

Transformational Leadership

Héctor R. Díaz-Sáenz

INTRODUCTION

Transformational leadership is the process by which a leader fosters group or organizational performance beyond expectation by virtue of the strong emotional attachment with his or her followers combined with the collective commitment to a higher moral cause. For the past 30 years transformational leadership has been the single most studied and debated idea within the field of leadership studies. From 2000 to 2010 an impressive total of 476 articles looking into transformational leadership were listed in the SCOPUS database. More impressive, perhaps, is the range of publications in which these articles appeared, which included the *International Journal of Educational Management*, the *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, *Military Psychology*, *Library Management*, and *Social Behavior and Personality*.

In accounting for its phenomenal popularity, Jay Conger (1999) pointed to the desperate desire on the part of American businesses to develop a heroic response to the threat of international competition during the 1980s and the need to foster empowerment in the context of organizational restructuring and an increasingly demanding educated work force. Daft and Lengel (1998) claimed that transformational leadership is the only one adequate during times of environmental turbulence, whereas transactional leadership is more suitable for stable environments. Interest in transformational leadership was further fuelled by the publication of popular leadership books, such as those by Bennis and Nanus in 1985 and Tichy and Devanna in 1986 that celebrated well-known transformational leaders in the corporate and not-for-profit sectors. The most highly celebrated

exemplars of transformational leaders from the world of politics include Mahatma Gandhi, John F. Kennedy and Nelson Mandela. From the corporate world, Richard Branson, Anita Roddick and Jack Welch have been frequently pointed to as exemplars of transformational leaders, though not without either debate or dissension.

This chapter commences by examining the origins and development of the concept of transformational leadership. Then follows a review of the various measures and assessment instruments that have been developed to better understand how transformational leadership is manifested and how it might be developed. Next, a comprehensive review is provided of the wide variety of contexts in which transformational leadership has been empirically examined, as well as the most frequently researched theoretical relationships that have been tested empirically. The chapter closes with a consideration of the criticisms that have been levelled at transformational leadership and how the field might be profitably moved forward.

ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

While the term 'transformational leadership' was originally coined by James Downton in a 1973 paper on rebel leadership, it was James MacGregor Burns who brought the term to wider parlance in his classic study of political leadership in the 1978 book simply entitled *Leadership*. Burns made an important distinction between 'transactional leadership', which he suggested was the way that most politicians led their followers on the basis of

reciprocal exchange leading to the satisfaction of both the leader's and the follower's self-interests; and 'transformational leadership', which was practiced by those political leaders who were able to engage their followers not only to achieve something of significance but also to 'morally uplift' them. Transformational leaders both influence and are influenced by followers 'to rise to higher levels of motivation and morality' (Burns, 1978, p. 20). They not only lead but also develop leaders. Their value is not measured by newspaper clippings but by the degree of positive social change that is promoted as a result of their leadership.

Seven years later, industrial psychologist Bernard Bass (1985) expanded on this important distinction and brought it to the top of the agenda for both leadership researchers and practitioners alike. While commencing with four factors, the Full Range Leadership (FRL) model that Bass and various others have elaborated currently contains nine factors. Within this model, the transformational leadership factors include idealized influence (both attributed and behaviours), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. The second set of factors, transactional factors, include contingent reward and management-by-exception (both active and passive). Finally, the laissez-faire leadership factor indicates an absence of leadership (i.e. a non-transaction).

Focusing on the transformational leader factors, leaders with idealized influence become role models that followers want to identify with and emulate. These leaders are admired, respected and trusted and are perceived to have extraordinary capabilities, persistence and determination. Leaders who possess these qualities are frequently described as having charisma. Leaders who create inspirational motivation paint a clear vision for their followers' future state as well as provide the momentum to reach that vision through the arousal of team spirit. These leaders also provide meaning, challenge, clearly communicated expectations, and a commitment to set goals. Leaders who exhibit intellectual stimulation encourage followers to be innovative and creative in redressing old problems in new ways and regularly examining old assumptions to see if they are still viable. Finally, leaders showing individual consideration treat each follower as an individual and consider their individual needs, abilities and aspirations. They help individuals to develop their strengths and spend time coaching and guiding people.

For Bass, the ideal approach for leaders to take exhibits both transformational and transactional forms of leadership. Transactional leadership involves an exchange wherein the leader offers rewards in return for compliance and performance by his or her followers. The transaction usually takes the form of contracts, employment

agreements, performance management systems and service-led agreements. Waldman and his colleagues, in a 1990 paper, drew attention to the importance of the augmentation effect of transformational leadership over and above the effect of transactional leadership. Indeed, the distinction that is drawn between transactional leadership and transformational leadership, as well as the crucial role that transformational leadership plays in generating optimal performance, parallels the widely discussed distinction that has been drawn between management and leadership, most notably by Zelenik in 1977 and Kotter in 1990.

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP MEASURES

One of the most widely used instruments to measure transformational leadership, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), was developed by Bass (1985). Through constant refinement, the questionnaire has become increasingly reliable so that it is the most widely used measure of transformational leadership used by leadership researchers around the world. The MLQ has been translated into many languages, including German, French, Japanese and Hebrew (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Originally only three factors related to transformational behaviours emerged as part of the MLQ model: charismatic leadership (instilling pride, faith and respect and promoting an articulated sense of mission); individual consideration (delegating for learning, teaching and coaching in a relationship of respect for their followers); and intellectual consideration (stimulating thinking in new ways before acting) (Bass, 1985). In addition, the MLQ measured two additional factors related to the transactional component (contingent reward, in exchange for the expected performance; and management-by-exception, allowing followers to do their work with an old approach if accomplishing the goals but giving negative feedback when doing something wrong that prevents achieving it) as part of a complete set of factors that encompassed the full range of behaviours that a leader exhibits. Bass argued that the transactional behaviours were the foundations of the full set of behaviours that transformational leaders perform. That is why transformational leaders are able to induce additional effort by sharply increasing the subordinate's trust and confidence, and by elevating the value of outcomes for the subordinate instead of only 'clarifying what performance is required and how needs would be satisfied as a result' (1985, p. 22).

The widespread use of the MLQ by researchers through the years, has provided sufficient feedback

that has helped to improve the measurement of transformational leadership behaviours as conceptualized by Bass (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Currently the refined MLQ version 5X includes four transformational behaviour components known as the four I's:

- idealized influence (includes two subscales that measure behaviour and elements attributed by followers and others such as charisma)
- inspirational motivation
- intellectual stimulation
- individualized consideration

In addition, the transactional dimensions include two components: contingent reward (constructive transaction), and management-by-exception (corrective transaction), which is divided into two components (active MBE-A or passive MBE-P) plus an additional component of no leadership (*laissez-faire* leadership) (Bass & Riggio, 2006). An important consideration has to be taken by researchers regarding the charismatic component of this approach (see Conger, Chapter 7, this volume). Bass's conceptualization argues for promotion of follower's autonomy as opposed to House's conceptualization of charismatic leadership, which implies the follower's dependency on 'charismatic acts by the leader' (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

In addition to Bass's MLQ model, several other researchers have worked on the development of the transformational leadership construct and on the measurement devices required to assess the behaviours of these types of leaders. These early works have already been identified and discussed at length by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) as well as by Bass and Riggio (2006), and Brown and Reilly (2009). Thus, these works will not be reviewed here. However, we note that

while all of these approaches differ somewhat in the specific behaviours they associate with transformational leadership, all of them share the common perspective that effective leaders transform or change the basic values, beliefs, and attitudes of followers so that they are willing to perform beyond the minimum levels specified by the organization. (Podsakoff et al., 1990; p. 108)

The additional assessment that was considered relevant to review here is the one developed by Podsakoff et al.'s (1990) Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI) because it was found, by this review, to be the second most widely used instrument to assess transformational leadership after the MLQ. At that time, according to Podsakoff et al. (1990), the only certain knowledge about this approach was that transformational leadership was multidimensional in nature. They found

conceptual differences among the several approaches that were measuring transformational leadership. Their development of the TLI was based on the construct definitions found in a comprehensive review of all the works that examined behaviours related to transformational leaders, including Bass's work. Thus, they identified and developed measures for six behaviours known to be associated with transformational leadership:

- *Identifying and articulating a vision* – behaviour on the part of the leader aimed at identifying new opportunities for his or her unit/division/company, and developing, articulating and inspiring others with his or her vision of the future.
- *Providing an appropriate model* – behaviour on the part of the leader that sets an example for employees to follow that is consistent with the values the leader espouses.
- *Fostering the acceptance of group goals* – behaviour on the part of the leader aimed at promoting cooperation among employees and getting them to work together towards a common goal.
- *High performance expectations* – behaviour that demonstrates the leader's expectations for excellence, quality and/or high performance on the part of followers.
- *Providing individualized support* – behaviour on the part of the leader that indicates that he/she respects followers and is concerned about their personal feelings and needs.
- *Intellectual stimulation* – behaviour on the part of the leader that challenges followers to re-examine some of their assumptions about their work and rethink how it can be performed (Podsakoff et al., 1990, p. 112).

Regarding transactional leader behaviours, contingent reward being the principal behaviour identified by Bass (1985), it was the only construct definition included in the TLI to capture the fundamental exchange notions, measuring 'the extent to which a leader provides rewards in exchange for follower's effort' (p. 113). However, the analysis of their measures suggested that the factors – articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model and fostering the acceptance of group goals – were multiple indicators of an underlying 'core' transformational leader behaviour dimension. Thus, the TLI transformational leader behaviours are measured by four first-order transformational factors – high-performance expectations, individualized support, intellectual stimulation, and a 'core' transformational behaviour construct – as well as one transactional leader behaviour. It is important to understand these factors as presented by their results (Podsakoff et al., 1990), because they have been misunderstood by some researchers who have ignored the core factor and,

as a result, have limited the interpretation of their studies.

The TLI has been used in countries such as the USA, Mexico, People's Republic of China, Greece, Korea, Hong Kong, the UK, Taiwan, and Pakistan. It was also used in different contexts such as by firemen, sales force, bank teams, manufacturing companies and universities. A relevant observation with respect to both the MLQ and the TLI is that they do not directly address charisma as an important assessment of transformational leadership. Nevertheless, both approaches take into account the charismatic conceptualization in their development. Interestingly, early on in the evolution of transformational leadership, there was a tendency among researchers to use charisma as a synonym of transformational leadership. In the original conceptualization by Bass (1985), charisma was included as a component, along with vision, respect for the leader and inspiration and encouragement within the factor labelled charismatic leader behaviour. Through the refinement of the MLQ, this component was transformed into inspirational influence.

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH FINDINGS

The transformational leadership construct has been applied in studies across many fields and contexts, yielding theoretically expected results but nevertheless sometimes revealing comparative differences due to specific contextual or cultural features. Some recent representative empirical studies are discussed below, according to some of these specific themes or contexts.

CEO studies

Theoretically, it is expected that chief executive officers (CEOs) and top-level executives would be more able to exhibit transformational leadership behaviors than middle-level managers because, among other functions, they establish the vision of their organization, they hold the premier leadership role in the organization and they have a higher degree of autonomy. For example, Jung, Wu and Chow (2008) focused on a sample of 50 Taiwanese companies from the electronics and telecommunications industry. In this study, they wanted to understand how the CEO's transformational leadership impacted the level of innovation at the organizational level. Their results indicated a direct and positive effect of CEO transformational leadership on organizational innovation. Another study looked at the influence of the CEO on

shared perceptions about organizational outcomes with the top management teams of credit unions (Colbert, Kristof-Brown, Bradley & Barrick, 2008). A visionary transformational leadership communicates the organization's important goals to the top team. The study found that the degree of transformational leadership exhibited by CEOs was positively related to higher goal importance congruence with their vice-presidents. At the organizational level, within-team goal importance congruence mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and performance.

Another recent study by Pastor and Mayo (2008) looked at the influence of the CEO's managerial values on goal orientation. Their study indicates that the level of formal education is reflected in the managerial values exhibited. Those CEOs with graduate degrees tended to value a learning goal orientation more than those with no graduate degree, who tended to favour a goal performance orientation. At the same time, those with graduate-level education tended to be more transformational and more closely associated with McGregor's Y philosophy of management in contrast with the more transactional approach of CEOs who had no graduate education. This study's inclusion of the educational variable adds a very important and novel approach to the understanding of transformational leadership and its relationship with education. In their study, Zhu, Chew and Spangler (2005) also established the positive influence that the transformational leadership of CEOs had on strategic initiatives related to Human Resources Management (HRM). Their study found that transformational CEOs were more likely to adopt a human-capital-enhancing HRM than nontransformational CEOs. Furthermore, human-capital-enhancing HRM mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational outcomes such as absenteeism and perceived organizational outcomes.

Middle-manager studies

Many empirical studies have found that transformational leadership is equally applicable and relevant to middle-level managers as well as to top-level management. For example, Singh and Krishnan (2008) explored the mediating role of altruism in the relationship between self-sacrifice and transformational leadership in India. They also looked at the effect of all three on followers' collective identity and perceptions of unit performance. The MLQ Form 5X developed by Bass and Avolio (1995) was used for measuring transformational leadership. The results provided evidence of altruism mediating the relationship

between self-sacrifice and transformational leadership. Transformational leadership was positively related to followers' collective identity and perceived unit performance. They also found that, when leaders model the importance of cooperative behaviors over personal interests, they are more likely to be seen as being more transformational. Finally, the study also demonstrated that under transformational leadership, there is followers' perception of successful unit performance.

The military context

A study conducted on a Navy facility by Eid, Johnsen, Bartone and Nissestad (2008) evaluated the role of personal hardiness in facilitating change or growth in transformational leadership on a leadership training activity. The cadets underwent a stressful military training exercise, and the authors found a significant increase in transformational and transactional leadership styles after the exercises. Moreover, the transformational leadership style was not only maintained, but actually increased six months after the exercise.

Another military study conducted by Mannheim and Halamish's (2008) was performed to determine whether or not the effect of leadership style of trainers is universal across teams from varied backgrounds. Their findings did not support the universal relationship that was predicted according to transformational leadership theory. Data were collected from 890 cadets in the basic, operations and support, and infantry tracks in an officers' training school of the Israeli Defense Force. They were organized into 66 teams. Mannheim and Halamish's main finding is the importance of specification of leadership relationships to team outcomes for a particular track. The predicted relationships of leadership style with team outcomes were found mainly in the basic track. In this track, the transformational leadership style impacted the group outcomes of learning culture and group cohesion.

Cross-cultural contexts

There has been a substantial amount of empirical work put into measuring the prevalence and effectiveness of transformational leadership in different national cultural contexts throughout the world. The most important and extensive study of this type to date is the GLOBE research programme which was originated by Robert House but conducted by hundreds of researchers from over 60 nations (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla & Associates, 1999). This impressive study is dis-

cussed in more detail in the chapter on cross-cultural leadership (Guthey & Jackson, Chapter 12, this volume). The GLOBE study has found that specific aspects of transformational leadership are universally endorsed across cultures around the world. However, a more recent set of studies support the notion that cultural features influence how this approach applies from country to country: for example, how it is perceived (Spreitzer, Perttula, & Xin, 2005). Depending on the culture, the transformational leadership relationship will be stronger within less traditionally entrenched cultures, such as in the USA, whereas it would be perceived as being weaker in countries with a traditional culture, such as Taiwan, where respect for hierarchy is important. How strong the effect of transformational leadership is displayed differs according to the culture, although it has a positive impact in most of them. Accordingly, transformational leadership was related to superior team performance mediated by team potency in Hong Kong and US bank teams. The effect of transformational leadership on team potency was stronger among teams with higher power distance as well as with higher collectivism (Schaubroeck, Lam & Cha, 2007). Furthermore, in Jung, Yammarino and Lee (2009), a collectivistic culture was found to enhance the transformational leadership effect, which seemed to facilitate the follower's motivation to go beyond self-interest. It seems more likely to motivate followers to work for transcendental goals instead of immediate self-interests in collectivistic cultures such as Korea than in more individualistic ones such as the USA. This result was presented regardless of the follower's attitude (e.g. trust in leader, loyalty, value congruence) towards their leaders. Another comparative study that looked at the influence of culture between countries (Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen Lowe, 2009) extended the work of Podsakoff et al. (1990) whose work was one of the first to test the central effect of transformational leadership on followers to 'perform beyond the level of expectations' (Bass, 1985), by measuring follower's organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs). OCBs are defined as being extra-role behaviours: i.e. are behaviours over and above what are formally defined or informally expected. Kirkman et al. (2009) extended this research to the People's Republic of China and confirmed an indirect relationship existed between transformational leadership and OCB through procedural justice using Podsakoff et al.'s TLI measure of transformational leadership. One exciting finding is that the results did not differ between the US and PRCs samples. In addition, power distance is a cultural value that moderates the follower's reaction to transformational leadership.

A study with a focus on the educational context applied Kouzes and Posner's transformational

leadership model (Abu-Tineh & Al-Omari, 2008). This study examined the degree to which transformational leadership is being practiced by Jordanian school principals. They found that although the non-Western countries try to get the knowledge and technology of the West, they want to preserve their own cultural identities. Thus, they point to a significant gap in understanding the influence of society and context on educational leadership, and affirm that the studies on transformational leadership have paid little attention to this contextual consideration.

One study that makes us aware that social phenomena are more complex than usually considered is the one developed by Osborn and Marion (2009). Overall, most of these types of study indicate that culture matters, but sometimes it might not be the most salient factor affecting a leadership relationship. For instance, in spite of expected cultural differences between Japan and the USA, Osborn and Marion (2009) did not find any important effects. Their study of alliances in research-intensive sectors might suggest that other contextual dimensions such as knowledge and information base might have a stronger effect than cultural factors. Looking at three aspects of leadership performance – (a) alliance innovation and (b) strategic contributions to US sponsor company and (c) Japanese sponsor company – their study suggests that international alliances are multifaceted. They found that higher transformational leadership for sponsoring executives was positively linked to the alliance's strategic contribution to their respective firms. However, transformational leadership was a negative predictor of innovation performance. This study indicates that the relationship of leadership and performance is influenced by the type of governance structures (e.g. technical agreements vs joint venture and long-term supply contracts). Osborn and Marion conclude

We argue that leadership investigations should be based on a larger theoretical framework where context is important. The bulk of explained variance in our study was attributable to context and contextual leadership factors. Effective leadership particularly for innovation was embedded in its context. (2009, p. 205)

A couple of recent studies have apparently found only limited effects of culture upon the impact of transformational leadership. This is in line with the arguments put forward by Den Hartog et al. (1999) about the universality of the construct. Both studies (one in Mexico, the other in Greece) used the TLI measurement instrument developed by Podsakoff et al. (1990). The first study found that transformational leadership's communication interaction with followers helped to reduce stress

factors (such as role conflict and role ambiguity) (Díaz-Sáenz, Gomez Holguín & De la Garza García, 2008). Transformational leadership is the most preferred communication source over others such as peers and family and friends to mitigate stress factors by sharing positive information about work, negative information about work and information not related to work. When leaders exhibited low levels of transformational leadership behaviours, followers tended to communicate less with their leader and more with their peers, and with family and friends. The second study, developed in the Greek culture (Panagopoulos & Dimitriadis, 2009), also reported a good fit for the data collected using the TLI, which was developed in another cultural context. Their study found that transformational leadership mediates the relationship between behaviour-based control and key salesperson outcomes such as job performance, satisfaction and commitment (Panagopoulos & Dimitriadis, 2009).

Virtual teams

The emergence of virtual teams and their increasing adoption in organizations has attracted the attention of researchers to this type of work environment. The experiment is the methodological approach most favoured for this type of research. For example, a study developed in a laboratory setting by Wang and Xi (2007) found that transformational leadership has a significant effect upon team performance. This might not be a surprising finding; however, their study identified that, under the conditions of a virtual context, trust in the leader partially mediates this relationship. On the other hand, transactional leadership was found to have no effect upon performance. This latter finding suggests that rewards might not actually be as effective in a virtual environment as they are in a traditional setting.

Another experiment sought to understand the effects of transformational and transactional leadership styles and communication media upon team interaction and its outcomes (Hambley, O'Neill & Kline, 2007). This study found that leadership and transactional leadership are equally effective for problem-solving tasks, in spite of the communication medium used for interaction in a short term (face-to-face, videoconferencing or chat). Hambley et al. (2007) suggested that virtual team leadership requires longer time to identify differences in the effectiveness of each leadership style and media use. It is important to take into account that this study assessed the interactions among team members who had not worked together before. An additional experiment compared the

leadership effectiveness of virtual (computer mediated) vs face-to-face teams, measuring only transformational behaviours (Purvanova & Bono, 2009). Leaders of virtual teams also led face-to-face teams, performing the same type of project for both teams. The findings of this experiment indicated that leaders changed their transformational behaviour depending on the type of team they were leading. Furthermore, 'transformational leadership behaviours were more strongly linked to performance in virtual than face-to-face teams' (2009, p. 352). An additional experiment focused on personality factors as predictors of transformational leadership and specifically to virtual teams by comparing virtual with face-to-face teams (Balthazard, Waldman, & Warren, 2009). In here, personality is not manifested more in face-to-face than in virtual contexts, where the first context has more information cues in the communication interaction (both oral and non-verbal). Thus, no links between personality traits and transformational leadership were found as they occurred in face-to-face settings. The findings of this study also suggest that written communication may influence perceptions of transformational leadership. As Balthazard et al. explained, 'The extent of participation and grammatical complexity, or the intricacy of embedded grammatical structures in written sentences, were the best predictors of transformational leadership in their VTs' (2009, p. 661).

Personality and transformational leadership

A considerable amount of research has been put into understanding the relationship between personality and transformational leadership. One exemplary study sought to understand the influence of followers' personalities on the transformational assessment of their leaders (Hautala, 2005). This study found a positive relationship between followers who had either an extraverted or feeling personality inclination and their assessment of transformational leadership compared to those followers who were more introverted and stronger thinking inclination. A follow-up study (Hautala, 2006) similarly found that the personality of leaders influenced the degree of their self-assessment of their transformational leadership. Extroverted individuals saw themselves as being more transformational than introverted ones. Additionally, the leaders' personality traits differed with the personality traits that followers linked to transformational behaviours: i.e. 'leader's self-ratings indicated that perceiving, extraversion and intuition were most transformational. Subordinates' appraisals indicated that the most transformational

leaders were sensing leaders' (Hautala, 2006, p. 789). Understanding the links between emotional intelligence, personality and transformational behaviour was the focus of the study by Rubin, Munz and Bommer (2005). Their study found a positive relationship between personality traits and emotional recognition and transformational leadership behaviours. In addition to the study of personality and virtual teams, as reviewed in last section, Brown and Reilly (2009) studied the possible relationship between elements of personality as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and transformational leadership as measured by the MLQ. They found no relationship between MBTI and the followers' assessment of leaders' transformational behaviour.

Emotional intelligence

The linkage between emotional intelligence and transformational behaviour is another avenue of inquiry that has attracted growing interest by leadership researchers. For example, Barling, Slater and Kelloway (2000) discovered a positive relationship existed between followers' perception of their leader's transformational behaviours and their emotional intelligence. However, only three transformational behaviours (i.e. idealized influence, inspirational motivation and individualized consideration) and contingent reward were significantly associated with the level of emotional intelligence of the leader. By way of contrast, Brown, Bryant and Reilly (2006) found there was no relationship between the emotional intelligence of the leader and either the levels of perceived transformational leadership or desired outcomes. This finding is intriguing given the prior support for this relationship. More research is needed to understand better these possible relationships. Perhaps the inconsistencies might have arisen as a result of the deficiencies or limitations in the instruments used to assess the constructs, as Küpers and Weibler (2006) found in their analysis of the emotional quality of the MLQ. They propose that emotions and emotional competencies be considered for the transformational leadership instrument. Finally, Barbutto and Burbach (2006) identified a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. Their findings were consistent with Barling et al. (2000), except for the direction of the relationship with the idealized influence dimension of rater reports. As they explain:

In all cases, we found stronger correlations between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership in leader self-reports than in rater reports.

This finding is likely best explained by common method bias, because leaders completed both the emotional intelligence questionnaire and the self-report version of the multi-factor leadership questionnaire. According to the emotional intelligence subscales, empathetic response is the most consistent antecedent of transformational leadership behaviors. The findings across methods indicate a modest relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. (2006, p. 60)

In the face of divergent findings, it is clear that further research is needed to understand these relationships. Most specifically, consistency in construct definition and the use of assessment instruments is needed to measure emotional intelligence.

META-ANALYTIC STUDIES

An important and growing body of research that is helping us to better understand the advances in the transformational leadership construct are meta-analytic studies. In this review we look at the latest studies, since some earlier ones are also included in the ones presented here. Even though the MLQ is not the only scaled developed to study transformational leadership, we only found meta-analytic reviews that considered this type of assessment (Bono & Judge, 2004; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & Engen, 2003; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe et al., 1996). A word of caution is, therefore, warranted while looking at the conclusions of these studies because having only MLQ assessments is in itself a limitation that prevents us from making generalizations beyond the items included in this scale (Lowe et al., 1996). We look at these studies in chronological order to get a sense of the advances achieved by scholars that have pursued empirical research in this area.

First of all, Lowe et al. (1996) analysed the research that links transformational and transactional leadership to leader effectiveness. They found transformational leadership to be associated with higher levels of efficiency in public and private organizations, as well as with leaders at lower and higher levels, regardless of the criterion variable used to assess efficiency (e.g. either follower perception or organizational indicators). With respect to levels, the findings confirmed that transformational patterns of behaviour are not exclusive to leaders at the top level of the organization. Their study also indicated a mono-method bias in measuring leadership effectiveness tends to inflate the effect size. On the other hand, using organizational measures could attenuate those effects because that type of variable does not characterize

indicators that reflect the leader–follower relationship. Their concluding position on this issue is that a ‘true relationship lies between that indicated by the study results for subordinate perceptions and that for organizational measures’ (1996, p. 419).

A more recent multi-analytic study looked at behavioural differences between male and female leaders (Eagly et al., 2003). Based on social role theory, the authors expected that male and female leaders would exhibit different leadership behaviours. Accordingly, this study found support for that expectation, although these differences were quite small. The review revealed that, in general, women tended to be more transformational in leadership than the men included in the studies. What was particularly interesting in this study is that those dimensions that were inclined to predict leadership effectiveness were generally more pronounced in women than in men. Furthermore, transactional leadership behaviours that rewarded good performance were more generally engaged in by women than by men. Even though differences were small, the support for social role theory brings important implications regarding the relationship between leadership and gender roles.

In a meta-analytical study that seems to revive the old argument of leaders being born or developed, Bono and Judge (2004) found that, overall, there were only small correlation effects between the Big Five personality traits and the transformational and transactional dimensions. They concluded that ‘our results suggest that continued use of the Big Five traits may not be fruitful in revealing the dispositional bases of transformational and transactional leadership’ (2004, p. 907). Nevertheless, their study indicated a strong relationship between extroversion and transformational leadership behaviour. Thus, Bono and Judge suggest that future research should focus more on the role of extraversion in influencing leadership behaviours. Furthermore, they invited researchers to develop research that will allow the understanding of the way in which leadership behaviours are developed. In particular, they pointed to leadership training as an important line for future research, as they discovered a number of studies in their review that provided evidence supporting the notion that transformational leadership behaviour can, in fact, be learned.

Finally, another meta-analytical study tested and found strong support for the validity of the transformational and transactional leadership (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Most importantly, the authors observed a high correlation between these two theoretically distinct, although related, dimensions. Consequently, Judge and Piccolo (2004) called for a deeper understanding of the relationship between the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership dimensions.

In addition, to a lesser extent, this study also found support for the validity of laissez-fair leadership. This study claimed to test the full range of transformational leadership. Nevertheless, it is important to note that all transformational dimensions were combined and treated as one, based on previous reports of high correlations among them (see Howell & Hall-Merenda, 1999; Judge & Bono, 2000). Thus, this study does not address whether or not there are different effects among the theoretical dimensions. Furthermore, this study acknowledged an earlier debate regarding the extent to which charismatic and transformational leadership are conceptually different. Bass claimed that charismatic leadership was only one part of transformational leadership (see Bass & Riggio, 2006). Nevertheless, Judge and Piccolo (2004) tested these two leadership elements and found similar validities for transformational and charismatic leadership, which suggests that they are very similar concepts. On the positive side of the ledger, this meta-analytic study noted that, in general, from the mid-1990s onwards the transformational leadership studies had become increasingly rigorous and more generalizable.

It is important to note that none of the meta-analytical studies found for this review took into consideration studies that applied transformational leadership assessment instruments other than Bass's MLQ. Whereas there are methodological justifications for not mixing studies applying different assessments, it seems amiss that no meta-analytical studies have considered the substantial body of empirical studies that have investigated transformational leadership using other instruments.

LIMITATIONS AND CRITICISMS OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Most of the empirical research has supported the notion that transformational leadership has a favourable influence upon follower's performance, often arguing strongly in favour of the practice and development of transformational leadership behaviours. Nevertheless, as with any theoretical concepts, weaknesses and limitations have been observed by several scholars regarding transformational leadership theory (e.g. Beyer, 1999; Northouse, 2007; Tejada, Scandura, & Pillai, 2001; Tracey & Hinkin, 1998; Yukl, 1999).

Probably one of the weaknesses most frequently noted is the tendency among transformational leadership researchers to idealize the transformational leadership approach to the extent that too much credit is given to the leader, whereas others

factors that lead to individual, group or organizational development are ignored. One of these elements would be the effects of the followers' contribution to the interaction with their leader and situational or process factors underlying foundations or transformational effects.

Another criticism that needs to be addressed within the scientific community as a whole is the tendency to limit one's vision and not to properly acknowledge the full body of research when doing research. It is readily apparent from this review that the efforts made by researchers interested in the transformational leadership construct have been dissipated because of fragmented energy. Researchers tend to favour the exclusive use of either MLQ (developed by Bass), the measures developed by Podsakoff and colleagues or Kouzes and Posner and ignore the studies that have used other instruments. Although it may well be justified to use one measure over another for a specific study, it does not make sense if we are genuinely interested in making progress in our understanding of transformational leadership to ignore the findings that have been yielded by studies using different instruments. We should not limit our view to one approach, as if we were faithful disciples of one researcher and not interested in the contribution of another. A decade ago, Hunt (1999) suggested that transformational leadership theory was at the stage of 'concept evaluation/augmentation', which was consistent with the problematic findings associated with the operationalization of the MLQ at that time. It would seem then that transformational leadership has not yet reached the next desired stage of 'consolidation/accommodation', which would reflect its maturity in construct development.

Another limitation that still remains from the time of Hunt's review revolves around the problems of supporting the four transformational factors of the MLQ Form 5X. Tracey and Hinkin (1998) reported a high correlation among its scales and, instead of four factors, found support for one factor only (Tracey & Hinkin, 1998). This high level of intercorrelation among the subscales in Form 5X was later confirmed by Tejada et al. (2001), calling for a refinement of the MLQ. Their study proposed a reduced 27-item set of transformational and transactional scales cross-validated in independent samples. The refinement of this instrument offers the advantage of having a smaller survey, which is consistent with the multifactor leadership instrument, which supports its predictive validity.

Another limitation also mentioned by Hunt (1999) that still remains today is the fact that research has been done using mostly surveys, relying heavily upon MLQ (see Bryman, Chapter 2, this volume). The only exception found for this

review was the use of the Podsakoff's et al. (1990) leadership instrument. Nevertheless, even though their paper is widely cited (506 times), their instrument is still not as widely used as the MLQ. Building on the criticism of an overreliance upon one methodological method, Beyer (1999) contended that transformational leadership research sorely lacks studies that draw upon qualitative data. In particular, the relationship between leaders and followers is ripe for qualitative analysis.

There are still a lot of different levels of analysis or a combination of them that is still unexplored. For instance, there might be some instances in which transformational leadership influences the context, some others in which the context limits or facilitates the emergence of transformational leadership. For instance, Yukl (1999) observes that several theorists argue that some conditions, such as unstable environments and organic structure (among others), may increase the effect of transformational leadership on followers, yet only a few studies have looked into these factors. Furthermore, there might be an interaction of leadership and contextual factors that accounts for what is happening in organizational settings. Following this line of thought, Beyer (1999) suggested looking at the content of the leader's acts to deliver his or her vision and whether followers are convinced individually or collectively.

In her criticisms, Beyer (1999) adds that researchers use only the psychological approach, ignoring the sociological one that was most notably championed by Weber. For the same reason, she claimed that researchers neglect the insights and definition of charismatic leadership offered already by Weber which could complement transformational leadership theory. Consistent with this view Yukl (1999) added that there is a misconception regarding charisma that has been fostered by too many definitions argued by theorists. With respect to these issues of charismatic leadership, researchers should look at the debate that took place between Beyer, Bass and others in Volume 10, Issues 2 and 4 of *The Leadership Quarterly* in 1999. Both Beyer and Yukl claimed that researchers have departed from Weber's definition of charismatic leadership, which sociologists see 'as an unusual form of normative social structure that emerges in times of crisis' (Beyer, 1999, p. 310). Yukl also stated that there are theoretical inconsistencies among several theoretical explanations of charismatic as well as transformational terms in ways that have overlapped too much. He proposed that both types of leadership cannot happen at the same time, concluding:

A transformational leader seems more likely to take actions that will empower followers and

make them partners in a quest to achieve important objectives. A charismatic leader seems more likely to emphasize the need for radical change that can only be accomplished if followers put their trust in the leader's unique expertise. Incompatible aspects of the core behaviors for transformational and charismatic leadership may make it rare for both types of leadership to occur at the same time. (Yukl, 1999, p. 301)

In the end, Beyer's (1999) demand for a clear definition of transformational leadership apart from charismatic leadership seems reasonable because today there is ambiguity in how they are defined. Bass' response to Beyer did not state clearly whether or not there is a difference between transformational and charismatic leadership or how Weber's charismatic leadership definition had been tamed in favour of a more integrative view within transformational leadership.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

In 1999 Jerry Hunt stated that the field of leadership was in stage 2 and, even though he referred to the field of leadership in the context of the 'New' or transformational leadership discussion, today, it seems that the field is still in stage 2, in spite of the growing body of research. Transformational leadership has progressed over the years. Nevertheless, it seems that the efforts are fragmented into diverse isolated group of researchers who sometimes seem to ignore each other. Thus, future research needs to take a more integrative theoretical view. In fairness, Hunt also acknowledged that the field was moving forward and what was happening was exciting. Nevertheless, as an outsider of this then called 'New Paradigm', Beyer (1999) considered that Hunt was being too optimistic. She saw that the approach to transformational leadership was too narrow, thanks to the predominant psychological and quantitative methodology. Beyer felt that future transformational leadership research should take into account consideration of the measurement of different levels of analysis within organizations and the incorporation of more sociological perspectives. Disappointingly, Beyer's call has not apparently been heeded so that, 10 years on, there is still a marked tendency to recycle the same methodological approach over and over again in the study of transformational leadership. There is no shortage of interesting avenues of inquiry, however. For instance Pastor and Mayo (2008) have suggested that we should investigate the use of neural networks to map the links between specific beliefs and transformational behaviours more precisely. They further explain: 'an interesting line for

future research would be to study how the top management team functions as a collective mind' (2008, p. 353). Finally, future research should look for instances in which leadership has an influence upon the context as well as vice versa. For example, Osborn and Marion suggest 'echoing Hunt (1991) it is important in future research to recognize that leaders in different echelons may well be in different contexts where different casual mechanisms are important' (2009, p. 204).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to acknowledge Patricia D. Witherspoon, 'a truly transformational leader', for introducing him to the field of leadership.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Tineh, A. M. & Al-Omari, A. A. (2008). Kouzes and Posner's transformational leadership model in practice: the case of Jordanian schools. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(8), 648–660.
- Balthazard, P. A., Waldman, D. A. & Warren, J. E. (2009). Predictors of the emergence of transformational leadership in virtual decision teams. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(5), 651–663.
- Barbuto Jr, J. E. & Burbach, M. E. (2006). The emotional intelligence of transformational leaders: a field study of elected officials. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(1), 51–64.
- Barling, J., Slater, F. & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: an exploratory study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21(3), 157–161.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*, 1st edn. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M. & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*, 2nd edn. Mahwan, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bennis, W. G. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: the strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Beyer, J. M. (1999). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 307–330.
- Bono, J. E. & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 901–910.
- Brown, F. W., Bryant, S. E. & Reilly, M. D. (2006). Does emotional intelligence – as measured by the EQI – influence transformational leadership and/or desirable outcomes? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(5), 330–351.
- Brown, F. W. & Reilly, M. D. (2009). The Myers–Briggs type indicator and transformational leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(10), 916–932.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Colbert, A. E., Kristof-Brown, A. L., Bradley, B. H. & Barrick, M. R. (2008). CEO transformational leadership: the role of goal importance congruence in top management teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(1), 81–96.
- Conger, J. (1999). Charismatic and transformational leadership in organizations: an insider's perspective on these developing streams of research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 145–179.
- Daft, R. L. & Lengel, R. H. (1998). *Fusion leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J. & Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A. (1999). Culture specific and cross culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 219–256.
- Díaz-Sáenz, H. R., Gomez Holguín, R. & de la Garza García, J. (2008). La relación entre comportamientos de liderazgo transformacional, contenidos de comunicación y factores de estrés en el trabajo. *Revista Investigación Administrativa*, 102, 7–21.
- Downton, J. V. (1973). *Rebel leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C. & Engen, M. L. v. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: a meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 569–591.
- Eid, J., Johnsen, B. H., Bartone, P. T. & Nissestad, O. A. (2008). Growing transformational leaders: exploring the role of personality hardiness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(1), 4–23.
- Hambley, L. A., O'Neill, T. A. & Kline, T. J. B. (2007). Virtual team leadership: the effects of leadership style and communication medium on team interaction styles and outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 103(1), 1–20.
- Hautala, T. (2005). The effects of subordinates' personality on appraisals of transformational leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11(4), 84.
- Hautala, T. M. (2006). The relationship between personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, 25(8), 777–794.
- Howell, J. M. & Hall-Merenda, K. E. (1999). The ties that bind: The impact of leader-member exchange, transformational leadership and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84: 680–694.
- Hunt, J. G. (1999). Transformational/charismatic leadership's transformation of the field: an historical essay. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 129–144.
- Judge, T. A. & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 751–765.
- Judge, T. A. & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768.

- Jung, D., Wu, A. & Chow, C. W. (2008). Towards understanding the direct and indirect effects of CEOs' transformational leadership on firm innovation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(5), 582–594.
- Jung, D., Yammarino, F. J. & Lee, J. K. (2009). Moderating role of subordinates' attitudes on transformational leadership and effectiveness: a multi-cultural and multi-level perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(4), 586–603.
- Kirkman, B., Chen, G., Farh, J.-L., Chen, Z. & Lowe, K. (2009). Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: a cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 744–764.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). *Force for change: how leadership differs from management*, The Free Press.
- Küpers, W. & Weibler, J. (2006). How emotional is transformational leadership really? Some suggestions for a necessary extension. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(5), 368–383.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G. & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385–425.
- Mannheim, B. & Halamish, H. (2008). Transformational leadership as related to team outcomes and contextual moderation. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(7), 617–630.
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Osborn, R. N. & Marion, R. (2009). Contextual leadership, transformational leadership and the performance of international innovation seeking alliances. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 191–206.
- Panagopoulos, N. & Dimitriadis, S. (2009) Transformational leadership as a mediator of the relationship between behavior-based control and salespeople's key outcomes. An initial investigation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 43(7/8), 1008–1031.
- Pastor, J. C. & Mayo, M. (2008). Transformational leadership among Spanish upper echelons: the role of managerial values and goal orientation. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(4), 340–358.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H. & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142.
- Purvanova, R. K. & Bono, J. E. (2009). Transformational leadership in context: face-to-face and virtual teams. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3), 343–357.
- Rubin, R. S., Munz, D. C. & Bommer, W. H. (2005). Leading from within: the effects of emotion recognition and personality on transformational leadership behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 845–858.
- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K. & Cha, S. E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1020–1030.
- Singh, N. & Krishnan, V. R. (2008). Self-sacrifice and transformational leadership: mediating role of altruism. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(3), 261–274.
- Spreitzer, G. M., Perttula, K.H. & Xin, K. (2005). Traditionality matters: an examination of the effectiveness of transformational leadership in the United States and Taiwan. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(3), 205–227.
- Tejada, M. J., Scandura, T. A. & Pillai, R. (2001). The MLQ revised psychometric properties and recommendations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 31–52.
- Tichy, N. & Devanna, M.A. (1986). *The transformational leader*. New York: Wiley.
- Tracey, J. B. & Hinkin, T. R. (1998). Transformational leadership or effective managerial practices? *Group & Organization Management*, 23(3), 220–236.
- Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Adding to contingent reward behaviour: the augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. *Group and Organization Studies*, 15(4): 381–394.
- Wang, L. & Xi, Y. (2007). Trust as a mediator of the effects of transformational leadership on performance in virtual teams. 2007 International Conference on Wireless Communications, Networking and Mobile Computing, WiCOM, 6045–6048.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285–305.
- Zalensk, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*, 55: 67–88.
- Zhu, W., Chew, I. K. H. & Spangler, W. D. (2005). CEO transformational leadership and organizational outcomes: the mediating role of human-capital-enhancing human resource management. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(1), 39–52.