir, 2007) by gaining a better understanding of followers’ role in the leadership process. This thesis seeks to demonstrate the need for further research to examine the relatively untapped area of leadership, followership. I will first provide a detailed discussion of the research that has been conducted on followership and servant leadership before presenting the specific hypotheses for the factors that are expected to predict follower preference for servant leadership.

FOLLOWER-FOCUSED THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP

Although research in the social sciences has discussed followership prior to the 1980s (e.g., Follet, 1924; Hollander, 1978), the research that some consider to mark the beginning of the follower-centric approach to leadership (Bligh, 2010) is the work on romance of leadership by Meindl and his colleagues. As proposed by Meindl and Ehrlich (1987), the romance of leadership theory highlighted the tendency for individuals to show bias toward leadership as a way to cope and come to grips with the cognitive and moral complexities of organized activity. They proposed that a halo effect (i.e., cognitive bias where initial positive perceptions influence subsequent perceptions) occurred for a variety of leadership attributes. As a result, those leaders who were idolized and initially perceived as being effective would have their shortcoming and flaws overlooked by those who followed.

The romance of leadership theory took a social constructionist approach, in that the leadership ratings provided information about followers’ conceptualization of the leaders rather than information exclusively about the leaders (Meindl, 1995). The main assumption that this theory makes is that the relationship between leaders and followers is constructed by the followers, and therefore, is affected by various follower characteristics and situational contexts (Meindl, 1995). The theory suggested shifting the focus to followers’ processes of attribution and sense-making in organizations to gain more information about their motivation, which up to that point had been ignored (Bligh & Schyns, 2007). Moreover, the theory suggested that ratings of leaders are not as objective as originally thought, but more
subjective and inherently biased accounts of how followers conceptualized leader effectiveness, leader behaviors, and their potential impacts (Bligh & Kohles, 2012). Therefore, although research on the romance of leadership was making more of an effort to incorporate the role that followers play in the construction of leadership, the ultimate interest was still in the leaders and their effectiveness (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012; Carsten, Uhl-Bien, West, Patera, & McGregor, 2010). The romance of leadership approach “loosened traditional assumptions about the significance of leaders to the leadership phenomena” (Meindl, 1995, p. 330), creating a path for the focus on followers to become a necessary topic to explore.

Also recognizing the need for more of a focus on followers in leadership research was Robert Kelley, who wrote the Harvard Business Review article, “In Praise of Followers” (Kelley, 1988) and later the 1992 novel, The Power of Followers. These two publications further sparked the emergence of followership research in organizational studies. Kelley’s (1988, 1992) model of leadership was one that did not attribute the leadership process solely to the leader. He proposed that followers have an active, rather than passive, role in the leadership process. He called for organizations to not only focus on developing leaders’ leadership skills, but also to invest time in developing employees’ followership skills. He pointed out that in the majority of organizations, followers surpass the number of leaders. Therefore, he recognized the importance in overseeing and cultivating the development of followers and viewed it as an opportunity for fostering greater organizational success.

Kelley identified two underlying behavioral dimensions of followership. The first dimension measures the degree to which a follower exercises independent and critical thinking, and the other assesses the follower on a passive/active scale of engagement. Using these dimensions, he provided one of the first comprehensive followership models, categorizing followers into five categories: the passive (low on both engagement and independent thinking), the conformist (high on engagement and low on independent thinking), the alienated (high on independent thinking and low on engagement), the pragmatics (middle on both engagement and independent thinking), and the star (or exemplar) followers (high on both independent thinking and engagement). By demonstrating the need to cultivate followers, Kelley’s work assisted in debunking the leadership myth (i.e., that leaders are the only substantial topic worth examining) and provided legitimacy to the term followers.
Another influential piece of followership work was Ira Chaleff’s 1995 publication, *The Courageous Follower*. Like Kelley, Chaleff (1995) proposed that leadership research should incorporate a dynamic model of followership, embracing (rather than undermining) the identity of the follower. The premise of this publication was to present the concept that followers are an integral component of the leadership process. Focusing on the positive aspects of followers, he identified four different dimensions of followership. The dimensions indicate where followers fall with regard to the amount of support they provide the leader and the degree to which they challenge the leader. Chaleff’s four categories are implementer, partner, individualist, and resource. By presenting followers in a proactive and positive light, Chaleff’s publication contributed to enticing researchers to examine the other individuals involved in the leadership process beside the leader.

Building on this early work, researchers have recently recognized the need for a better understanding of how followers perceive their roles in the organization and have focused their efforts on developing the construct of followership in more detail. Baker (2007) provided the first review of the research that had been done up to that point on the topic of followership. He made four key observations in summarizing that literature: (1) followership and leadership pertain to roles, (2) followers are active rather than passive, (3) followers and leaders share a common purpose, and (4) the relational dynamics between followers and leaders is significant. A subsequent review by Bligh and Kohles (2008) identified three categories of followership research: (1) follower attributes, (2) leader-follower relations, and (3) follower outcomes of leadership behavior. Most recently, Crossman and Crossman (2011) argued that the followership literature can be divided into three groups: descriptive (e.g., active, passive, disregarding, supporting, or in opposition to the leader), prescriptive (e.g., idealized behavior that followers should exhibit rather than those they actually do), and situational factors (e.g., how compatible particular leadership and followership styles are when operating in relation to one other in certain contexts).

Carsten et al.’s (2010) qualitative study of followership found that followers differ in how they report interacting with their leaders. They examined what followership means to different followers and found that followership holds “a multiplicity of meaning” (p. 545). They concluded that there were three types of followers: (1) those who viewed followers as passive, supporting the “leader’s way,” (2) those who held more active views, offering
opinions when granted the opportunity, but still remaining obedient to the leader, and (3) those who viewed followership in a proactive light, identifying followers as participants or “co-producers” (Shamir, 2007) in the leadership process. Their findings suggested the importance of determining followers’ beliefs of their role in the leadership process and whether there is congruency with the organizations’ followership perceptions. This is because incongruence may become detrimental to the overall organizational climate and effect overall organizational success. Moreover, the results of the study provided further evidence that employees are no longer just taking directions from their leaders, but rather are taking a more proactive role in organization decision-making, along the same line of the “courageous followers” identified by Chaleff (1995).

More recently, Carsten and Uhl-Bien (2012) built on the qualitative findings of Carsten et al. (2010) by providing empirical evidence that co-production beliefs are powerful antecedents to upward communication behavior and intentions to engage in unethical behavior. Carsten and Uhl-Bien (2012) provided evidence for the positive relationship between co-production of leadership beliefs and voice behavior. Moreover, they determined that there was a moderating effect of context (considerate leadership style, overall relationship quality, and autonomous work climate) in the relationship of co-production beliefs and voice but not for constructive resistance. The voice behaviors of those who had weaker co-production of leadership beliefs were affected when the leader was considerate, the relationship quality was high, and more autonomous work climate; those with higher co-production beliefs held more stable voice behavior (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012). In an additional study, Cartsten and Uhl-Bien (2013) presented working adults vignettes of unethical leaders and found support for the mediating effect of followers’ co-production of leadership beliefs, such that those who held strong co-production beliefs are more likely to not obey and resist the unethical requests of their leaders. Moreover, they found an interaction between co-production beliefs and romance of leadership beliefs, such that those with stronger co-production beliefs and who romanticized their leader were more likely to obey unethical requests made by their leader. Thus, at the heart of the followership approach to leadership is the movement away from the traditional passive connotation of the term follower and their role and responsibilities in the organization, and movement towards an active connotation of the term.
Despite progress in our understanding of the concept of followership, researchers have called for additional research to better understand followers’ beliefs about their own roles in the co-production of leadership, and the impact that their beliefs have on the organization (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012; Shamir, 2007; Uhl-Bien, Riggio, Lowe, & Carsten, 2014). Thus, although followership aids in reversing the lens that we look through in studying leadership (Shamir, 2007), it is still in its empirical stages of infancy. At the same time that recent followership theories have provided major steps in our understanding of the role of followers in leadership, research on more leader-focused approaches has also demonstrated an increased value of how leaders can support followers and facilitate their growth and development, particularly in research on servant leadership; I turn to that literature next.

**Servant Leadership**

In the volatile 21st century, organizations are determined to discover ways to enhance employee’s engagement, motivation, performance, and overall organizational social responsibility. This is a major challenge in the organizational setting, due to the increase in unethical cases dealing with greedy and egotistical leaders (Peterson, Galvin, & Lange, 2012; van Dierendonck, 2011). Therefore, leadership researchers have emphasized the need for an approach to leadership founded on ethical behavior and encouraging partnership among leaders and followers (DeGraaf, Tilley, & Neal, 2004). Although there has been a recent emergence of leadership theories that seek to satisfy this need, such as ethical leadership (Spector, 2014), an emerging approach that focuses heavily on followers is servant leadership.

Conceptualized by Robert Greenleaf (1977), servant leadership is based on Herman Hesse’s *Journey to the East*. In the novel, a group on men embarked on a mythical journey. The central character, Leo, serves the group by doing tedious chores and provides the group with song and spirit. The group is not fazed by anything, until Leo’s sudden disappearance. The group become disarrayed and ends up abandoning their journey. It is not until some years have passed that the narrator finds out that Leo, the servant, was in fact the great noble leader of the Order that mandated the journey.
A servant leader’s primary motivation is to selflessly serve their followers’ needs first and foremost. According to this paradigm, once individuals have made the conscious decision to serve others, it is only then that leadership aspirations develop. Servant leaders believe that serving their followers and developing followers’ task effectiveness, self-motivation, community stewardship, and future leadership capabilities will lead to successful follower performance and overall organizational effectiveness (Greenleaf, 1977). This is done by promoting teamwork, ethical and caring behavior, and sharing organizational power especially in decision-making (Spears, 2004). Greenleaf (2002, p. 24) best stated the fundamental test of servant leadership:

Do those served, grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit or at least not be further deprived?

Therefore, a primary goal of servant leadership is to assist others in recognizing their own potential to cultivate the servant leader in themselves, in order to benefit the organization and society as a whole.

Although Greenleaf described a variety of characteristics held by servant leaders, additional studies have been conducted expanding on these characteristics. Ehrhart (2004) developed a general 14-item measure of servant leadership, identifying the following seven categories of servant leadership: forming relationships with subordinates, empowering subordinates, helping subordinates grow and succeed, behaving ethically, having conceptual skills, putting subordinates first, and creating values for those outside of the organization. Similarly, Liden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson (2008) identified a 28-item multidimensional servant leadership measure consisting of the following seven dimensions: emotional healing, creating value for the community, conceptual skills, empowering, helping subordinates grow and succeed, putting subordinates first, and behaving ethically. Spears (2010) distinguished the following ten characteristics that he thought were most representative of servant leaders: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment, and building community. Recently, researchers determined a different set of eight dimensions of servant leadership: standing back, forgiveness, courage, empowerment, accountability, authenticity, humility, and stewardship (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). Although there are a variety of measures of servant leadership, due to the representativeness
and supported validity, for this study’s purpose, I utilized the dimensions reported by Liden et al. (2008).

Though the concept of servant leadership is relatively novel, some research has accumulated that empirically examines servant leadership as a predictor of a variety of positive organizational outcomes. For instance, servant leadership has been shown to be an antecedent of subordinate organizational commitment, community citizenship behavior, and in-role performance (Liden et al., 2008). Additionally, servant leadership was associated with increases in organizational trust (Senjaya & Pekerti, 2010), goal and process clarity (Hu & Liden, 2011), creativity (Neubert, Kacmar, Carlson, Chonko, & Roberts, 2008), and individual (Liden et al., 2008; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010), team (Hu & Liden, 2011; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Peng, 2011), department (Ehrhart, 2004) and firm performance (Peterson et al., 2012). Even with these preliminary positive organizational outcomes, there are many who view servant leadership with a skeptical eye (Avolio et al., 2009). However, servant leadership principles have been adopted by a variety of high performing Fortune 500 companies, such as Southwest Airlines, TD Industries, Synovus, and AFLAC (Levering & Moskowitz, 2000). Servant leadership should not be perceived as a “soft leadership” style, as some of the most tough-minded leaders today are firm believers and practitioners of this leadership style (DeGraaf et al., 2004). Rather it is a type of leadership that remedies the issues that arise mainly due to poor and ineffective management.

Although there is some overlap between servant leadership and other well-known leadership types, it differs from other approaches to leadership in that it stresses personal integrity and focuses on forming strong long-term relationships with employees (Liden et al., 2008). One of the most important distinctions between servant leadership and other leadership styles is the focus on serving others. Servant leaders strive to instill servant leadership behaviors in their followers in hopes of them gaining the confidence to adopt servant leadership as their preferred form of leadership and themselves become servant leaders. This process is in hope of creating a culture of servant leaders, and thus creating a better organizational environment (Greenleaf, 1977).

The leadership approaches that are the most conceptually similar to servant leadership are transformational leadership (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991), leader-member exchange (Liden & Maslyn, 1998), and ethical leadership (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison,
Although servant leadership resembles the idealized influence and intellectual stimulation dimensions of transformational leadership, transformational leadership’s main focus is not on serving followers first, contributing to the community, and cultivating leadership behaviors among followers (Liden et al., 2008). Rather, transformational leaders’ focus is on getting the followers to support the organizational objectives (Bass, 2000; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004). Therefore, transformational leaders empower their followers to support the organization’s vision, in contrast to servant leaders who empower their followers to focus on service itself (Stone et al., 2004). Though the focus is on service, these leaders recognize the connection between service and the organizational mission and overall goals (Liden, Wayne, Liao, & Meuser, in press). Additionally, Graham (1991) described how servant leaders are sensitive to the needs of numerous stakeholders, including the larger society, and servant leadership encourages followers to engage in moral reasoning that will positively impact society at large.

LMX theory contends that leaders form different exchange relationships with their followers (Liden & Maslyn, 1998). Although there is overlap with servant leadership, LMX does not touch on the provision of personal healing, the development of followers into servant leaders, or the encouragement of service to the community (Liden et al., 2008). In terms of the similarity between ethical leadership and servant leadership, ethical leadership focuses more on directive and normative ethical behaviors rather than a strong focus on the developmental aspect of the followers (van Diereendonck, 2011). In addition, ethical leadership does not emphasize egalitarianism values as servant leadership does.

In addition to the theoretical differentiation between the various leadership styles, servant leadership has also been empirically supported as a distinct leadership style. Ehrhart (2004) provided construct validation for servant leadership, indicating that although servant leadership shared similarities with other leadership styles such as LMX and transformational leadership, it was a distinct measure of leadership. Liden et al. (2008) provided additional empirical support for the distinctiveness of servant leadership. Their 28-item servant leadership measure explained incremental variance over and above that explained by transformational leadership and LMX.

As demonstrated by the above research, the servant leadership style is a distinct paradigm of leadership that aims at creating the right environment to get the best out of
people and unleash their true potential (DeGraaf et al., 2004). Servant leadership, “places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader, emphasizing leader behaviors that focus on follower development, and de-emphasizing glorification of the leader” (Hale & Fields, 2007, p. 397), therefore making servant leadership aligned with the trend of follower-focused theories in leadership. Based on these reviews of the follower-centered approaches to leadership and servant leadership, I will now apply a followership lens to the study of servant leadership by discussing the main focus of this thesis: the followers’ characteristics that are predictive of a preference for servant leadership.

**FOLLOWERS’ PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS & LEADERSHIP PREFERENCE**

Various researchers have called for the need to gain a deeper understanding of the impact of followers’ characteristics and identities in the follower-leader relationship (Carsten et al., 2010; Collinson, 2006; Lord & Brown, 2004; Avolio et al., 2009). Researchers have supported that the relationship between leadership and organizational outcomes can be moderated and mediated by followers’ characteristics (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1990, Singer & Singer, 1990, Yukl, 1971). In addition to support for moderation and mediation, previous literature has explored the direct relationship between individual characteristics and followers’ preferences for a certain type of leadership (Ehrhart, 2012; Ehrhart & Klein, 2001; Schyns & Felfe, 2006; Schyns, Kroon, & Moors, 2007; Schyns & Sanders, 2007) and have provided support for the idea that followers’ personal characteristics do predict their perceptions of leadership and leadership effectiveness.

Research surrounding followers’ characteristics and preference for leadership style has been largely based on two theories: (1) similarity-attraction theory (2) need satisfaction or the compensation argument (Ehrhart & Klein, 2001; Popper, 2011). Ehrhart and Klein (2001) conducted one of the first studies to examine the direct relationship between follower personality characteristics and preference for leadership, utilizing those two theories as the theoretical foundation for their hypotheses. They specifically examined followers’ achievement orientation, risk-taking, self-esteem, need for structure, and five work values (extrinsic rewards, intrinsic rewards, interpersonal relationships, security, and worker participation). Results indicated that personality characteristics of followers do play an important role in determining followers’ preference for a leadership type, with eight of the
nine characteristics being significantly correlated with leadership preferences. Additional research based on similarity-attraction theory by Schyns and Felfe (2006) has demonstrated that those who are high on characteristics associated with transformational leadership (e.g., agreeableness and extraversion) recognize more transformational leadership characteristics, because they are attracted to those who share the same characteristics. This provides support for the notion that followers are unlikely to prefer those leaders who hold characteristics different than their own. This may be due to novel leadership behaviors providing followers too much uncertainty. It is this uncertainty in the behaviors of their leaders that followers may perceive as too risky, and therefore less attractive.

Examining followers’ characteristics is a fertile area of research and allows organizations to better understand the complex dynamic between leaders and followers (Kelley, 2008). In addition, research on followers’ characteristics may help us to better understand the mechanisms underlying the attribution process and help leaders adjust their behaviors to better fit their followers’ needs (Felfe & Schyns, 2006). One area that has not yet been examined is the specific characteristics related to followers’ preference for servant leadership. Similar to the research that has been done with other leadership approaches, I expect to find that followers’ characteristics influence their perceptions of servant leadership. Specifically, I examined the following characteristics, as they are either characteristics that servant leaders themselves hold, or characteristics that servant leaders are able to satisfy for their followers: individualistic-collectivistic values, universalism values, need for leadership, motivation to lead, and proactive personality. A summary of the hypotheses for how these characteristics are related to preference for servant leadership is provided in Table 1.

**Individualism-Collectivism**

Individualism and collectivism, components of an individuals’ self-concept, are heavily researched in psychological research. The “father” of individualism-collectivism, Hofstede, defined individualism as “a loosely knit social framework in which people are supposed to take care of themselves and of their immediate families only” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45). Conversely, he defined collectivism as “a tight social framework in which people distinguish between in-groups and out-groups [and] expect their in-groups to look after them, and in exchange for that they feel they owe absolute loyalty to it” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45).
Table 1. Summary of Direct Relationship Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follower personal characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Preference for Servant Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Emphasis on the independent aspect of the self, personal goals are priority, emphasis on exchange relationships and rationality</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism</td>
<td>Emphasis on the interdependent aspect of the self, in-group goals are priority, emphasis on communal relationships and relatedness</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism-Concern</td>
<td>Commitment to equality, justice, and protection for all people</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism-Tolerance</td>
<td>Acceptance and understanding those who are different from oneself</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Leadership</td>
<td>The extent to which an employee wishes the leader to facilitate the paths towards individual, group, and/or organizational goals</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation to Lead</td>
<td>An individual’s level of motivation to pursue or obtain a leadership position</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Personality</td>
<td>A disposition toward taking action to influence one’s environment</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, much like many psychological constructs, individualism-collectivism appears in the literature with different names and different subtypes, such as, independent-interdependent self-construal (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) and vertical and horizontal individualism-collectivism (e.g., Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

It was not until fairly recently that individuals’ self-concept was specifically examined in relation to the impact of the leader-follower relationship. Lord, Brown, and Feiberg (1999) suggested that the followers’ self-concept is an important source of variance in the determining followers’ behaviors and reactions to leaders. In a comprehensive review, van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, De Cremer, and Hogg (2004) suggested that a variety of aspects of followers’ self-conception might mediate the relationship between leadership effectiveness and followers’ behavior. However, much like with leadership research, the majority of the research regarding followers’ self-concept has been from the leader’s perspective and had not truly taken on a followership approach (Ehrhart, 2012; van Quaquebeke, van Knippenberg, & Brodbeck, 2011). Recently, researchers have called for analyzing the moderating effect of followers’ self-concepts and the relationship between followers’ perceptions and preference for specific leaders (van Quaquebeke et al., 2011). Ehrhart (2012) answered this call and examined the impact of two aspects of followers’ self-concept, self-esteem and self-construal, on preference for leadership. The results of his study indicated that followers’ self-construal, more so than self-esteem, impacted leadership perceptions, which in turn predicted their preference for leadership.

For the purposes of this thesis, I focused on the two aspects of an individuals’ self-concept, individualism and collectivism, and their relationship towards preference for servant leadership. Although there has been much debate surround the dimensionality of the individualism-collectivism (Taras et al., 2014), the most commonly accepted approach is to view these two aspects as distinct concepts, such that an individual could be high on both individualism and collectivism (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). One of the main priorities of servant leaders is to “first make sure that other people’s highest priority needs are being served” (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 24). Therefore, servant leadership is more closely in line with collectivist values, as followers are attracted to and develop favorable evaluations of servant leaders because the similar attitudes assist to validate the individuals’ beliefs. Conversely, those individuals who are high on individualistic values may perceive servant leadership as
less attractive, as the individual may view the servant leader’s behaviors as too focused on the good of the group. An individual with individualistic values may see the leader as unnecessary for their advancement and growth as they are outside of their immediate social framework. Therefore, I hypothesize the following:

- **Hypothesis 1a**: Individualism will be negatively related to preference for servant leadership.
- **Hypothesis 1b**: Collectivism will be positively related to preference for servant leadership.

**Universalism Values**

Universalism values are those that relate to the understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and nature (Schwartz et al., 2012). Central to this value is the belief that everyone should be treated as equal and there should be no distinctions made among people. Although psychological research has examined beliefs similar to universalism in the discrimination research (e.g., egalitarian beliefs), there has been limited research on universalism values in the context of leadership. One of the few set of researchers who focused on equality and leadership were Harter, Ziolkowski, & Wyatt (2006). They noted that a reason for an individual to resist a particular leadership type might be because the leadership type suggests inequality between the leader and the follower. Moreover, they made the claim that those with egalitarian values “will prefer an alternative, either an alternative to leadership altogether or an alternative image of leadership that suggests equality” (p. 282).

Universalism values are deeply rooted in the servant leadership paradigm. One of the key characteristics a servant leader holds is belief of viewing employees as equals and not just as those lower on the organizational chart. Therefore, the assumption can be made that servant leaders counter the traditional organizational structure. Schwartz et al. (2012) identified a variety of cultural values, one of them being universalism. They broke universalism values into three sub-dimensions: concern, nature, and tolerance. Concern values focuses on equality and justice. Tolerance values emphasize accepting and understanding those with different lifestyles and beliefs. Nature values emphasize the natural environment and protecting it against threats. For the purpose of this thesis, I focused on
concern and tolerance, as the nature sub-dimension does not fully relate to the organizational setting.

Using the similarity-attraction theory as the basis, those individuals who hold stronger universalism-concern values are much more likely to prefer a servant leader than those who weaker levels of this value. This is because those who hold equality as a core value should also believe in the dyadic, co-production of leadership, which is what servant leadership fosters. The servant leader sticks to his/her moral compass and makes certain to avoid inconsistencies in how they treat each of their followers (Ehrhart, 2004). Likewise, those who hold stronger universalism-tolerance values will also likely report higher preference for servant leadership, as servant leaders practice ethical behaviors and make it a goal to promote harmony among all followers. Much like those who hold strong universalism-tolerance values, servant leaders recognize the importance of understanding followers’ suggestions even when they are not in agreement with their own beliefs. Therefore, the following is hypothesized:

- **Hypothesis 2a**: Universalism-concern will be positively related to preference for servant leadership.
- **Hypothesis 2b**: Universalism-tolerance will be positively related to preference for servant leadership.

**Need for Leadership**

The need for leadership construct as defined by de Vries, Roe, and Taillieu (1999) is “the extent to which an employee wishes the leader to facilitate the paths towards individual, group, and/or organisational goals” (p. 113). An individual’s need for leadership is a social-contextual motive, indicating that the strength of the need changes depending on the context and individual characteristics such as age, job experience, and level of education (Vecchio & Boatwright, 2002). Followers will assess the situation prior to determining whether a leader’s intervention is needed. It is this assessment that determines whether or not leader guidance, support, or approval is needed to accomplish the task or situation at hand. This can then be extended to leadership preference, such that, those leaders who do not satisfy their followers’ need, whether it be directive or non-directive, will likely be less preferable than a leader who provides their follower with what they desire.
de Vries, Roe, and Taillieu (2002) empirically examined need for leadership and its moderating effect on relationships with various outcome variables. Although the results showed relatively weak moderating effects, a high need for leadership is associated with a stronger relationship between the leadership variables (i.e., inspirational skills, leaders’ structure, and leaders’ support) and the outcome variables (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work stress), a low need for leadership with a weaker or nonexistent relationship. Additional research by Leicht, Crisp, and de Moura (2013) has examined the group effect of need for leadership. This research showed that individual differences in need for structure moderate the relationship between leaders’ prototypically and leader preference; such that those who preferred more structure and leadership input showed more preference for prototypical leaders and dislike for non-prototypical leaders, then those who reported less need for structure. Schyns et al. (2007) provided results that demonstrated that individuals’ need for leadership/dependence is positively related to their perception of LMX, while the degree to which they believed the romance of leadership and LMX perception had no such relationship.

Although there have been relatively few empirical studies examining need for leadership, there have been a variety of studies examining similar constructs, such as need for structure (Felfe & Schyns, 2006; Leicht et al., 2013), need for autonomy (Yun, Cox, & Sims, 2006), and need for supervision (de Vries, Roe, & Taillieu, 1998). For example, need for supervision has been shown to moderate the relationship between charismatic leadership and subordinate job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and role conflict (de Vries et al., 1999; Schyns et al., 2007). It was also empirically supported that empowering and directive leadership interacted with followers’ need for autonomy to predict the followers’ self-leadership; such that, empowering leadership had a more positive effect on self-leadership when the follower had high need for autonomy, and directive leadership had a strong negative effect on followers high on the construct (Yun et al., 2006).

Thus far, there have been no studies examining the need for leadership construct as a predictor for preference for a specific type of leadership. I would expect to see those followers who are low on need for leadership as more likely to find servant leadership appealing than those who have a high need for leadership. This is because the servant leadership style encourages followers to take a more proactive role in the leadership process.
Those who need a leader may find the non-directive servant leader characteristics unappealing, as their leadership needs are not being met. Those who do not need a leader may recognize the servant leaders’ non-directive approach as an indicator of their leaders’ confidence that the individual is capable of leading themselves and accomplishing tasks with limited direction. Therefore, the following is hypothesized:

- **Hypothesis 3**: Need for leadership will be negatively related to their preference for servant leadership.

**Motivation to Lead**

The earliest and one of the most common approaches to studying leadership has centered on the various personal traits and attributes that predict those who will become good leaders. Until fairly recently, research overlooked the underlying motivational processes that also play a crucial role in those who emerge and are effective as leaders. Chan and Drasgow (2001) recognized this gap in the literature and developed the motivation to lead (MTL) construct. MTL is a personality construct that describes an individual’s level of motivation to pursue or obtain a leadership position. MTL consists of the following three dimensions: affective-identity, social-normative, and non-calculative. Affective-identity MTL is an individual’s natural predisposition to lead others and most directly reflects leadership self-efficacy and experience. The second dimension, social normative MTL, is the inclination to lead due to a sense of responsibility, as if it is the social norm to lead. The final dimension, non-calculative MTL, is an individual’s internal cost-benefit analysis of taking on a leadership role and is associated with an individual’s level of altruism. An assumption made in this literature is that this construct is relatively stable over time with only minimal changes depending on learning processes through experience and training.

Chan and Drasgow (2001) proposed and tested a model of the antecedents to MTL. Among them were personality constructs, general cognitive ability, and socio-cultural values, as well as leadership experience and leadership self-efficacy. MTL was shown to provide incremental validity in predicting leadership potential, over and above a variety of other more common leadership potential ratings, such as general cognitive ability, personality, values, past leadership experience, leadership self-efficacy (Chan & Drasgow, 2001). Additional research on MTL has examined the leaders’ chronic self-regulatory focus in conjunction with their values and how that influences their leadership behaviors (Kark & van Dijk, 2007).
Singer (1991) examined the MTL variable as an outcome, examining individual personality characteristics, self-efficacy, valence, and attribution, concluding that valence scores primarily predicted aspirations but with longer length of tenure, aspirations were predicted more by self-efficacy expectancies. Recently, motivation to lead has been empirically linked to childhood and adolescent academic intrinsic motivation, supporting the theory that leadership motivation develops incrementally (Gottfried et al., 2012).

I will examine the relationship between motivation to lead and whether it is an antecedent of followers’ preference for servant leadership. I propose that those who are high on motivation to lead may see servant leaders as more likely to provide a supportive environment to become a leader, and therefore be more receptive to this specific type of leadership. This may be because servant leaders allow their followers to lead themselves and empower them to become leaders. The more motivated a follower is to become a leader, the more likely they will desire opportunities to practice leader behaviors. Conversely, those who are low on MTL may be frustrated with the servant leader’s efforts to empower them, as they have no motivational desire to lead. Thus, those followers with a high MTL will prefer leaders with a style, like servant leadership, that will allow them develop their leadership ability and give them opportunities to lead.

- **Hypothesis 4**: Motivation to lead will be positively related to preference for servant leadership.

**Proactive Personality**

Research on proactive personality has gained momentum in recent years due to the benefits in organizational performance associated with proactivity. Proactive personality identifies individuals who have a propensity to identify opportunities and act on them, show initiative, and persevere until they bring about a meaningful change (Crant & Bateman, 2000). Conversely, those who are less proactive show little initiative and are characterized as being passive. Proactive personality has been linked to a variety of organizational outcomes such as overall career success (e.g. Seiber, Crant, & Kraimer, 1999), job performance (Crant, 1995; Thompson, 2005), innovation and creativity (Parker, Bindl, & Strauss, 2010), and newcomers’ socialization (Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003).

Zhang, Wang, and Shi (2012) sought to expand the proactivity and leadership research by examining the fit between both employees’ and leaders’ proactive personalities.
and the relationship with LMX relationship, employee job satisfaction, affective commitment, and job performance. Their findings supported incongruence effect, such that when follower and leader proactive behavior is equal, the follower will be more productive, satisfied, and committed. Thus, it is important for organizations to look at both follower and leader characteristics when forming high-performing dyadic relationship. Research has also been conducted which indicated that leaders’ attributions of a followers’ proactive behavior can result in either positive or negative performance evaluations (Grant, Parker, & Collins, 2009).

Aligned with the traditional perception of followers being passive in the leadership process, research has identified contingencies on leadership effectiveness based on followers’ proactivity levels (Li, Chiaburu, Kirkman, & Xie, 2013). Although transformational leadership is a very attractive leadership paradigm, positive outcomes may be reversed due to followers’ proactivity (Grant, Gino, & Hofmann, 2011). Extraverted leaders only enhance group performance when employees are passive and the effect is reversed when employees demonstrate proactive behaviors. The opposite can be hypothesized for servant leadership. The characteristics of servant leaders are less associated with extraversion and more in line with encouraging individuals to take on a more active participation in the organization. Servant leaders facilitate the growth of their followers and provide the opportunity for them to display proactive behaviors without the fear of getting reprimanded for providing their input and opinions. As mentioned by Kelley (1988), good followers are those who take on extra work once their own roles and responsibilities are superbly accomplished, and exude a confidence in their abilities, which in turn contributes to the likelihood for increased voice behavior. Followers with proactive personalities are more likely to respond favorably when leaders value their opinions and recognize the benefits of working for such a leader in terms of opportunities for growth. Thus, servant leaders should be more desirable to those with proactive personalities, as they recognize these behaviors as helping them succeed and develop. I therefore hypothesize that those who report higher levels of proactive personality are more likely to prefer servant leaders than those with less proactive personalities.

- **Hypothesis 5**: Proactive personality will be positively related to preference for servant leadership.
**Implicit Leadership and Followership Theories**

As the followership literature has expanded, more attention has been focused on reexamining how followers perceive their ideal leader and variables that impact these perceptions. A variety of researchers have supported that followers’ personality and demographic characteristics do influence the construction of followers’ implicit leadership theories, or ILTs (Ehrhart & Klein, 2001; Keller, 1999; Shalit, Popper, & Zakay, 2010; Vecchio & Boatwright, 2002). Research has also supported the mediating role of ILTs in the relationship between followers’ views of themselves and preference for leadership (Ehrhart, 2012). In summary, followers’ personality and values influence how leader categorization of an individual occurs, through which followers determine implicitly what characteristics they prefer in a leader and subsequently their preferred leadership style. Similarly, how followers view their role in an organization and the characteristics of prototypical followers should be influenced by followers’ characteristics and values, and should subsequently impact their preferred leadership style. The literature on ILTs and IFTs is discussed in further detail below.

**Implicit Leadership Theories**

Implicit leadership theories, based on the categorization theory (Rosch, 1977, 1978) and later further conceptualized by Lord and colleagues (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984; Lord & Maher, 1991), are individual perceptions of the traits associated with being a leader. When individuals encounter a potential leader, they compare the traits of the individual with their ILTs to categorize them as a leader or non-leader. Then depending on the categorization, they make inferences and judgments about a person’s ability based on the prototypically of the leader. ILTs involve both the recognition of the presence of leadership and the individuals’ inferential leadership perceptions (Medvedeff & Lord, 2007). Modification of these inferences is difficult, as the categorization process becomes automatic and outside of awareness (Medvedeff & Lord, 2007). The previously described romance of leadership theory can be seen as an individuals’ implicit leadership theory, such that the romanticized ideas of the leader are what the individuals use as the foundation of their perceptions of a leader. Moreover, research has suggested that how individuals view themselves in relation to
their ideal leader prototype impacts the degree to which they use ILTs when determining the effectiveness and preference for leaders (van Quaquebeke et al., 2011).

As with most popular constructs, there have been a variety of ILT measurements that have been developed (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004), with the majority of them being lengthy. The ILT measure utilized most often is Offerman, Kennedy, and Wirtz’s (1994) 41-item scale. They originally identified eight ILT dimensions: sensitivity, charisma, attractiveness, intelligence, strength, dynamism, tyranny, and masculinity. However, Epitropaki & Martin (2004) factor analyzed Offerman et al. (1994) scale and found statistical support for a shortened version with six dimensions: sensitivity, intelligence, dedication, dynamism, tyranny, and masculinity. These six dimensions were found to be of a second order factor of either leader prototype (sensitivity, intelligence, dedication, and dynamism) or leader anti-prototype (tyranny and masculinity). Recently, Ehrhart (2012) utilized this scale to examined follower self-concept, ILTs, and preference for leadership, and provided some support for the mediated effect of followers’ ILT on the relationship between followers’ self-concept and leadership preference. His results showed that the effects of followers’ independent self-construal on charismatic leader preference were partially mediated by the dedication ILT dimension and the effects of interdependent self-construal were fully mediated by the sensitivity ILT dimension.

Although researchers have examined the mediating effect of ILTs on the personality characteristics and leader preferences’ relationship, there have been no studies focusing specifically on preference for servant leadership. Therefore, this thesis seeks to expand the servant leadership literature, as well as provide more support for the mediated effect of ILTs. Building off the study conducted by Ehrhart (2012), the ILT dimensions closely aligned with servant leadership are sensitivity and dedication. An individual who has a high independent and interdependent self-construal, universalism values, motivation to lead, and proactive personality should characterizes their prototypical leader as one who is compassionate, sincere, and understanding (sensitivity ILT), as well as, dedicated, motivated, and hard-working (dedication ILT), all of which are associated with servant leader behaviors. However, for those individuals who have a low need for leadership, only the dedication ILT dimension should mediate the relationship, as those who report not needing a leader will not see the sensitivity as ideal leader behavior. Thus, through leader categorization processes,
individuals’ sensitivity and dedication ILTs should positively impact the degree to which they prefer servant leadership. Therefore, I hypothesize the following:

- **Hypothesis 6a**: The negative relationship between individualism and preference for servant leadership will be mediated by the sensitivity and dedication ILT dimensions.
- **Hypothesis 6b**: The positive relationship collectivism and preference for servant leadership will be mediated by the sensitivity and dedication ILT dimensions.
- **Hypothesis 6c-d**: The positive relationship between concern (H6c) and tolerance (H6d) universalism values and preference for servant leadership will be mediated by the sensitivity and dedication ILT dimensions.
- **Hypothesis 6e**: The negative relationship between need for leadership and preference for servant leadership will be mediated by the dedication ILT dimension.
- **Hypothesis 6f**: The positive relationship between motivation to lead and preference for servant leadership will be mediated by the sensitivity and dedication ILT dimensions.
- **Hypothesis 6g**: The positive relationship between proactive personality and preference for servant leadership will be mediated by the sensitivity and dedication ILT dimensions.

**Implicit Followership Theories**

Similar to the implicit leadership theory (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984), implicit followership theory (IFT) focuses on implicit assumptions about followers and followership (Bligh, Kohles, & Pillai, 2011). Defined by Sy (2010), IFTs are “individuals’ personal assumptions about the traits and behaviors that characterize followers” (p. 74). The concept of IFTs can be seen through two lenses, social cognition and categorization theory. The social cognition literature indicates that individuals have a natural propensity to classify others using previously created schemas (Fiske & Taylor, 1991). Similar to ILTs, this theory has also been conceptualized through follower categorization theory (Shondrick & Lord, 2010), typically with leaders describing prototypical follower behavior. As described by Carsten and Uhl-Bien (2012), “followers construct followership by examining their beliefs and behaviors relative to the co-production of leadership” (p. 211). Individuals’ IFTs of prototypical followers are based on either common taxonomy (how followers are) or goal derived (how followers should be; Schyns & Meindl, 2005). IFTs typically form at an early
age via socialization (Hunt, Boal, & Sorenson, 1990), and further develop as individuals gain experiences and encounters with followers (Lord & Maher, 1991).

Recent empirical work by Sy (2010) provided a theoretical foundation of implicit followership theory in addition to the development of a measure of the construct, which parallels the measure created by Offerman et al. (1994). His results yielded an 18-item measure of IFTs that covered six dimensions: industry, enthusiasm, good citizen, conformity, insubordination, and incompetence. He also reported evidence for a second-order factor, comprised of follower prototype (industry, enthusiasm, and good citizen) and follower anti-prototype (conformity, insubordination, and incompetence). Another dimension of IFT introduced by Carsten et al. (2010) and the primary form studied in this thesis is the co-production of leadership beliefs construct. These beliefs address the extent to which an individual categorizes their prototypical follower on a continuum from passive to active (Carsten & Uhl-Bien, 2012), or in other words, the extent to which followers are viewed as active participants in the leadership process. As mentioned previously, researchers are suggesting that there has been a shift in the way we think about followers, moving towards a more active view of followers. Yet this does not mean that everyone has adopted this line of thinking; some individuals’ still view followers as passive bystanders who blindly obey their leader. Many individuals still hold these negative connotations of the term follower and submit to this passive view, reinforcing negative stereotypes (Hoption, Christie, & Barling, 2012). How individuals perceive themselves as followers can play an important role in better understanding the leadership process. Negative qualities associated with the follower label may threaten followers’ opportunities to believe in themselves and hinder their ability to perform at their full potential by way of the self-fulfilling prophecy (Hoption et al., 2012). Conversely, followers who hold a more positive view of the follower label can bolster their confidence and belief in the impact they can have in the organization.

To date, research has primarily focused on leaders’ IFTs and how these implicit perceptions can impact the leader-follower relationship, as well as followers’ ratings of their leaders. Although this literature has expanded research on the importance of followers’ role in the leadership process, leaders have still been the main focus in that it is the leader’s perspective of followers that is still emphasized. To address this gap in the literature, I apply a followership approach to examine the mediating effect of followers’ co-production of
leadership beliefs on the relationship between their personal characteristics and preference for servant leadership. Followers’ beliefs about themselves should impact their perceptions of what constitutes a prototypical follower, and therefore determine the degree to which they prefer a servant leader. Specifically, followers low on need for leadership and high on individualism, universalism-concern values, motivation to lead, and proactive personality should have active perceptions of their role in the leadership process. These followers are then likely to have a strong preference for servant leadership, as servant leaders are fully supportive of a dyadic, leader-follower relationship. Those who are high on collectivist values are likely to hold more passive views of their role in the leadership process as the likelihood for them to assume powerful role is minimal (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Moreover, they would still find servant leadership as attractive as servant leaders encourage followers’ to build their relationships with others. I do not posit the relationship between universalism-tolerance values and preference for servant leadership to be mediated by co-production of leadership beliefs, as co-production of leadership beliefs are not contingent on understanding of those with different beliefs or lifestyles. I therefore hypothesize:

- **Hypothesis 7a-b:** The positive relationship between collectivism and individualism and preference for servant leadership will be mediated by co-production of leadership beliefs.

- **Hypothesis 7c:** The positive relationship between universalism-concern values and preference for servant leadership will be mediated by co-production of leadership beliefs.

- **Hypothesis 7d:** The negative relationship between need for leadership and preference for servant leadership will be mediated by co-production of leadership beliefs.

- **Hypothesis 7e:** The positive relationship between motivation to lead and preference for servant leadership will be mediated by co-production of leadership beliefs.

- **Hypothesis 7f:** The positive relationship between proactive personality and preference for servant leadership will be mediated by co-production of leadership beliefs.

Also of interest is the relationship between individuals’ ILTs and co-production of leadership beliefs. I presume that both theories are linked and act as opposites of one another. In other words, if an individual holds anti-prototypical ILTs then conversely they will hold IFTs that conceptualize the follower is a passive bystander, willingly obeying the commands
of the leader. Moreover, an individual who categorize leaders as the sensitive, intelligent, and dedicated (prototypical ILTs) are likely to hold implicit categorizations of followers as active players in the leadership process, who are there to voice their opinions and constructively challenge their leaders decisions (i.e., high on co-production of leadership beliefs). I therefore hypothesize the following:

- **Hypothesis 8**: Individuals with prototypical ILTs will have stronger co-production of leadership beliefs, and those who hold anti-prototypical ILTs will hold weaker co-production of leadership beliefs.

A summary of the relationships hypothesized in Hypotheses 1-8 is provided in Figure 1. As is shown, the effects of follower characteristics on preference for servant leadership is expected to be mediated by follower ILTs and IFTs.

*Note: Universalism-tolerance is not hypothesized to be mediated by IFT & need for leadership is not hypothesized to be mediated by ILT-sensitivity

**Figure 1. A model of followers’ characteristics, implicit followership theory, implicit leadership theories, and preference for servant leadership.**
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

SAMPLE & PROCEDURE

Participants were current undergraduate and graduate management and psychology students at a large public, university in the western United States who completed the study as a part of their management or psychology course for extra credit. Of the participants, 64.5% were female and 35.5% were male. The average age of the participant was 23.65 (SD=5.1). The sample was 3.2% “African or African-American,” 17.9% “Asian, Pacific Islander, or Asian-American,” 46.6% “Caucasian, European, or European-American,” 24.6% “Latino/Latina or Latin-American,” and 7.6% “Other.” Participants reported having an average of 59.5 months of work experience (SD=63.7). Utilizing a multi-phase data collection procedure, data were collected in three phases via a paper and pencil survey. At phase 1, followers’ personal characteristics and demographics were measured. At phase 2, approximately two week after phase 1, followers’ ILTs, and IFTs were measured. Then two weeks following the collection of mediating variables participants received descriptions of five leadership styles and were asked to complete a set of items related to the dependent variable, preference for the particular leader.

In studies that utilize survey research, inattentive responses have been identified as a potential issue regarding the quality of data (Meade & Craig, 2012). In an attempt to minimize the chances of careless responding, instructed response items were included in the survey so to detect those participants who responded carelessly (e.g., “Please respond to this question with Somewhat Disagree”). To be included in the study, respondents must have correctly responded to three or more of the five items included to evaluate careless responding. A total of 6 participants were dropped from the study due to inattentive response patterns, as they did not correctly respond to at least three careless response items.

A total of 401 participant completed at least one phase of the study. Out of the 401 participants, a total of 340 completed phase 1, 360 participants completed phase 2, and 280 completed phase 3. Of the 360 participants who completed phase 2, 357 participants were included in the exploratory factor analysis for the co-production of leadership scale. For the
multiple regression analyses (i.e., Hypotheses 1-5), a total of 242 participants were included when examining the relationships with the continuous DV, and a total of 239 were included examining the dichotomous DV. For the analyses examining the multiple mediation model, a total of 228 and 225 participants were included for the continuous and dichotomous DV, respectively.

**Phase 1: Predictor Variables**

All of the items for the scales listed below are provided in the Appendix.

**Individualism-Collectivism**

Individualism and collectivism was measured using Triandis and Gelfand’s (1998) 16-item scale. For the purpose of this study, the horizontal and vertical dimensions were combined into the overall individualism and collectivism scale scores. The reliabilities in this study were .67 for collectivism and .66 for individualism.

**Universalism Values**

To capture individuals’ universalism values, Schwartz et al.’s (2012) 9-item scale was used. The scale captures the three dimensions identified for universalism values: universalism-concern, universalism-nature, and universalism-tolerance. For the purpose of this study, the focus was on universalism-concern and universalism-tolerance as those two dimensions are hypothesized to be closely related to servant leadership values. The reliabilities for this study were .73 for universalism-concern and .71 for universalism-tolerance.

**Need for Leadership**

For the need for leadership scale, I utilized de Vries and colleagues’ (2002) 17-item scale. The reliability for this study was .91.

**Motivation to Lead**

To measure motivation to lead (MTL), I used the MTL scale developed by Chan and Drasgow (2001). The scale assesses the extent to which an individual has aspirations to hold a leadership position. The scale consists of three subscales: affective/identity MTL (AIMTL),
non-calculative MTL (NCMTL), and social-normative MTL (SNMTL). The reliabilities for this study were .78 for AIMTL, .84 for NCMTL, and .71 for SNMTL.

**Proactive Personality**

To measure proactive personality, I used the Sieber et al. (1999) ten-item Proactive Personality Scale (PPS). The reliability for this study was .85.

**PHASE 2: MEDIATOR VARIABLES**

All of the items for the scales listed below are provided in the Appendix.

**Implicit Leadership Theories**

To measure individuals’ implicit leadership theories, I used the Epitropaki & Martín (2004) 21-item scale. The reliabilities for this study were .63 for sensitivity, .67 for intelligence, .67 for dedication, .47 for dynamism, .72 for tyranny, and .85 for masculinity.

**Co-Production of Leadership Beliefs**

To gather information about the participants’ IFTs, I developed a co-production of leadership beliefs scale. In the first step, a pool of seven undergraduate and graduate students working in an industrial/organizational psychology lab were given the definition of co-production of leadership beliefs and asked to create as many items as possible to capture the construct. A total of 15 items were initially created. In the next step, I reviewed the items and identified three general categories for the items: (1) follower role in the decision-making process, (2) follower obedience to their supervisor, and (3) follower proactivity. To validate this sorting, the same group of students sorted each item into one of the three categories (or into a fourth category if they did not feel it fit in the three main categories). Additionally, the students were asked to rate the quality of each item in terms of its fit with the category. To be retained, the items had to be sorted correctly by at least 5 out of 7 students and had to be rated highly (>4.0 on a five-point scale) in terms of fit. A total of thirteen items achieved the two criteria and were used in the study. Exploratory factor analyses resulted in the scale being shortened to eleven items; see the Results section for more detail on these analyses.

**PHASE 3: OUTCOME VARIABLES**

All of the items for the scales listed below are provided in the Appendix.
Leader Preference

Participants were presented with five short leader descriptions. Each participant was asked to imagine that they had just received a front-line managerial position at a major athletic clothing corporation, Athleteware. They were informed that included in their new employee documents are memos from five managers, one of which were their regional manager. Participants were told that this is to facilitate a better manager-employee match. Participants were asked to (1) read the descriptions of the five managers, (2) rate how much he/she liked each of the five managers using a 15-item preference for leadership measure developed by Ehrhart (2012), and (3) rank order and pick the leader that he/she would most likely want to work for.

Three of the five descriptions (task-oriented, relationship oriented, and charismatic) were taken directly from Ehrhart & Klein (2001). Following the same logic behind the creation of the three other leadership descriptions, two additional leader descriptions were created focusing on four servant leader and four transformational leader behaviors that captured the dominant and unique aspects of their respective theories. The following are the five descriptions used for the five leadership styles and their corresponding alpha reliabilities.

**Task-Oriented Leadership**

Task-oriented leadership was described using the following characteristics (each characteristic is associated with the corresponding letter superscript): (a) guides subordinates in setting performance goals that are high but realistic (b) plans and schedules the work (c) provides necessary supplies, equipment, and technical assistance, and (d) coordinates subordinate activities. The alpha reliability for the task leadership preference scale in this study was .96.

I'm successful as a leader because I emphasize task accomplishment. 

(a) I begin by working with my store managers to set goals for their work. I don't want to overwhelm my store managers with impossible standards, so I make sure their goals are realistic yet still challenging. 

(b) I am very careful and detailed in laying out what my store managers need to get done. I don't want there to be any ambiguity; they need to know exactly what to do and when it needs to get done.

(c) Once they know what needs to get done, I make sure they have everything they will need to do it. I provide them with the necessary supplies, equipment, and technical assistance to insure that they can be successful at their jobs.

(d) Finally, I coordinate the work so that the store managers and their assistant managers know what their job is and there is no overlap between the two. I want everyone to
know what their role is so that they can see how they are contributing to the accomplishment of our organization's goals. (Ehrhart & Klein, 2001, p. 163)

**Charismatic Leadership**

The charismatic leader was described in the literature to hold the following characteristics: (a) communicate high performance expectations to followers, (b) exhibit confidence in followers’ ability to reach goals, (c) take calculated risks that oppose the status quo, and (d) articulate a value-based overarching vision and collective identity. The alpha reliability for the charismatic leadership scale in this study was .96.

I have been a successful leader because I am committed to this company's future and I work hard to communicate my vision for this company to my store managers. (a) I set high standards for my store managers. I expect them to work as hard as they can to reach those standards. (b) However, I don't push them only for the sake of productivity; rather, I want them to reach their potential and do the best job they can. I want them to realize how good they can be and how much they have to offer. (c) My goal is to do things differently than this organization has done them in the past, and I'm willing to take some chances to show them how things can be improved. I rely on my store managers to be creative in finding new ways to get the job done. (d) I don't want my store managers to think of this as just another job. Instead, I try hard to make them feel like they're a part of something special here, something big, something that's going to make a difference in this organization. (Ehrhart & Klein, 2001, p. 162-163)

**Relationship-Oriented Leadership**

Relationship-oriented leadership was described using the following characteristics: (a) treats subordinates with kindness and respect, (b) emphasizes communication with and listening to subordinates, (c) shows trust and confidence in subordinates, and (d) provides recognition and shows appreciation for subordinates contributions and accomplishments. The alpha reliability for the relationship-oriented leadership scale in this study was .96.

I attribute my success as a leader to my concern for my store managers' personal well-being. (a) The first thing I try to do in all of my interactions with my store managers is to treat them with kindness and consideration. I am committed to being friendly and respectful, even when stress is high or there is a lot of work to be done. (b) Another thing I emphasize with my store managers is communication. I keep them informed of progress on projects or any other organizational issues that might affect them, and I am always available to listen to my employees' problems, whether their problems are personal or work-related. (c) In addition, I show trust and confidence in my store managers. I want them to feel involved in their work and to know that I think they can do a good job. (d) The final thing I do with my store managers is that I recognize their contributions. If they work hard
and do a good job, I go out of my way to make sure they know that their work is appreciated. (Ehrhart & Klein, 2001, p. 163)

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The following characteristics were identified to represent core behaviors and characteristics of transformational leadership: (a) idealized influence, (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration. The alpha reliability for the transformational leadership scale in this study was .96.

I have been a successful leader because I am committed to the mission and vision of the organization and work hard to motivate my employees to have the same commitment. (a) I have the desire, dedication, and determination to strive for organizational excellence. It is important to me to stand by my principles and try to be a good role model for my employees. (b) I also want my employees to be committed to the vision of the future. It is my enthusiasm and optimism that assists me in getting my employees to see the connection between their individual contributions and the larger goals of the organization. (c) However, I do not want my own enthusiasm to be so overwhelming that everyone is compliant. Instead, I rely on my store managers to look at problems from different angles and encourage them to share differing perspectives on the same problem. (d) Lastly, I see myself as a supportive coach for my employees. I have an open-door policy and encourage my employees to communicate with me with the goal of having each of my employees reach their highest potential.

SERVANT LEADERSHIP

The following characteristics were identified to represent the core characteristics and behaviors of servant leadership: (a) putting subordinates first, (b) helping employees grow and succeed, (c) empowering subordinates, and (d) creating value for the community. The alpha reliability for the servant leadership scale in this study was .96.

I have been a successful leader because I am fully committed to my employees and to the community in which the organization resides. (a) I want my employees to understand that my goal as their manager is to ensure that their workplace needs are being met, above any needs that I may have. With my guidance, my employees will then support others on the team to recognize the value of aiding others. (b) I ensure that my store managers are constantly learning new skills that will help them as they move forward in their careers. My employees know that I am here to answer any questions and look forward to creating a long-term working and personal relationship with all my employees. (c) Another goal of mine is to empower my employees to speak up and provide recommendations on how to improve the company as a whole. I want them to take responsibility and learn how to handle difficult problems independently. (d) Lastly, I emphasize to my employees the value of giving back to the community. I want employees to be
regularly volunteering and for our organization to be considered a valuable part of the community.

**Analyses**

Prior to analyzing the proposed hypotheses, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine the factor structure, validity, and reliability of the co-production of leadership scale that was developed for this study. In order to test Hypotheses 1-5, regression analyses were run in SPSS using the continuous preference for servant leadership scale. The primary dependent variable for the analyses, preference for servant leaders, was analyzed in two different forms: as a continuous preference scale for the servant leader and as a dichotomous choice (i.e., ranked servant leader first, did not rank servant leader first).

Following testing the direct relationships, Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro for SPSS was conducted to test the mediation model which included the direct predictors and mediators of the continuous servant leader preference scale. In order to test the proposed mediated relationships, it is required that four criteria be met to support the mediated relationships (Kenny, Kashy, & Bolger, 1998). First, the independent variables each need to be related to the mediators (i.e., ILTs & IFTs). Second, the independent variables need to be related to the dependent variable (i.e., preference for servant leadership). Third, the mediators must be related to the dependent variable with the independent variables included in the model. Finally, the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable must be zero when controlling for the mediator variables. If the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable is reduced to anything but zero, with the mediator in the model, there is evidence for partial mediation. Additional analyses were conducted to test all hypotheses concerning direct predictors and mediators of the categorical servant leader choice dependent variable.

Hypothesis 8, which addressed the relationship between individuals’ implicit leadership and followership theories, was examined by the correlations between the ILTs and IFTs. The implicit leadership theories was split into two dimensions, leader prototype (sensitivity, intelligence, dedication, and dynamism) and leader anti-prototype (tyranny and masculinity). In addition to examining the relationship between ILTs and the three individual dimensions of IFTs (decision-making, obedience, and proactivity), this relationship was also examined using a combined IFT measure.
Participants’ age, gender, ethnicity, and work experience were controlled due to their potential influence on individuals’ leadership preference. I controlled for age, as older participants’ are more likely to have greater work experience, and therefore be exposed to different leaders. The potential for diverse exposure could affect individuals’ preference for a specific leadership type. Additionally, gender was controlled, as researchers have demonstrated differences among leadership preferences depending on whether the individual is male or female (e.g., Boatwright & Forrest, 2000). Likewise, ethnicity was controlled due to the extensive research surrounding cultural differences in preferred leadership type (e.g., House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002).
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

MEASURE DEVELOPMENT

The full sample of phase 2 participants (n=357) was used to test the psychometric properties of the 13 items developed for the co-production of leadership beliefs scale. Principal axis factoring (PAF) was conducted to explore the scale’s dimensionality, and promax oblique rotation was utilized as the factors developed were identified as being correlates of one another. The variance accounted for by the solution, the variance accounted for by each individual factor, and the interpretability of the factors were all evaluated to determine the initial plausibility of the factor structure. PAF of the instrument suggested that a three-factor solution best explained the data. The variance explained by the solution was 42.04%, and the three factors individually accounted for 27.06%, 9.63%, and 5.35% of the variance, respectively. Using the pattern matrix for interpretation, four observed variables loaded on the first factor (values ranged from -.33 to .87), four observed variables loaded on the second factor (values ranged from .68 to .76), and three observed variables loaded on the third Factor (absolute values ranged from .54 to .83). One item that loaded on the first factor (“Followers should not blindly adhere to their leader’s way of doing things”) did not meet the criteria for inclusion as the factor loading was below 0.40 (-.22); therefore the item was removed and the analyses was repeated.

In the next iteration, PAF of the 12-item instrument suggested that a three-factor solution best explained the data. The variance explained by the solution was 44.40%, and the three factors individually accounted for 28.24%, 10.42%, and 5.74% of the variance. Using the pattern matrix for interpretation, four observed variables loaded on the first factor (values ranged from .59 to .82), four observed variables loaded on the second factor (values ranged from .31 to .84), and three observed variables loaded on the third factor (absolute values ranged from .49 to .69). One item that loaded on the third factor (“Followers should not wait for their leaders to ask before providing suggestions”) did not meet the criteria for inclusion
as the factor loading was below 0.40 (.31); therefore the item was removed and a third iteration of the analysis was conducted.

In the third iteration, PAF of the 11-item instrument suggested that a three-factor solution best explained the data. The variance explained by the solution was 47.75%, and the three factors individually accounted for 29.63%, 11.45%, and 6.68% of the variance. Using the pattern matrix for interpretation, four observed variables loaded on the first factor (values ranged from .61 to .83), four observed variables loaded on the second factor (values ranged from .48 to .69), and three observed variables loaded on the third factor (absolute values ranged from .45 to .77). All items in this factor solution met the criteria for inclusion in the measure. The final co-production of leadership scale, along with the alpha reliabilities are shown in Table 2. Note that the overall IFT measure was created by first reverse scoring the obedience dimension, and then averaging this dimension with decision-making and proactivity dimensions.

**Preliminary Statistical Analyses**

The means, standard deviations, and correlations of the variables of interest are provided in Table 3. Examination of the matrix revealed some significant correlations among the variables in the proposed model. Below I discuss some of these findings as well as some descriptive statistics for servant leadership preference and ranking and comparisons across the leaders evaluated by participants.

**Servant Leadership Preference and Choice**

Preference for servant leadership was significantly correlated with collectivism ($r=.23$), universalism tolerance ($r=.25$) and concern ($r=.21$), motivation to lead ($r=.21$), proactive personality ($r=.17$), ILT dedication ($r=.16$), IFT decision making ($r=.24$), IFT proactivity ($r=.18$), and prototypical ILT ($r=13$). Contrary to my prediction, need for leadership was positively correlated with preference for servant leadership ($r=.17$).

Examining the demographic variables, there were no significant correlations with preference for servant leadership. However, there were significant correlations among the predictor variables and demographics. Specifically, age was significantly correlated with collectivism ($r=-.11$) and IFT-decision making ($r=-.12$). Sex was significantly correlated with individualism ($r=-.19$), collectivism ($r=.13$), universalism-concern ($r=.19$), need for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>Scale alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>Followers should take an active role in decision-making processes</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Followers should feel comfortable voicing their opinions when leaders are making decisions</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Followers should collaborate with their leader’s decision-making in order to further the mission of the organization</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Followers should give their input when leaders are making decisions</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>Followers should take orders and follow them</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is not appropriate for a follower to challenge a leader’s request</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Followers typically should not challenge leaders even when they feel there is a better way to accomplish a task</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Followers should remain obedient regardless of whether they are in agreement with the actions of the leader</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>Followers should be enthusiastic to share their ideas with leaders</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Followers should take the initiative in performing their duties</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is best for followers to be proactive rather than waiting for guidance from their leader</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations among All Variables in the Study

|                      | M    | SD   | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   | 17   | 18   | 19   | 20   |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Individualism     | 4.97 | .71  | --   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 2. Collectivism      | 5.41 | .64  | .01  | --   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 3. Universalism-Con | 5.58 | .96  | -.10*| .36**| --   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 4. Universalism-Tol | 5.61 | .89  | -.13*| .45**| .46**| --   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 5. Need for Leadership | 3.51 | .67  | .00  | .15**| .14* | .17**| --   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 6. Motivation to Lead | 3.60 | .44  | .15**| .38**| .25**| .28**| -.003| --   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 7. Proactive Personality | 3.89 | .53  | .40**| .24**| .13* | .21**| .06  | .42**| --   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 8. ILT-Sensitivity   | 4.48 | .53  | -.11 | .24**| .23* | .22**| .17**| .10  | .03  | --   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 9. ILT-Dedication    | 4.71 | .42  | .13* | .20**| .13* | .09  | .002 | .25**| .15**| .32**|--   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 10. IFT-Decision-making | 6.02 | .74  | -.04 | .34**| .26**| .25**| .08  | .21**| .14**| .33**| .31**|--   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 11. IFT-Obedience    | 3.25 | 1.00 | .13* | .05  | -.14*| -.08 | .07  | .02  | .01  | -.12*| -.15**| -.28**|--   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 12. IFT-Proactivity  | 5.91 | .77  | .09  | .26**| .19**| .22**| .12* | .24**| .27**| .28**| .30**| .47**| -.14**|--   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 13. Preference for Servant Leadership | 3.82 | .74  | -.04 | .23**| .21**| .25**| .17**| .21**| .17**| .06  | .16  | .24**| -.12 | .18**| --   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 14. Servant rank 1   | .022 | .41  | -.08 | .08  | .01  | .06  | -.03 | .11  | -.001| -.01 | .02  | .04  | -.12 | -.02 | .34**|--   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 15. IFT              | 5.56 | .61  | -.04 | .22**| .26**| .24**| .05  | .17**| .16**| .32**| .33**| .76**| -.72**| .69**| .23**| .07  | --   |      |      |      |      |      |
| 16. ILT-Prototype    | 4.43 | .37  | .12* | .26**| .20**| .18**| .13* | .23**| .20**| .70**| .69**| .37**| -.07 | .38**| .13* | .03  | .35**|--   |      |      |      |      |      |
| 17. ILT-Anti Prototype | 2.03 | .68  | .30**| -.004| -.15*| -.11 | .03  | -.06 | .20**| -.15**| -.08 | -.21**| .27**| -.06 | -.007| -.05 | -.26**| .04  | --   |      |      |      |      |
| 18. Age              | 23.66| 5.10 | .00  | .11* | .02  | -.07 | -.07 | -.04 | -.03 | -.10 | -.11 | -.12*| .06  | -.05 | -.11 | -.002| -.10 | -.05 | .003 | --   |      |      |      |
| 19. Sex              | .65  | .48  | -.19**| .13* | .19**| .10  | .14* | -.08 | -.03 | .22**| -.01 | .18**| -.21**| .08  | .12  | .07  | .21**| .07  | .35**| -.04 | --   |      |
| 20. Minority Status  | .53  | .50  | .02  | .10  | .18**| .20**| .03  | .01  | .08  | .06  | -.08 | .09  | -.07 | .02  | .12  | -.09 | .08  | .02  | .06  | -.12 | -.04 | --   |
| 21. Experience       | 59.45| 63.72| .02  | -.07 | .06  | -.01 | -.06 | .06  | .05  | -.09 | -.07 | -.07 | .01  | .02  | -.04 | .07  | -.02 | -.05 | -.02 | .79**| .02  | .16**|

Note: *= p < .05, **= p < .01.
leadership \((r=.14)\), ILT sensitivity \((r=.22)\), IFT-decision making \((r=.18)\) and obedience \((r=-.21)\). Minority status (i.e., non-white, white) was significantly correlated with universalism concern \((r=.18)\) and tolerance \((r=.20)\).

Choice of servant leader (i.e., participants who chose the servant leader as their most preferred leader) was only significantly correlated with preference for servant leadership \((r=.34)\). There were no other significant correlations with the servant leadership choice variable.

**Comparisons across the Leaders**

When participants were asked to rank the five leaders, 65 participants (23.5%) chose the transformational leader as their most preferred leader, 60 participants (21.7%) chose the servant leader, 57 participants (20.6%) chose the charismatic leader, 53 participants (19.2%) chose the relationship-oriented leader, and 42 participants (15.2%) chose the task-oriented leader. Participants rated the transformational leader highest on the 15-item preference scale \((M=3.86)\) and the servant leader the next highest \((M=3.82)\), followed by the relationship-oriented leader \((M=3.78)\), the charismatic leader \((M=3.72)\), and the task-oriented leader \((M=3.63)\).

The transformational leader was not rated significantly higher than the servant leader \([t(276)=.59, p>.01]\), and the relationship-oriented leader \([t(277)=1.44, p>.01]\). The transformational leader was rated significantly higher than the charismatic leader \([t(277)=2.73, p<.01]\) and the task-oriented leader \([t(277)=3.88, p<.01]\). The servant leader was not rated significantly higher than the relationship-oriented leader \([t(278)=.80, p>.01]\) nor the charismatic leader \([t(278)=1.74, p>.01]\). However, servant leadership was rated significantly higher than the task-oriented leader \([t(278)=2.92, p<.01]\). Lastly, the charismatic leader was not rated significantly higher than the task-oriented leader \([t(279)=1.44, p>.01]\).

**Regression Analyses**

All direct relationships were testing using multiple regression in SPSS. All mediation analyses were tested using Hayes’s (2013) PROCESS macro for SPSS. The PROCESS macro utilizes an ordinary least squares-based path analytical framework to analyze statistical models involving moderation, mediation, and their combination, termed conditional process modeling.
Preference for Servant Leadership

For this analysis, preference for servant leadership 15-item scale was utilized as the outcome variable. While there were a variety of significant correlations indicating relationships between the predictors and preference for servant leadership, the regression analyses showed that only two of the predictors had significant independent effects on preference for servant leadership. In support of Hypothesis 5, there was a significant positive relationship between proactive personality and servant leadership preference ($\beta=.148, \ p\leq.01$). Additionally, the relationship between need for leadership was statistically significant; however it was in the opposite direction than hypothesized ($\beta=.137, \ p\leq.01$). Though not hypothesized, minority status (i.e., white vs. non-white) was also statistically significant ($\beta=-.217, \ p\leq.01$), indicating that minorities expressed higher preferences for servant leadership than non-minorities.

Hypotheses 6a-g predicted that followers’ ILT sensitivity and dedication would mediate the relationship between the five personal characteristics and preference for servant leadership. Individualism ($B=.09, \ p<.05$) and motivation to lead ($B=.15, \ p<.05$) were both significantly related to the mediator of ILT dedication. Additionally, when the ILT dimensions were regressed on preference for servant leadership, the dedication dimension (but not sensitivity) was significant ($B=.26; \ p<.05$). Nevertheless, when testing the indirect effects of the follower characteristics through the ILT dimensions of dedication and sensitivity, none were found to be significant. Thus, there was no support for Hypotheses 6a-g.

Hypotheses 7a-f predicted that followers’ IFTs would mediate the relationship between the five personal characteristics and preference for servant leadership. There was a significant direct effect between proactive personality and IFT proactivity ($B=.27; \ p<.05$). Additionally, findings showed a significant relationship between collectivism and the mediators IFT decision-making ($B=.25; \ p<.05$) and IFT obedience ($B=.25; \ p<.05$). In a regression with the IFT dimensions predicting preference for servant leadership, the only significant relationship was the decision-making dimension ($B=.18; \ p<.05$). Nevertheless, when examining the indirect effect of the follower characteristics through the IFT dimensions, all of the hypotheses predicting the mediating role of individuals’ IFTs were found to be not significant. Thus, there was no support for Hypotheses 7a-f.
Choice of Servant Leader

As mentioned above, all hypotheses were also tested using a categorical variable identifying those who ranked the servant leader as their most preferred leader to work for and those who did not. As was mentioned previously, choice of servant leader variable was not significantly correlated with any of the variables in the study. The regression analyses provided further evidence for the lack of support for the direct relationships between the five personal characteristics and those who chose servant leader as their most preferred leader. These findings indicate that individualism-collectivism, universalism concern and tolerance, need for leadership, motivation to lead, and proactive personality do not predict whether an individual will choose a servant leader as their most preferred leader.

The mediation hypotheses (Hypotheses 6a-f & 7a-g) were also found to be non-significant. Therefore, providing no evidence of individuals’ ILTs and IFTs mediating the relationship between the personal characteristics and choosing servant leadership as the most preferred leadership type.

Relationship between ILTs & IFTs

Lastly, the results provided support for Hypothesis 8, which examined the relationship between followers’ ILTs and IFTs. ILT prototype (sensitivity, dedication, dynamism, intelligence) was significantly correlated with IFT decision-making \((r=.37)\), IFT proactivity \((r=.38)\), and the overall IFT combined measure \((r=.35)\). ILT anti-prototype (masculine and tyranny) was significantly correlated with IFT decision-making \((r=-.21)\), IFT obedience \((r=.27)\), and the overall IFT combined measure \((r=-.26)\). In addition to examining the correlations among those constructs, ILT prototype and anti-prototype were regressed on co-production of leadership beliefs (IFTs). Individuals with prototypical ILTs were shown to have stronger co-production of leadership beliefs \((\beta=.35; p\leq.01)\) then those who held anti-prototypical ILTs, who were shown to have weaker co-production of leadership beliefs \((\beta=-.27; p\leq.01)\).

Additional Exploratory Analyses

In light of the lack of support for the study hypotheses, additional exploratory analyses were conducted. Preliminary analyses were completed examining group differences between graduate and undergraduate student participants, as well as differences between
psychology and management participants. In addition to there being no significant mean differences among the two sets of groups, when examining the graduate and undergraduate student differences, the overall pattern of relationships and the strength of those relationships were very similar when removing the graduate students (n=35) from the sample. The only differences were that the ILT dedication dimension and the overall ILT prototype scale were not significant in the undergraduate sample but were significantly correlated in the overall sample.

When examining the group differences between the psychology (n=118) and business (n=87) participants, the correlations that were significant for psychology students and business students were also significant and of similar magnitude in the overall sample. The only exception was IFT obedience dimension in the business student sample ($r=-.28$). Due to this difference, I ran the mediation analyses for just the business students to determine if there were significant results with IFT obedience as the mediator. Just as with the full sample, the mediations with just the business participants were not significant.
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The goal of this thesis was to contribute to the understanding of followers’ role in the leadership process by identifying those follower characteristics that were predictive of follower preference for servant leadership. The leadership literature has begun to shed some light on the contribution of followers with the development of followership theory; however, there is still much that is not known regarding which characteristics predict preference for servant leadership and the underlying mechanisms that explain this relationship. Therefore, this thesis examined whether five different follower characteristics were significantly related to preference for servant leadership, and whether those relationships were partially explained by followers’ implicit leadership and followership theories.

DIRECT RELATIONSHIP FINDINGS

Evaluating both the preference for servant leadership scale and the categorical outcome variable of those who chose the servant leader as their most preferred leader provided limited support for the hypotheses predicting the relationship between the five personal characteristics and preference for servant leadership. The correlations among the personal characteristics and preference for servant leadership provided more support for the importance of personal characteristics in understanding preference for servant leadership, as preference for servant leadership was significantly correlated with collectivism, universalism tolerance and concern, motivation to lead, proactive personality, ILT dedication, IFT-decision making, and IFT proactivity. In general, those individuals who emphasize the interdependent aspect of the self, are committed to equality, justice, and protection to all people, and accept and understand those who are different tend to prefer servant leadership. Additionally, individuals who have a high level of motivation to pursue a leadership position and have a disposition toward taking actions to influence one’s environment also tend to prefer servant leaders. Nevertheless, out of the personal characteristics, only proactive personality and need for leadership were statistically significant predicting preference for servant leadership in the regression analyses. As predicted, those followers who have a
proactive personality are more likely to prefer a servant leader than someone who is not as proactive. This finding supports the reasoning that followers who are more proactive see the servant leadership behaviors as allowing them to grow and succeed in the organization without fear of being reprimanded. Followers recognize that servant leaders will facilitate the growth of their followers,

Contrary to my prediction, there was a significant positive relationship between need for leadership and preference for servant leadership. This may have been due to those individuals high on need for leadership either not perceiving the servant leader as non-directive or concluding that the servant leaders approach would not inhibit them from fulfilling their leadership needs. Rather, these individuals high on need for leadership see the servant leader as a figure that will provide them with the right amount of support they need to develop their leadership skills. An additional reason for this positive relationship may be the demographics of the participants used in this study. All of the followers in this sample were students, with the average age of 24. Thus, there may be generational differences that are at play, such that those in the millennial generation who have a high need for leadership are looking for a developmental leader like the servant leader rather than someone who is more directive.

One potential explanation for the limited support for the direct relationship between personal characteristics and servant leadership preference is that there are likely stable aspects and variable aspects of leadership preference. Research has indicated that the stability of leadership preference may be impacted by the situation. For instance, Nevicka, De Hoogh, Van Vianen, and Ten Velden (2013) found that a narcissistic leader who is generally deemed undesirable may be rated as more favorable in certain uncertain situations. Additionally, other factors have influenced the limited findings as preference for leadership may also depend on age and culture, such that as followers age, they are more exposed to different leaders and are more likely to see limitations in their leaders’ influence (Chong & Wolf, 2009).

Another potential explanation for the limited amount of support for personal characteristics as predictors of servant leadership preference is that that there are a variety of followers’ characteristics that play a role in predicting leader preference. Though the characteristics that were hypothesized in this study are theoretically supported in the
literature, it may be that any one characteristic accounts for a limited amount of variance in leadership preference, resulting in generally weak findings. Because of the small effect sizes, the relatively small sample size could have additionally negatively impacted the results.

It is also important to discuss preference for servant leadership scale mean and standard deviation (M=3.82, SD=.74), as it provides support for the notion that servant leaders are generally liked by their followers. However, that being said, when participants were forced to choose between the various leaders, 14.5% of participants ranked servant leaders as their least preferred leader (n=40). It is these individuals who may have perceived servant leaders as being too focused on serving the community and not focused enough on organizational goals. This is important as leaders who are not focused on organizational goals may compromise their followers’ abilities to get ahead in an organization. Clearly, more research is needed to understand why individuals vary in their responses to a servant leader.

**Mediation Findings**

In addition to the direct relationship hypotheses, I also examined the mediation effect of individuals’ IFTs and ILTs on the relationships between the personal characteristics and preference for servant leadership. Findings provided no support for these relationships. One of the potential reason for the lack of evidence supporting these hypotheses is ILTs and IFTs may be less static and more dynamic multidimensional constructs. In terms of ILTs, individuals’ schemas of what a leader looks like have been identified by some researchers as being relatively stable (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004); however, Lord and Brown (2001) have argued that prototypes are dynamic and are created at time of use. Shondrick & Lord (2010) provide support for both notions, such that while ILTs and IFTs are dynamic and can be adjusted to fit various context, once ILTs and IFTs has been utilized for sense-making, individuals tend to consistently utilize the same schemas. The relatively low alpha coefficients of the various ILT dimensions provide some evidence for the dynamic nature of ILTs. Therefore, the possible inconsistent nature of ILTs and IFTs could provide an explanation for the lack of of significant findings for the mediation effect of followers’ ILTs and IFTs of the relationship between the personal characteristics and preference for servant leadership.
Lastly, support was found for Hypothesis 8, which examined the relationship between ILTs and IFTs. Those followers, who characterized their ideal leader as someone who is masculine and tyrannical also viewed their role in the leadership process as passive participants. This is in line with Carsten & Uhl-Bien’s (2012) findings, in which they found that followers who hold weak co-production of leadership beliefs are less likely to have high levels of voice behavior depending on the context (e.g., leadership). Conversely, followers who conceptualized their ideal leader as someone who is intelligent, sensitive, dedicated, and dynamic viewed their role in the leadership process as more active, including offering their input and thoughts during the decision-making process. This finding is especially important for followers, as awareness of how they interact with their leaders provides some insight into which type of leader-follower relationship allows them to be the most successful.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Although there was limited support for the hypotheses presented in this study, there are a variety of important practical implications for organizations based on research in the followership area. Examining followers’ leadership preference can have important benefits for organizations. Organizations can utilize the information to match new employees with supervisors. Although it may not be feasible for an organization to invest the various resources necessary to match employees and their managers, there are certain things such as providing a structured environment for initial interactions to take place, such as in the initial onboarding phase, and training managers on how to initiate professional relationships with their employees (Ehrhart, 2012).

Training is a function that is widely used in the organizational setting, and is used as a way to utilize human capital as a competitive resource. The findings provide support for the attractiveness of servant leadership and that followers are attracted to servant leader behaviors. Therefore, another practical implication of this study is that training on servant leadership may have positive benefits for managers and their subordinates. Additionally, since servant leadership is a follower-centric leadership paradigm, organizations should also invest in developing proactive followers. By enhancing both servant leadership and as well as followership skills, organizational improvement, can be gained (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2009a,
Additionally, trying to understand how followers’ perceive and react to leadership styles should provide organizations with the ability to improve feedback to leaders and help leaders to evaluate their leadership styles (Schyns, Kroon, & Moors, 2007).

Understanding employees’ implicit perceptions of followers and leaders roles in the organization can assist in facilitating employee-supervisor relationships throughout the organization. Coyle, Foti, Giles, Langford, and Holup (2013) provide support for this implication, as they found that the congruence between leaders and followers in regard to leader and follower prototypes was positively related to LMX quality. It is most often the case that there is miscommunication and discrepancy among supervisors’ expectations of their employees and vice versa. Therefore, understanding of ILTs and IFTs and what are thought to be role congruent behaviors throughout the organization provide employees information regarding the behavioral expectations of followers and leaders, which may positively impact job satisfaction, organizational commitment and well-being (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004). There is similar support for the positive impact of IFTs on employee job satisfaction and well-being (Sy, 2010).

Lastly, servant leadership can be utilized as an additional leadership style that organizations can utilize to help facilitate the increase of women in leadership positions. Due to servant leadership’s egalitarian foundation, this leadership style provides an avenue for reducing the gap between women and men in leadership positions. Servant leaders are not more suitable for one gender, which provides a way for more women leaders to not be viewed poorly because they are going against the stereotypical male leader behaviors (Barbuto & Gifford, 2010).

**LIMITATIONS**

Though the study utilized a strong multi-phase data collection, there were several limitations that may have contributed to the lack of significant findings in the thesis and should be discussed. The first is the use of vignettes describing each of the five leaders rather than the real leaders. Participants may have viewed the leaders as unrealistic and not relatable, which may have impacted the ratings of the various leaders. Therefore, future studies may utilize advancement of technology, such as video vignettes to depict leaders that display isolated key behaviors associated with each leader type to increase realism. Also
related to the five leader descriptions, participants may have experienced some fatigue, as they were required to read and rate the five leaders. While the five leader descriptions were randomized to create five different versions to minimize the effect of rating fatigue, this could have been a reason why the means of the leaders were so close. In may be valuable for researchers to look into developing a shorter leader preference scale, as well as to further examine how to concisely and accurately depict leader behaviors through either a written or visual medium. Introducing the leaders using anecdotal information describing how they handled the same situation in different ways may be more engaging and realistic for participants. Moreover, though common source is always an issue that arises with survey data, this study sought to minimize common source bias with the separation in data collection across three different time points (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003).

Two other limitations of the study pertain to the use of a student sample, located at a university in western United States. While there was a total of 401 participants who completed at least one phase, to be included in analyses testing Hypotheses 1-5, participants had to have completed two out of the three phases. Moreover, to be included in testing the mediation hypotheses, participants must have completed all three phases, leading to a relatively smaller sample size (n=230) for those analyses, which could have played a role in the non-significant findings. Additionally, the results may not be as generalizable to individuals in the work force because perceptions may change with greater exposure to leadership at work. A student sample has relatively lower work experience than that of the general workforce. The longer followers work the more likely they will see limitations in their leader’s influence (Chong & Wolf, 2009). As the follower becomes older they experience more leaders and followers are able to recognize leader change as more troublesome for the organization, therefore the followers perception of how influential a leader is diminishes. That being said, this sample did include individuals with more work experience than is typical of a student sample (M=59.45 months). Nevertheless, in order to extend generalizability of these findings, it is recommended that this study be replicated in a larger working sample in different organizational contexts.

Lastly, there has been much discussion surrounding the measurement of ILTs and IFTs, specifically the implicit nature of ILTs and IFTs. Researchers have debated as to what makes ILTs and IFTs implicit when the majority of the time these constructs are measured
explicitly (e.g., self-report measures). Epitropaki, Sy, Martin, Tram-Quon, and Topakas (2013) sought to provide clarification on this matter in their review of IFTs and ILTs. They contended that while individuals tend to lack awareness of the influence of one of their activated schema on action tendencies, they may also have introspective access to the schema they are applying (Epitropaki et al., 2013). Though researchers have suggested that lack of content awareness is a precursor to implicit processing, this is a misconception (Gawronski & Payne, 2010). However, future research should develop new ways to measure individuals’ implicit followership and leadership theories. This study utilized an explicit measurement of both ILTs and IFTs, which may have been involved in the lack of support for the mediation hypotheses.

**Future Directions**

Though the majority of the hypotheses presented in this study did not obtain support, there is much to be learned from research in this area. In addition to some of the future directions mentioned above, research in this area should examine additional personal characteristics and preference for servant leadership in an organization where servant leadership is practiced. Data can be collected during the onboarding phase of new employees and leader perceptions can then be based on actual servant leader behaviors.

Moreover, although the focus of the study was not specifically on ILTs and IFTs, there were significant correlations among the mediators and personal characteristics. Future research should examine various antecedents of ILTs and IFTs to further understand these implicit cognitive processes. In addition to the antecedents, an additional avenue for research is to further examine the interplay between ILTs and IFTs, allowing researchers to gain further understanding of how these two implicit theories inform the leadership process. Although there has been some research that has identified the positive effect of leaders’ IFTs and follower performance (Duong, 2012; Whiteley, Sy, & Johnson, 2012), additional studies should examine the effect of followers’ positive prototypical IFTs on follower performance. There is the opportunity for much value in gaining a deeper understanding of the relationship between IFTs and ILTs, as well as evaluating the content and stability of this particular relationship.
CONCLUSION

This thesis contributes to the literature on followership by examining how preference for servant leadership may develop as a result of followers’ personal characteristics, ILTs and IFTs. Servant leadership and the understanding of followership may be a key component in organizations gaining the competitive advantage in the ever-growing diverse work environment. The results of the study provide limited support for the hypotheses presented in this thesis. Nevertheless, the results did show that followers who have proactive personalities, as well as need a leader to help guide them, are more inclined to prefer the leadership behaviors that are displayed by servant leaders. Additionally, followers who held prototypical ILTs were shown to also hold strong co-production of leadership beliefs. Conversely, those followers who held anti-prototypical ILTs were shown to hold weak co-production of leadership beliefs. Despite the relatively limited findings in this study, there was some evidence that personal characteristics may provide insight into what followers prefer servant leadership, and other characteristics that predict servant leadership preference should be evaluated. Additionally, although this thesis expands the followership literature, there is much to be uncovered. Therefore, future research should continue to further investigate the active role that followers play in the leadership process.
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APPENDIX

COMPLETE MEASURES
Individualism/Collectivism Scale

Instructions:
The following questions measure a variety of feelings and behaviors in various situations. Listed below are a number of statements. Read each one as if it referred to you. Please circle the number that best matches your agreement or disagreement.

Horizontal individualism

1. I’d rather depend on myself than others.
2. I rely on myself most of the time; I rarely rely on others.
3. I often do “my own thing.”
4. My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me.

Vertical individualism

5. It is important that I do my job better than others.
6. Winning is everything.
7. Competition is the law of nature.
8. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused.

Horizontal collectivism

9. If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud.
10. The well-being of my coworkers is important to me.
11. To me, pleasure is spending time with others.
12. I feel good when I cooperate with others.

Vertical collectivism

13. Parents and children must stay together as much as possible.
14. It is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want.
15. Family members should stick together, no matter what sacrifices are required.
16. It is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my group.

Note: Overall individualism and collectivism scale scores were created by averaging the horizontal & vertical dimensions of each.
Universalism Values Scale

**Instructions:** Here we briefly describe some people. Please read each description and think about how much each person is or is not like you. Indicate the number that is associated with how much the person in the description is like YOU.

**HOW MUCH LIKE YOU IS THIS PERSON?**

*Universalism-concern*

1. Protecting society’s weak and vulnerable members is important to him/her.
2. He/She thinks it is important that every person in the world have equal opportunities in life.
3. He/She wants everyone to be treated justly, even people he doesn’t know.

*Universalism-nature*

4. He/She strongly believes that he/she should care for nature.
5. It is important to him/her to work against threats to the world of nature.
6. Protecting the natural environment from destruction or pollution is important to him/her.

*Universalism-tolerance*

7. He/she works to promote harmony and peace among diverse groups.
8. It is important to him/her to listen to people who are different from him/her.
9. Even when he/she disagrees with people, it is important to him/her to understand them.

Need for Leadership Scale

**Instructions:** Please indicate on which of the following aspects you personally need the contribution of your supervisor/boss/manager/leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anchors:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Mainly</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I need my supervisor/boss/manager/leader to. . .
1. . . . set goals.
2. . . . decide what work should be done.
3. . . . transfer knowledge.
4. . . . motivate me.
5. . . . coordinate, plan and organize my work.
6. . . . maintain external contacts.
7. . . . provide me with information.
8. . . . gear all activities of the team to one another.
9. . . . create a good team spirit.
10. . . . provide me with support.
11. . . . arrange things with higher-level management.
12. . . . handle conflicts.
13. . . . give work-related feedback.
14. . . . correct mistakes.
15. . . . help solve problems.
16. . . . recognize and reward contributions.
17. . . . inspire me.

Motivation to Lead Scale

**Instructions:** How well do the following statements describe how you feel? Imagine a typical work or school situation where you are working in a group or team, and the question is raised if someone should be appointed as a group leader. Assume for now that everyone in the group has roughly the same level of training, knowledge and experience on the job. Please read each statement carefully and choose the one answer that best describes your agreement or disagreement using the scale below. There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer honestly and frankly. Indicate your answer on the answer sheet provided.
Anchors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affective/Identity MTL (AIMTL) Scale**

1. I am definitely not a leader by nature. (R)
2. Most of the time, I prefer being a leader than a follower when working in a group.
3. I have a tendency to take charge in most groups or teams that I work in.
4. I am the type of person who is not interested to lead others. (R)
5. I believe I can contribute more to a group if I am a follower rather than a leader. (R)
6. I am the type of person who likes to be in charge of others.
7. I usually want to be the leader in the groups that I work in.
8. I am the type who would actively support a leader but prefers not to be appointed as leader. (R)
9. I am seldom reluctant to be the leader of a group.

**Non-calculation MTL (NCMTL) Scale**

10. I would only agree to be a group leader if I know I can benefit from that role. (R)
11. If I agree to lead a group I would never expect any advantages of special benefits.
12. I would want to know what’s in it for me if I am going to agree to lead a group. (R)
13. I am only interested to lead a group if there are clear advantages for me. (R)
14. I have more of my own problems to worry about than to be concerned about the rest of the group. (R)
15. I will never agree to lead if I cannot see any benefits from accepting that role. (R)
16. I never expect to get more privileges if I agree to lead a group.
17. I would agree to lead others even if there are no special rewards or benefits with that role.
18. Leading others is a waste of one’s personal time and effort. (R)

**Social-Normative MTL (SNMTL) Scale**

19. I have been taught that I should always volunteer to lead others if I can.
20. I feel that I have a duty to lead others if I am asked.
21. I was taught in the value of leading others.
22. It is not right to decline leadership roles.
23. I would never agree to lead just because others voted for me. (R)
24. It is an honor and privilege to be asked to lead.
25. I agree to lead whenever I am asked or nominated by the other members.
26. People should volunteer to lead rather than wait for others to ask or vote for them.
27. It is appropriate for people to accept leadership roles or positions when they are
Proactive Personality Scale

Instructions: Please read each statement carefully and choose the one answer that best describes your agreement or disagreement using the scale below. There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer honestly and frankly. Indicate your answer on the answer sheet provided.

Anchors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life.
2. Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change.
3. Nothing is more exciting than seeing my ideas turn into reality.
4. If I see something I don't like, I fix it.
5. No matter what the odds, if I believe in something I will make it happen.
6. I love being a champion for my ideas, even against others' opposition.
7. I excel at identifying opportunities.
8. I am always looking for better ways to do things.
9. If I believe in an idea, no obstacle will prevent me from making it happen.
10. I can spot a good opportunity long before others can.
Implicit Leadership Theory Scale

**Instructions:** Please use the following scale to indicate how characteristic the following traits are of your **IDEAL** leader. Note that you are not rating yourself or any particular leader, but you are rating your **IDEAL** leader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all characteristic</td>
<td>Somewhat characteristic</td>
<td>Extremely characteristic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Helpful
2. Understanding
3. Sincere
4. Intelligent
5. Educated
6. Clever
7. Knowledgable
8. Dedicated
9. Motivated
10. Hard-working
11. Energetic
12. Strong
13. Dynamic
14. Domineering
15. Pushy
16. Manipulative
17. Loud
18. Conceited
19. Selfish
20. Male
21. Masculine

Co-production of Leadership Scale

**Instructions:** Imagine a typical work situation in which you are working in a group with a single group leader. Please circle the extent to which you agree with the following statements regarding your role as a follower (i.e., subordinate).
**Decision-making Scale**

1. Followers should take an active role in decision-making processes.
2. Followers should feel comfortable voicing their opinions when leaders are making decisions.
3. Followers should collaborate with their leader’s decision-making in order to further the mission of the organization.
4. Followers should give their input when leaders are making decisions.

**Obedience Scale**

5. Followers should take orders and follow them.
6. It is not appropriate for a follower to challenge a leader’s request.
7. Followers typically should not challenge leaders even when they feel there is a better way to accomplish a task.
8. Followers should remain obedient regardless of whether they are in agreement with the actions of the leader.

**Proactivity Scale**

9. Followers should be enthusiastic to share their ideas with leaders.
10. Followers should take the initiative in performing their duties.
11. It is best for followers to be proactive rather than waiting for guidance from their leader.

Note: The overall IFT measure was created by reverse scoring the obedience scale and then averaging all three dimensions.
Leadership Preference Scale

Instructions: Please answer to what extent you think...

Anchors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To little or no extent</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. …you would work at a high level of performance under this manager?
2. …you would enjoy working with this manager?
3. …you would get along with this manager?
4. …you would admire this manager?
5. …this manager’s work style is compatible with your own?
6. …this manager will be successful?
7. …this manager is similar to your ideal manager?
8. …you would be personal friends with this manager?
9. …you and this manager are similar in terms of outlook, perspective, and values?
10. …you and this manager would see things in the same way?
11. …you and this manager are alike in a number of areas?
12. …you think this manager will be a high performer?
13. …you have a similar personality to this manager?
14. …this manager would bring out the best in you?
15. …this manager would help you reach your work-related goals?