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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Within the military and behavioral science, the concept of leadership has been examined for many years. Although there is no single, universally accepted definition of leadership, it has been suggested that a leader is one who is innovative while seeking to solve new problems, along with bringing something new and different to a group (Johnson, 2014). This would be considered a behavioral view of leadership, in that it describes the way a leader acts and exhibits these characteristics. Contrastingly, leadership has also been described as a trait that some people simply possess (McCleskey, 2014).

Within a behavioral perspective, several theories have been developed describing the various behaviors that leaders may exhibit or possess. According to Burns (1978) and later expanded upon by Bass (1985), leadership can be split into a dichotomy, consisting of transactional and transformational leadership styles. The former refers to those leaders who simply give orders, while the latter denotes those leaders who aid in the growth and development of their subordinates. More specifically, transformational leaders are those who utilize their charm and charisma in a way that convinces subordinates and other participants to put the needs of the organization or the whole above the needs of themselves. By doing this, the subordinate may experience an increase in level on Maslow’s hierarchy, moving from achieving more basic needs (such as physiological, safety, love and belonging, and esteem) to achieving increased levels of self-actualization and achievement (Bass, 2008; Maslow, 1954; McCleskey, 2014). The focus of a transformational leader is on the betterment and growth of his or her subordinates.
Contrastingly, transactional leaders are known as the givers, in the sense that they give the orders or the requests (Bleda, 1978). These leaders focus more on a symbiotic relationship where there is an exchange between the leader and the follower (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987), where the exchange is carried out by a given command and a result. It is symbiotic in the sense that the leader gets the task completed and the subordinate gains more experience, or simply just gains more respect from the leader. The focus of a transactional leader is more on the end result of the relationship. One organization where leadership is very valued is the US Army. These leaders are trained in their duties and basic leadership skills, but they are able to exhibit whatever style they choose. This makes these leaders very unique, and desirable to look at when examining leadership styles.

Military Structure and Leadership Dynamics

The military structure is based on a hierarchy, where subordinates respond to their respective superiors. This respect and distinction between the subordinate and superior can be seen with salutes, standing at the position of attention, and title usage (Halbe, 2011). Whether it be within the battalion, platoon, or squad, leaders command this respect and make themselves known as an authoritative and respected figure. All branches of the military have their own promotional structures, but this study will focus on the US Army and their leaders. The Army has unique training for those who desire to be leaders, such as Officer Candidacy School (OCS) and Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC). This training focuses on leadership development and how to properly and effectively lead subordinates to complete the mission. Within this ROTC structure, it has been found that military leaders, even those who do not possess a higher ranking, have
high levels of responsibility and authority and have a high level of accountability for the successes and failures of their subordinates (Hannah & Sowden, 2013).

Transformational Leadership

Leadership is imperative to the overall mission in the military, but it has also long remained ambiguous in the culture (Hutchison, 2013). For example, Wolters and colleagues (2014) interviewed past and current brigade commanders in order to find the most important competencies for leaders. These included developing a positive atmosphere within the formation, building teams, taking another person’s perspective, influencing outside the formation, the ability to thrive in change, and critical thinking. These would make the leader someone who is invested in his or her subordinates, which is more representative of the transformational style of leadership. Transformational leadership styles have been found to have a positive association with cognitive and affective processes of subordinates (Boies & Howell, 2009). This same study by Boies and Howell found that transformational leadership is also linked to follower agreement, which shows that these leaders try to build a collective identity within teams. In a study conducted with naval officer leadership, it was found that transformational leadership was one of the behaviors that had the strongest association with subordinate satisfaction (Deluga, 1991). Transformational leadership has been found to be more associated among higher ranking officers, as lower ranking officers are seen as more passive and less transformational (Kane & Tremble, 2000). These authors also found higher ranking transformational leaders to add a significant, unique addition to the potential for extra effort from subordinates, which was supported by another study done by Stadelmann (2010). Kane and Tremble (2000) also found that transformational leadership styles can
augment the decreases in job motivation and affective commitment that are caused by transactional leadership. Since transformational leadership has been shown to be effective in the military setting, it appears important to those within the military that these values be instilled in leaders as early as possible, in order to produce the most capable leaders. If these values are taught earlier on in training, it is very possible that lower ranking officers may also be seen as more transformational and have this significant, positive influence on the effort and satisfaction of their subordinates.

Transactional Leadership

It has also been found that transformational leadership styles relate more to the organizational structure of the military, but transactional leadership may also be effective, though not nearly as effective, due to the contingent rewards it brings about (e.g. promotions, promotion points and awards; Breevaart et. al, 2014; Di Schiena, Letens, Van Aken, & Farris, 2013). It was found that transactional leadership may also be associated with calculative commitment, although it did decrease job motivation and affective commitment (Kane & Tremble, 2000; Mawritz, Folger, & Latham, 2014). Because of the possible effectiveness of transactional leadership in the military, the need to train leaders correctly in order to prevent corruption is also very important. Jennings and Hannah (2011) determined that inadequate leadership can lead to adverse consequences to the military members and to those who depend on it. Studies conducted with organizations and the Canadian military found that when subordinates did not expect a transactional style but their leader exhibited one, the overall job satisfaction and attitude toward the supervisor both decreased (Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007; Ivey & Kline, 2010). With the nature of the job, the Army and its soldiers cannot afford to risk
decreased levels of workplace cohesion, as it could very well mean the difference between life and death. High levels of unit cohesion may also protect against PTSD in soldiers exposed to stressors (Dickstein et al., 2010); thus, finding ways to increase and maintain cohesion is very important. By increasing levels of cohesion within units, members may also become more satisfied with their leaders, fellow teammates, and overall experiences with the unit. This may ultimately lead to more efficient performance.

Program Satisfaction

Leadership styles have also been found to influence job and program satisfaction of subordinates. Kruglanski, Pierro, and Higgins (2007) found that the highest levels of workplace satisfaction results when leaders’ styles match those preferred by the subordinates and those required by the objective. Thus, it appears leaders may need to have a proper understanding of their subordinates and their groups in order to adopt a style that will bring about the most cohesion and satisfaction for optimal performance (Surujlal & Dhurup, 2012). Additionally, researchers have demonstrated that transformational and transactional leadership styles have a significant relationship with workplace satisfaction (Ali, Sidow, & Guleid, 2013).

The idea of increased levels of satisfaction leading to more ideal performance is an interesting one within military contexts, as soldiers are constantly training to be prepared for anything, so it could be found to be a key component in their trainings and preparations. Bleda (1978) found that overall satisfaction in the military was greatly related to leadership styles experienced. Further, it was found that those who experienced more “originator” leadership (leaders who formulated the ideas) rather than “giver” leadership (those who simply relayed the ideas and messages) experienced more
satisfaction. This idea is supported by other studies, where it has been found that transformational leadership is the most beneficial to increasing levels of job satisfaction among both enlisted soldiers and officers (Breevaart et. al, 2014; Ivey & Kline, 2010). This could suggest that by attempting to train future military leaders to be more innovative thinkers, job satisfaction could thereby increase greatly among the soldiers they will later lead.

When it comes to a university ROTC program, there is not a substantial amount of research examining program satisfaction among its members. It is known that the programs lead to increased self-motivation, leadership capabilities, and responsibility (Miller & Benton, 1992), but the research does not examine how satisfied the cadets are within their programs, specifically due to leadership styles. Card, Gross, Goodstadt, and Shanner (1975) examined members of ROTC and the Army to examine career commitment, and found that the strongest determinant of commitment among Army officers was job satisfaction. This suggests that improving program satisfaction before commissioning, at an ROTC level, could increase this commitment among cadets, which could carry over into their careers when they do commission. This is important for future Army leadership, as it could lead to improved job satisfaction among units and improved overall unit cohesion.

Due to this gap in ROTC related satisfaction and leadership research, the present study was a necessary first step in order to eventually determine how leadership training could be better provided to training cadets. Officers provide behavioral examples and serve as authoritative figures to their subordinates; thus, effective leadership styles are necessary in order to ensure subordinates are satisfied and attending to the task at hand.
Therefore, the purpose of the present study was twofold. The first purpose was to investigate the presence and prominence of transactional and transformational leadership styles among US Army ROTC cadets in authority positions. The second purpose was to see whether these leadership styles had a significant influence on the program satisfaction of US Army ROTC cadets who are not in leadership positions. It was hypothesized that MS level 4 (leaders) would self-report as having higher levels of transformational leadership than MS levels 1-3 (subordinates) will report them as having. Additionally, it was expected that higher levels of peer-rated transformational leadership would correlate with greater levels of program satisfaction among subordinate soldiers. Further, higher levels of peer-rated transactional leadership were expected to correlate with lower levels of program satisfaction among subordinate soldiers. Finally, it was hypothesized that both leadership styles (transformational and transactional) would significantly predict a significant proportion of the variance associated with program satisfaction.

CHAPTER 2

METHODS

Participants

The target population for this study included all cadets in ROTC programs in the United States. For the present study, the accessible population included ROTC cadets who attend universities in the southeastern region of the United States. From this accessible population, a sample size of $N=88$ was obtained. This sample was selected based on convenience, due to travel and time restrictions. Cadets were sorted into one of two groups: leaders and subordinates. Leaders were those who were at MS level 4 ($n=18$), which subordinates were MS levels 1 through 3 ($n=70$). A third of participants
were MS level 1, 26.1% of participants were MS level 2, and MS levels 3 and 4 had 20.5% of participants each. The year in program follows a similar decreasing pattern, with a little over a third of participants in their first year (38.6%), a little under a third in their second year (29.5%), 17% in year three, and 14.8% in year 4. A majority of cadets in this sample were not in National Guard at the time, but about a fifth of participants were (20.5%). Similar to this, a great majority of participants were not doing Green to Gold (93.2%), but a small percentage of cadets were (6.8%). Only 15.9% of cadets were classified as SMP cadets, with their identifying branches split between National Guard (11 participants) and Army Reserve (3 participants). Most participants identified as having either a 3-year scholarship (29.5%) or that they were currently working toward a scholarship (27.3%). The majority of cadets indicated that going Active Duty would be their desired route after graduation and commissioning (78.4%). Within this sample, participants ranged from age 18 to 35, with the majority of participants in the 19-22 age range. There was an uneven split of genders, with 73.9% of participants identifying as male and 26.1% identifying as female. 10.2% of participants classified themselves as being of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin, while 79.5% classified themselves as not being of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin. Some participants did not respond. The majority of participants classified themselves as being white (64.8%), with the next highest identification being black or African American (23.9%). The remaining percentage was made up of those who classified themselves as Asian or Pacific Islander or mixed with two or more races.
**Instrumentation**

**Demographics.** A demographic questionnaire asked participants to provide information regarding their age, year in the program, and rank within the program (see Appendix B). Questions asking whether or not the cadets were already in the National Guard, SMP cadets, or going through Green to Gold were included in the demographic questionnaire. The questionnaire also asked about their scholarship status within the program, including national four year scholarships, two or three year scholarships, or currently working towards being awarded a scholarship. Finally, participants were asked to provide information regarding their desired branch after commission and graduation (National Guard, Army Reserves, or Active Duty).

**Leadership style.** Leadership style was assessed using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5x Short) developed by Bass and Avolio (1985, 1995, 2004). This questionnaire measures transformational leadership based on idealized attributes, idealized behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualize consideration, as well as transactional leadership based on contingent reward and management-by-exception (active). Participants responded to 45 questions on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always). While the measure also assesses passive/avoidant leadership, that scale was not to be utilized for the present study. This measure includes a self and rater version, where the leaders used the self version to rate their own views of their leadership style and the subordinates used the rater version to rate their views of the leaders’ style. The Cronbach’s alpha collected from previous studies has been found to range between .78 and .94 (Alsayed, Motaghi, & Osman, 2012; Kanste, Miettunen, Kyngas, 2007; Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008).
**Program satisfaction.** The questionnaire used to measure program satisfaction was the ROTC Satisfaction Index. This is a modified version of the Job Satisfaction Index (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951). Based on a previous study that used this measure for research within the Navy (Feild & Ridenhour, 1975), the word “job” within the original survey was changed to “ROTC program” for the present study’s purpose. This is an 18-item survey, with answers based on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The original Job Satisfaction Index was found to have an odd-even product moment reliability coefficient of .77, then corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula to .87. (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951). The modified version used for this study had a Cronbach’s alpha of .70. According to Brayfield and Rothe (1951), the Job Satisfaction Index has concurrent validity, as it correlated with the Hoppock Job Satisfaction Blank with $r = .92$.

**Procedures**

After receiving IRB approval and prior to recruitment, researchers communicated with the Cadre overseeing the ROTC cadets in order to gain approval to recruit from the programs. These programs included ROTC programs located in a rural part of southeastern Georgia. All cadets received the same packet of questionnaires, including the MLQ 5x Short (rater or self), the ROTC Program Satisfaction Questionnaire, and a demographic questionnaire. The packets were counterbalanced in order to eliminate any effects the order of survey completion may have had on the answers given by the participants. For the MLQ 5x Short, those who were at MS level 4 received the packets with the self-rated version, while those who were MS levels 1-3 received packets with the rater version. Before surveys were given, researchers split participants into leader and
subordinate piles to prepare to hand out. Consent forms were also distributed at this time in order for them to sign and agree to participate, knowing that they may withdraw at any time and that their answers would remain anonymous. The consent forms also included that their participation was voluntary and their willingness to or to not participate would not affect them in any sort of way within the ROTC program. The survey packets were administered one morning after the cadets completed PT. Since PT is a required activity, this time was chosen to have the best likelihood of getting to all of the cadets. Surveys took approximately 10-15 minutes to complete, which was in line with times estimated by the original researchers and others who have used these surveys (Ashforth, 1994; Bass & Avolio, 1985; Brayfield & Rothe, 1951).

**Data Analyses**

SPSS Version 22.0 (IBM Corp., 2013) was used for all data analyses. A *p*-value of *p* ≤ 0.05 was used as the criterion for determining statistical significance for all analyses.

Hypothesis one predicted that leaders would self-report themselves with higher levels of transformational leadership than their subordinates will. Because of this, an independent *t*-test was run in order to compare the means of the leadership styles of both groups. This was to see if the self-rated scores were higher in transformational leadership or not.

Hypotheses two and three were run with their own Pearson *r* correlations. Both hypotheses consisted of continuous forms of data (hypothesis 2- transformational leadership and program satisfaction in a positive relationship; hypothesis 3- transactional leadership and program satisfaction in an inverse relationship).
Hypothesis four was tested using a stepwise multiple regression. The first part of this hypothesis was designed to see which of the independent variables (transactional and transformational leadership) generated significant models accounting for the most variance associated with program satisfaction. The second part of this hypothesis was to determine which predictor variable accounted for the most amount of variance associated with program satisfaction. This was determined by examining the $R^2$ value and the $\beta$ value for each variable.

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

Various Individual Differences Between Leaders and Subordinates

The military structure could be considered dynamic, with much potential for growth and moving up in rank and, because of this, gaining responsibility. Although both groups of soldiers (leaders and subordinates) are a part of the same Army and the same unit, there are some differences that separate the two that go beyond just those in leadership positions and those in subordinate positions. Some of the most prominent differences between the two groups have been found to be in personality, overall responsibility, and the type of conditioning and training that the groups have to go through. These are the factors that play a part in really distinguishing between the two groups, both in general and in daily operations.

**Personality.** Within the military, personality characteristics may influence what facilitates some individuals to be more suitable and successful in a leadership role than others. Common personality traits among leaders may play a significant role in this. Allen, Bynum, Oliver, Russell, Young, and Babin (2014) found that personality is a
predictor of leadership performance and even leadership potential. These researchers were also able to find that candidates in Officer Candidate School (OCS) had more leadership self-efficacy and motivation to lead, along with higher levels of implicit leadership (when relating to potential and performance). This finding alone shows that there are common traits among leaders that give them more of that potential and better performance than others who either may have attempted to gain leadership and failed or those who simply decided to not be in a leading position. It also shows that it may be possible to look at which candidates may have higher levels of leadership potential as natural personality traits when selecting who should move on and become an officer.

Scott and Bruce (1995) suggested that there are five different styles that leaders (in this case, officers) may exhibit when they are making decisions. These styles are: rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous, and they are not mutually exclusive. By finding these styles and laying them out, it gave a foundation to explore and see whether officers possessed more or less of a certain trait when compared to subordinates. It was found that leaders actually tended to be more spontaneous, and they were less rational, dependent, and avoidant than their team members. Also, these leaders had reported higher levels of natural decision making alongside lower levels of dependency on others, procrastination, and careful processing of decisions when compared to subordinates. This decisive and action-oriented leadership style is what the team members actually were seeking, so they stated being highly satisfied with these leaders. This goes back to the Allen and colleagues study (2014), because it shows the different personality traits in decision making that leaders have more prominently than their subordinates.
In addressing personality within the literature, it is also noteworthy to mention the Big Five personality traits, which is also known as the five factor model (FFM; Bass, 1990; Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). This model conceptualizes personality among five traits that each lies on its own continuum. These traits include openmindedness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. People who display openmindedness are typically nonconforming, imaginative, and have a high tolerance. The role of this trait in leadership (and military leadership) is still unclear, as only a few studies have found it to be a predictor of effective leadership (Johnson & Hill, 2009). Leaders who are high in conscientiousness are typically dependable and achievement oriented (Johnson & Hill, 2009). Several studies have looked at conscientiousness and its association with leadership, and have found it to be the most highly associated and the best predictor of effective leader performance (Bartone, Snook, & Tremble, 2002; Johnson & Hill, 2009; Taggar, Hackett, & Saha, 1999).

Extraverted leaders are those who have strong tendencies toward being social. Some studies in leadership, and specifically military leadership, have shown that a high rating in extraversion has a positive correlation and association with effective leadership (Tagger, Hacket, & Saha, 1999; Watson and Clark, 1997). Several studies have even found that a high extraversion score is predictive of effective leadership performance (Johnson & Hill, 2009; Judge & Bono, 2000; Judge & Colbert, 2002).

Leaders with high scores in agreeableness are typically caring and tolerant. They can sometimes even be seen as overly eager to have positive relationships with others. Although some studies have found that high levels of agreeableness are associated with
effective leadership (Bartone, Snook, & Tremble, 2002; Judge & Bono, 2000), its true association is inconclusive (Johnson & Hill, 2009).

The fifth trait in the Big Five is neuroticism. Those who display this trait are typically anxious, insecure, and even overall more negative. This makes subordinates less like to see them as leaders (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994; Johnson & Hill, 2009). In this case, leaders who score low in neuroticism (those who display confidence and positivity), are more associated with the emergence of leadership, with subordinates being more likely to see them as leaders (Johnson & Hill, 2009; Taggar, Hackett, & Saha, 1999). The variety of traits in personality make it hard to pinpoint exactly which ones make someone a leader, but these studies show that there are several common traits and behaviors that have been found to be more prominent among leaders than among subordinates.

**Responsibility.** The amount of responsibility may be the biggest distinguishing component of leaders and subordinates. Officers may be in one of several different roles, including either being located at the battalion or the brigade level. This has been found to make a difference in how the leader acts, as they are two different environments with two different levels of interaction with soldiers. When an officer first gets to a unit, he or she may be placed at the battalion level. This gives the officer much more of a chance to interact with the soldiers and have more of a direct leadership style, which would give the officer much more responsibility (Wolters et al., 2014). However, if the officer gets moved to the brigade level, he or she is much more distant from actual subordinate soldier interaction. This is more of an indirect leadership style, as the officer has to depend on subordinate commanders in order to make sure his or her vision and
commands properly get delivered to the other soldiers (Wolters et al., 2014). Although the officer is more indirectly leading, it is still a large amount of responsibility, as he or she has to make sure the directions are being clearly delivered on all levels, and he or she has many more subordinate soldiers to lead.

Leaders must be responsible for and have authority over their subordinates, have accountability when handing difficult missions, operate within a strong culture of tradition, operate in extreme environments under extreme circumstances, embrace selfless service and sacrifice, and must also embrace (and model) high levels of character (Hannah and Sowden, 2003; Paullin, Legree, Sinclair, Moriarty, Campbell, & Kilcullen; 2014). These are just a few of the responsibilities that officers have, one of the major ones being that they are responsible for the lives and wellbeing of their subordinate soldiers. This is an intense amount of stress, because while lower enlisted soldiers may be looking out for themselves and their peers, officers have an obligation to look out for these other soldiers. This relates back to having those personality factors of implicit leadership and motivation to lead, as they would not be able to do this without the proper motivation. Paullin and colleagues (2014) also found that leaders must be able to solve problems, exhibit sound judgement and make proper decisions for groups of people, influence and motivate others, have strong interpersonal skills in order to relate to others, be adaptable, maintain physical fitness and military knowledge, embrace and model Army values, and possess the relevant technical knowledge and skill set. All of this must also be done in the overall group’s best interest, so it is a lot of responsibility, especially for an officer who may have just reached their unit. Because of this, proper training is crucial.
**Training.** Officer candidates have to go through a different selection and training process than subordinates. While those who are enlisted and, therefore, not automatically in a leadership rank or role, go to Basic Combat Training to learn the necessary physical skills and then Advanced Individual Training to learn the specifics of their job, officer candidates go a different route. There are several ways to enter the officer realm, ranging from Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (ROTC), United States Military Academy, and Officer Candidate School (OCS). ROTC is typically a four-year program that cadets will go through and complete while they are also working on their degree. In this program, they will get in shape both physically and mentally, along with getting leadership training. This, along with the United States Military Academy, is the most in-depth program when wanting to become an officer, as it requires the participant to continue his or her education along with learning the structure of the military and how to be an effective leader. OCS is typically where things will get different, as it is for people who have already completed their degree and want to join in as an officer. This is a 12 week course, which has different academic, physical fitness, and overall leadership performance components. Candidates must complete this course and show signs of positive leadership in order to become officers (Allen et al., 2014).

Paullin and colleagues (2014) state that there are possible things one must be able to do in order to properly perform as a leader. This includes having declarative knowledge (knowing the history and knowing the facts), having procedural knowledge and skill (knowing how to implement the facts), and having motivation (motivation to lead, to succeed, etc.). Any effective questionnaires or interventions, according to Paullin and colleagues (2014), should be able to look at where a candidate stands in all three of these
areas in order to see the possible potential of effective leadership performance. Because of the need to do be able to have these abilities and know how to utilize them, officers need proper training and experiences to stretch their training. This way, they are truly gaining these competencies that they need in order to better guide their soldiers.

**Leadership in the Military**

Within the military, there have been many different leadership styles discussed. Lindsay, Day, and Halpin (2011) looked into the idea of shared leadership within the military. It’s distinguished as a form of leadership in teams where everyone is responsible for leadership and where leadership comes out as a result of interactions of the members. Every member of the team plays a role in influencing and leading the others to reach overall group goals. This type of leadership can be found anywhere in a group (among any member at any moment in time), can move in any direction (vertically or horizontally through the ranks), and can even change dynamically. The authors discuss examples of shared leadership currently in the military, such as in Air Force units and Army Special Forces units. The existence of these examples shows that shared leadership is currently present in the military (at least in certain situations), and it could be possible to expand the presence of this leadership. This type of leadership is said to be ideal because when one person is making the decisions and exerting all of the influence, the potential effectiveness of the group could reach its limits much more quickly than if there is shared leadership. However, the authors make sure to emphasize that this leadership may not be appropriate in all military contexts (Lindsay, Day, & Halpin, 2011), so a more dichotomous approach may be necessary.
Taking a more traditional approach and examining leadership when there are distinct leaders, as opposed to group leadership, there is the full range leadership model. Developed by Burns (1978), this model looks at transactional and transformational leadership. It views leaders as either depending on reinforcers between parties (a mutually beneficial relationship; transactional) or on the growth and development of the subordinates (transformational). Transactional behaviors are described as an exchange-based interaction and influence, where subordinates receive rewards from their leaders in exchange for effort; transformational behaviors are described as promoting subordinate admiration, respect, and trust of the leader, motivation and commitment to the shared group goals, innovation and creativity, and growth reflecting individual needs (Kane & Tremble, 2000). The full range model was expanded upon by Bass (1990) in order to include more passive/avoidant leadership styles. Although these types of leadership have been heavily researched in organizational workplaces (van Eeden, Cilliers, & van Deventer, 2008), they have also been discovered in military settings.

The presence of transformational leadership in a military setting is a very prominent one, and much research has focused on the effects of its presence. According to Kane and Tremble (2000), leaders having transformational behaviors add significant variance to predicting subordinate extra effort and relating to increased job motivation; they also found that transformational behaviors can influence other growth and development of subordinates. The development of subordinates can be seen in things such as cognitions, positive affect, and building a collective identity (Bois & Howell, 2009). Cheng, Yen, and Chen (2012) found that transformational leadership can have a positive influence on the job involvement of subordinates, which can be seen as
supporting the Kane and Tremble (2000) finding of subordinates putting in extra effort. In a study conducted by Bass, Avolio, Jung, and Berson (2003), it was found that having high levels of transformational leadership (along with transactional leadership) helped units to maintain high levels of performance. These authors found that differences in effects may also be due to where the transformational leadership is present, in that a sergeant’s transformational style was more indicative of unit performance than a platoon leader’s transformational style, which is due to the nature of these leaders’ relationships with the soldiers. Transformational leadership may also lead to group cohesion (Mannheim & Halamish, 2008), which may be an important factor in improving performance and satisfaction. Several studies have found that transformational leadership influences satisfaction, both job and overall (Chen, Hwang, & Liu, 2012; Ivey & Kline, 2010), which may be important when determining proper training for those in leadership positions.

On the other side of the leadership dichotomy, transactional leadership has also been found to be present in military settings. Bass, Avolio, Jung, and Berson (2003) have explained that using transactional leadership may be appropriate in the beginning, when trying to stabilize effective platoon performance. This is due to the rewarding nature of transactional leadership, which may provide clarity of expectations and structure, therefore possibly leading to more effective performance. Along these same lines, the authors also found that transactional leadership may help to establish base levels of trust in a leader by the subordinates. When a leader enters a transactional relationship and shows that he or she can fulfill the promises made in that relationship, subordinates are better able to trust the leader. Once this trust is established, it is possible that a leader may
then switch to a more transformational style of leadership, which may further group cohesion and identification (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003). Transactional leadership has also been found to be positively correlated with a subordinate’s satisfaction with his or her leader, though not as strongly as with transformational leadership (Deluga, 1991).

**Measurement of Leadership Style and Satisfaction**

When it comes to measurement, there are many different types of options available. For the purpose of this review, measurement options were looked at by previous use in military settings, so that they were at least relevant to the present study. With leadership being a main focal point in this research, it was important to determine an appropriate measurement tool to use. Previously, research has used the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (RSLQ; Lucke & Furtner, 2015) within military settings. This questionnaire, developed by Houghton and Neck (2002) was designed in order to measure self-leadership in a way that matches self-leadership theory. The questionnaire consists of 35 items, with questions on a 5-point scale that range from *not at all accurate* to *completely accurate* that measure three components of self-leadership (Unsworth & Mason, 2012). The internal reliability of the scale was found to be .89 (Unsworth & Mason, 2012). Another measurement of leadership, the Leader Knowledge Test (LKT) has also been done within military settings. Although it does not measure leadership style directly, it does measure the perceptions one has on the importance of different leader traits and skills. This plays a role in what is being looked at with satisfaction especially, because perception is everything when it comes to satisfaction with leaders. This tool
would be useful with looking at how subordinates perceived their leaders’ behaviors, and how that perception then influenced satisfaction. With this questionnaire, participants rate leader traits and skills on a scale of 1 (*not at all important*) to 10 (*extremely important*). The scoring is then compared to a “key” made by those captains who have been through a Captain’s Career Course (Allen et al., 2014; McDaniel, Psotka, and Legree, 2009; McDaniel, Psotka, Legree, Yost, and Weekly, 2011). The internal consistency measures for this scale are .77 (trait scale) and .58 (skills scale; Allen et al., 2014). Although these scales were used in military settings, one of the most commonly used leadership rating scale was the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1995). This scale is used in regular organizational settings also, so the finding of common usage in military settings made it seem appropriate. The MLQ has many subscales, and measures transactional, transformational, and passive/avoidant leadership styles. Since these leadership styles have been found to be very prominent ones in military settings, the MLQ has been deemed the most appropriate. The questionnaire has participants answer questions on a scale of 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*frequently, if not always*). This scale uses a self-version and a rater version, which is useful because it allows subordinates to voice their opinions in order to see any discrepancies in how the leaders view themselves and how they are perceived to their subordinates. This has been used in many studies with military participants (Craig, 2013; Reed & Bullis, 2009; Tremblay, 2010).

The final variable looked at in this study is satisfaction. This means ROTC program satisfaction, but began with a search into job satisfaction scales. The first scale to look at is the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ; Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). This questionnaire looks at extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction.
There are 20 items in the scale, split between measuring these two types of job
satisfactions. The reliability of this scale is .96, with test-retest reliabilities between .70
and .80 (Buitendach & Rothmann, 2009). When looking at surveys that were used
previously in military settings, the Spector (1994) Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) has been
used in studies similar to the current one. It is a 36-item scale that looks at employee
attitudes about the job being assessed and different aspects of the job (Craig, 2013). The
Job Satisfaction Index (JSI; Brayfield & Rothe, 1951) is another measure that has
effectively been used in military settings, more specifically in a Navy ROTC setting
(Feild & Ridenhour, 1975). This seems to give the measure that military experience that
is ideal to be used in the present study. This survey consists of 18 items that are on a
Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). For the original JSI,
the odd-even product moment reliability coefficient was found to be .77, but was then
corrected using the Spearman-Brown formula to .87 (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951). The JSI
has been found to have concurrent validity, due to its high correlation with the Hoppock
Job Satisfaction Blank ($r = .92$; Brayfield & Rothe, 1951).

Overall, there are many different measures that are possible to use in relation to
leadership, whether it be for someone to look at his or her own leadership style or for one
to rate another’s leadership style. These measures are all different, but these were found
to be the most prominent and widely used in military settings. The military is its own
population, and there have not been very many scales designed for specifically military
use when it comes to leadership or even ROTC program satisfaction. However, several
have been used and adjusted to fit this special population, and have shown themselves to
be reliable and valid in these settings.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

To begin data analysis, descriptive statistics were calculated for the demographic information that the participants provided. MS level were recoded in SPSS to allow for proper data analysis. Those in MS levels 1-3 were recoded into group 1 (subordinates), while those in MS level 4 were recoded into group 2 (leaders). All MLQ subscale scores were also put together, for both subordinates and leaders, again to allow for proper data analysis. Descriptive analyses were run in order to check for and examine any possible outliers. Box plots were looked at to identify any of these outliers. Skewness and kurtosis scores were also examined to check for normality. These scores were divided by the standard error in order to obtain $z$ scores. Idealized attributes had a skewness $z$ score of -2.879, idealized behaviors had a skewness $z$ score of -3.288, intellectual stimulation had a skewness $z$ score of -3.097, contingent rewards had a skewness $z$ score of -3.307, and individual consideration had a $z$ score of 3.433 for kurtosis and a score of -4.109 for skewness. These scores indicated that the data was not normally distributed for these subscales of the MLQ. Four participants were identified by SPSS as outliers, but they were still included in the data analyses as it was determined after reviewing each participant’s measures as their scores appeared to be appropriate within an ROTC program. Some participants had higher levels of program satisfaction than others or saw their leaders as more transformational or transactional than others, which could be typical of an ROTC program with many differing types of cadets.

For hypothesis one, an independent $t$-test was run into to compare the means of the MLQ subscale scores (see Table 1). Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances showed
homogeneity of variance for three of the MLQ subscales: idealized behavior, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation. Idealized attributes and individual considerations violated Levene’s. For those that did not violate Levene’s, equal variances were assumed. For the subscales that did violate Levene’s, idealized attributes and individual considerations, equal variances were not assumed. Some significance was found, with the intellectual stimulation and individual consideration subscales. For intellectual stimulation, there was a significant difference in the scores for leaders ($M=3.125$, $SD=.5303$) and subordinates ($M=2.714$, $SD=.7817$); $t(86)=-2.104$, $p=.038$, $d=-.453$. This indicates a small effect. For individual consideration, equal variances were not assumed. There was a significant difference in the scores for leaders ($M=3.069$, $SD=.4986$) and subordinates ($M=2.693$, $SD=.8380$); $t(44.842)=-2.441$, $p=.019$, $d=-.729$. This indicates a small to medium effect size.

For hypothesis two, a Pearson-$r$ correlation was run. This correlation examined the subscales from the MLQ that correspond with transformational leadership (idealized attributes, idealized behaviors, intellectual stimulation, individual considerations, and inspirational motivation) and examined how each of these correlated with the job satisfaction index total (see Table 2 for score distribution). This was run as a one-tailed test. One subscale, idealized attributes, demonstrated a significant correlation, Pearson’s $r(70)=.199$, $p=.049$. Although this was a weak correlation, it was in the positive direction, indicating a positive linear relationship. The $r$-values for the other subscales were $r(70)=.141$, $r(70)=.179$, $r(70)=.152$, and $r(70)=.071$, showing that the idealized attribute subscale had the strongest correlation of them all, although all were weak in nature. A Pearson-$r$ correlation was run for hypothesis three as well, using the
transactional subscales from the MLQ. This was also run as a one-tailed test. These subscales include contingent rewards and management by exception. Neither of these subscales were found to significantly correlate with the job satisfaction index total score, having r-values of .168 and .154, respectively.

A multiple regression was run for hypothesis four using all of the subscales from the MLQ, both transformational and transactional. Job satisfaction index total score was used as the criterion variable. The results of the analysis were not significant, indicating that none of the leadership subscales accounted for a significant amount of variance in program satisfaction. The $R^2$ was found to be .085, and the standardized $\beta$ values were .387, -.048, -.344, .020, -.008, .113, .115. These low $\beta$ values indicate little to no impact of the subscales on program satisfaction.

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The present study examined the influences that different leadership styles have on program satisfaction in a US Army ROTC setting. Although not all hypotheses were supported, the results still provide the field with valuable information.

For the first hypothesis, two subscales of transformational leadership did support the prediction that leaders would self-report themselves as being more transformational. Those who were MS level 4 rated themselves significantly higher on both intellectual stimulation and individual consideration. This suggested that the first hypothesis was partially supported, as the leaders rated themselves as more transformational on two of the transformational subscales. This information could be used in training these cadets in
these specific areas, so that once they become leaders, their subordinates will see them as being more transformational. This is important because much of the literature has found that transformational leadership leads to many benefits. Transformational leadership has a positive correlation with both cognitive and affective processes of subordinates (Boies & Howell, 2009), which can help subordinates feel more autonomous and feel as though they are actually learning and benefitting from their leader. ROTC programs could incorporate more training on how to intellectually challenge subordinate soldiers and how to be more aware of individual differences when leading a group, so that the subordinates will see the leaders as more transformational to make the most out of the benefits found in previous research. Current ROTC structure is reflective of the Army, where cadets and soldiers are told to become a unit and act as a group. This may lead to programs forgetting about the individual and allowing the individual to express creativity and his or her own soldiering style, so reinforcing these ideas of challenging the individuals and being aware of differences may counteract these effects.

The second hypothesis was also partially supported by the results of this study. It was expected that higher levels of peer-rated transformational leadership would correspond with higher levels of program satisfaction among subordinate cadets. According to the results, idealized attributes (a subscale of transformational leadership) significantly corresponded with higher job satisfaction index scores. This suggests that when subordinates rated their leaders as having higher levels of idealized attributes, it corresponded with higher levels of subordinate program satisfaction. Idealized attributes refers to the attributes of the leader that make others want to be closer to the leader, such as charisma and other similar attributes (Rowold, 2005). They are seen as desirable to
subordinates, which leads to more trust that subordinates may have for the leader. This is important for ROTC programs to be aware of as they can begin to gather information on what their cadets see as an “ideal leader,” and then train them from there to fit that mold. They can utilize more input from the subordinates to help them have the best, most effective ROTC experience possible. This result also supports the previous literature, as research has found that transformational leadership may correlate with higher levels of program satisfaction. When leaders are seen as more transformational, more of a collective identity can be formed in the group (Boies & Howell, 2009). This could possibly lead to more program satisfaction in the future, as the subordinates may feel more part of the group and satisfy their needs for belonging. This is important to foster in subordinates because it could lead to more effective team functioning, which is critical during certain missions that the cadets will have to go through once they are leading squads. It has also been found that transformational leadership can bring out more effort from subordinates (Kane & Tremble, 2000). If this extra effort is put in, then the team may work much more smoothly and efficiently, which may lead to more program satisfaction among subordinates.

Hypotheses three and four were not supported, as nothing was found to be significant in the data analyses. Hypothesis three predicted that higher levels of peer-rated transactional leadership would correspond with lower levels of subordinate program satisfaction. It is known from previous research that transactional leadership does have a place in the military, due to the rewards and promotion system (Di Schiena, Letens, Van Aken, & Farris, 2013). Since it has been found that transactional leadership fits in to the military environment, it makes sense that it may not have a significant negative effect on
program satisfaction. The cadets and soldiers are used to a system of rewards and doing things in exchange for rewards (such as accomplishing a specific task and receiving an award), so the contingent reward aspect of transactional leadership is inherently a part of the culture. The hierarchical model of the military (with its proper chain of command in place) may actually provide a framework for transactional leadership to be more effective than it otherwise would be. The subordinates already know that they are answering to the leaders, and they know that their performance will lead to either desirable or undesirable consequences. Transactional leadership may not stand out as having a negative effect on program satisfaction because the cadets are aware that it is part of the system, so they are used to it and do not see it as anything out of the ordinary.

Although there were only a few areas found to be statistically significant and providing support for the hypotheses, the findings of this study can benefit the training of current and future ROTC cadets. Current ROTC training includes many leadership courses, but they are designed to have the cadets put into leadership rules and test their abilities to lead. For example, Cadet Initial Entry Training (CIET) has cadets leading small groups, but the only feedback they receive is from mentors who have been through the process. Although this is very valuable feedback for them, more intentional training of learning leadership styles and how to implement them may be beneficial. Cadets also go to Cadet Leaders Course (CLC), which includes a tactical leader development (TLD). This puts cadets in leadership positions in tactical environments over seven days, but, similar to CIET, it is designed around working under pressure and being a leader in high pressure situations based on feedback from a mentor, without a lot of formal leadership style education and training. By enhancing training in ROTC programs to match the
various subscales that were found to be significant in the present sample, cadets could conceivably be trained to become better leaders, which might improve satisfaction among ROTC programs, possibly reducing the amount of dropout. If training were to possibly emphasize these areas a little more, leaders may have more of a positive influence on program and job satisfaction. When cadets are at home, they also attend a leadership lab weekly. This could be an appropriate place to incorporate education of leadership styles and how to best implement them as they prepare for training courses (like CIET and CLC) and as they prepare to enter a leadership position in their school’s battalion. A study by Bleda (1978) found that those who experienced leaders who were more transformational and originating actually experienced more satisfaction. This shows that cadets may be more satisfied when they experience transformational leadership. When soldiers are actually in these units, they need to be satisfied in order to do their jobs effectively and work cohesively with each other. By knowing and understanding which aspects of leadership have positive and negative effects on satisfaction and teaching these aspects more thoroughly, it is possible that overall subordinate satisfaction may be raised once the cadets learn these transformational ideas (such as idealized attributes) and apply them to the subordinates in their ROTC programs. They may be able to utilize this leadership style, and bring more of a positive influence into the experiences of the entire program. Other studies have also supported this idea, as they have found that experiencing transformational leadership is the most beneficial to increasing job satisfaction (Breevart et al., 2014; Ivey & Kline, 2010).

As with any study, there were certain limitations associated with this present research. One limitation is that there were certain travel and time restrictions, so the
accessible population was limited to the southeastern United States. The demographics in this area may be different than other areas (such as the northeast or the northwest), so this may have an effect on the generalizability of the study. The population was also a convenience sample, instead of random, which may affect the generalizability, again because of possible demographic differences among regions.

Certain delimitations also had to be set for this study. ROTC programs were selected instead of active duty units. Although the working, day-to-day structure of the program may resemble an active duty working environment, they are not actually experiencing the same unique pressures that active duty soldiers are. This study is also focused on only two types of leadership, transformational and transactional. These are the leadership styles that were found to be most common in research with military populations, so they were the only ones selected to examine.

Looking forward, there are future directions research can address in an attempt to benefit the training of ROTC cadets. These are the future leaders of the Army, so it is important to make sure they are trained properly so that they can do their jobs effectively. By understanding how their leadership styles may have an effect on the satisfaction of their subordinates, they may be able to make better decisions and lead in a way that may bring about more cohesion and better working environments. It may be beneficial to examine other leadership styles, as they may prove to have a more significant impact than the ones discussed in this study. Other studies may also consider grouping subordinates to their actual leaders in order to have more specific answers, instead of grouping simply by MS level. Having the subordinates identify their leaders so that they can be grouped together may bring about different results in analysis. It may also be beneficial to
consider other leadership styles, as transformational and transactional are not the only ones. This could provide more insight on what may actually be more effective styles of leadership in these military settings, which could lead to forming new training programs. Gender differences could also be considered in future studies, as the role of women in the military is currently changing. As stated in the methods, there was an uneven gender distribution with around 74% male and around 26% female. According to a 2014 demographic analysis conducted by Military One Source, the gender differences were fairly similar for active duty officers, with 83.3% male and 16.7% female. The ROTC program recruited from in this study actually had a higher percentage of women, which could be an indicator of the growth that the Army has seen in female soldiers in just the past two years. Women are now, for the first time ever, being allowed in combat arms positions in the Army. Women have become US Army Rangers and have entered Infantry units, so any differences between genders are very important. These differences can be examined with female soldiers in the leader or subordinate positions. Future research can examine the common leadership styles of female soldiers compared to those of male soldiers and see if there are any significant differences in how they choose to lead and assert themselves over subordinates. Research can also examine how these different leadership styles affect the program satisfaction of female soldiers when compared to male soldiers.
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APPENDIX A

ASSUMPTIONS, DELIMITATIONS, LIMITATIONS

Research Question

The purpose of the present study is twofold. The first purpose is to investigate the presence and prominence of transactional and transformational leadership styles among US Army ROTC cadets in authority positions. The second purpose is to see whether these leadership styles had a significant influence on the program satisfaction of US Army ROTC cadets who are not in leadership positions.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 - Leaders will self-report as having higher levels of transformational leadership than their subordinates will report.

Hypothesis 2 - Higher levels of peer-rated transformational leadership will correspond with greater levels of program satisfaction among subordinate soldiers.

Hypothesis 3 - Higher levels of peer-rated transactional leadership will correspond with lower levels of program satisfaction among subordinate soldiers.

Hypothesis 4 - Both leadership styles (transactional and transformational) will account for a significant proportion of the variance associated with program satisfaction.

Limitations

There are certain limitations associated with this study. One of the biggest ones is, due to travel abilities and inabilities, we were only able to use US Army ROTC programs in the southeastern United States. This may affect the generalizability of the results, due to the demographics of this area. Another possible limitation is that the sample that was
collected was not random. We used these specific ROTC programs at these specific locations and got as many cadets as possible to participate, so it seemed to be more a convenience sample than random. This could also have an effect on the generalizability of the results.

**Delimitations**

There are also certain delimitations associated with this study. These are ROTC programs, so they are not currently in an active duty environment, although they are placed in units that resemble these working environments. This study focuses only on transactional and transformational styles of leadership. This was to keep the scope from getting too broad, and was based on previous research done with military units that involved these leadership styles.

**Definitions**

- **Leader** - A cadet who is in a leadership position within his/her unit (squad leader, for example), typically a junior or a senior
- **Subordinate** - A cadet who is not in a leadership position within his/her unit, typically a freshman or a sophomore
- **Transformational leadership** - Consists of leaders who help to enhance subordinate feelings of overall cohesion, commitment, performance, and feelings of involvement; the leaders develop followers who have increased self-efficacy and who are more committed to the mission (Bass, 1985; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003)
- **Transactional leadership** - Consists of a style where rewards and recognition are provided to subordinates for successfully carrying out assignments; the leaders
provide the goals and objectives and provide recognition when goals are met, which should lead to subordinates reaching expected levels of performance (Bass, 1985; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003)

- Program satisfaction- Assumed that this could be inferred based on the individual’s attitude toward his or her work (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951); measure of the member’s satisfaction with the overall employing organization (Feild & Ridenhour, 1975)

**Assumptions**

All participants had knowledge that this was a voluntary study and the possibility to withdraw at any time was there, so it is assumed that all participants did this of their own free will and were not coerced in any way. It is also assumed that all participants answered surveys and questionnaires genuinely and to the best of their ability. They were reassured of the anonymity of their responses, so we assume they answered truthfully and honestly.
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions. For those with options provided, select the option that best answers the question according to your current standing.

Age: ____________

Gender:

Male   Female   Other (please specify): ____________

Race:

Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin   Not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin

Ethnicity:

White   Black or African American   American Indian

Asian/Pacific Islander   Mixed two or more   Other

MS Level:

1   2   3   4

Year in the program:

First   Second   Third   Fourth

Are you currently a part of the National Guard?

Yes   No

Are you currently in Green to Gold?

Yes   No

Are you an SMP cadet?

Yes   No

If so, in what branch?
National Guard       Army Reserve

Rank within the program: ________________

Scholarship status within the program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Four Year</th>
<th>Two Year</th>
<th>Three Year</th>
<th>Currently working towards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>being awarded a scholarship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Desired branch after commission and graduation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Guard</th>
<th>Army Reserves</th>
<th>Active Duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE 5X SHORT

MLQ  Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire™
Leader Form (5x-Short)

For use by Jillian Gonzalez only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on March 14, 2016

My Name: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Organization ID #: __________________Leader ID #: __________________

This questionnaire is to describe your leadership style as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits you. The word “others” may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.

Use the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts

2. I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate

3. I fail to interfere until problems become serious

4. I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards

5. I avoid getting involved when important issues arise

6. I talk about my most important values and beliefs

7. I am absent when needed

8. I seek differing perspectives when solving problems

9. I talk optimistically about the future

10. I instill pride in others for being associated with me

11. I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets

12. I wait for things to go wrong before taking action

13. I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished

14. I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose

15. I spend time teaching and coaching
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I show that I am a firm believer in “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I act in ways that build others’ respect for me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I keep track of all mistakes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I display a sense of power and confidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I articulate a compelling vision of the future</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I avoid making decisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I get others to look at problems from many different angles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I help others to develop their strengths</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I delay responding to urgent questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I express satisfaction when others meet expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I express confidence that goals will be achieved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I am effective in meeting others’ job-related needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I use methods of leadership that are satisfying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I get others to do more than they expected to do</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I am effective in representing others to higher authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I work with others in a satisfactory way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I heighten others’ desire to succeed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I am effective in meeting organizational requirements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I increase others’ willingness to try harder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I lead a group that is effective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MLQ  Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Rater Form (5x-Short)

Name of Leader: _______________________________ Date: ______________
Organization ID #: __________________________ Leader ID #: ____________

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE PERSON I AM RATING. . .**

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

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

MODIFIED JOB SATISFACTION INDEX

Some ROTC programs are more interesting and satisfying than others. We want to know how people feel about different programs. This questionnaire contains eighteen statements about jobs. You are to circle the phrase below each statement which best describes how you feel about your present ROTC program. There are no right or wrong answers. We would like your honest opinion on each of the statements. Work out the sample item numbered (0).

0. There are some conditions concerning my ROTC program that could be improved.

    STRONGLY AGREE    AGREE    UNDECIDED    DISAGREE    STRONGLY DISAGREE

1. My ROTC program is like a hobby to me.

    STRONGLY AGREE    AGREE    UNDECIDED    DISAGREE    STRONGLY DISAGREE

2. My ROTC program is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.

    STRONGLY AGREE    AGREE    UNDECIDED    DISAGREE    STRONGLY DISAGREE

3. It seems that my friends are more interested in their ROTC programs.

    STRONGLY AGREE    AGREE    UNDECIDED    DISAGREE    STRONGLY DISAGREE

4. I consider my ROTC program rather unpleasant.

    STRONGLY AGREE    AGREE    UNDECIDED    DISAGREE    STRONGLY DISAGREE

5. I enjoy my work more than my leisure time.

    STRONGLY AGREE    AGREE    UNDECIDED    DISAGREE    STRONGLY DISAGREE

6. I am often bored with my ROTC program.

    STRONGLY AGREE    AGREE    UNDECIDED    DISAGREE    STRONGLY DISAGREE

7. I feel fairly well satisfied with my present ROTC program.
8. Most of the time I have to force myself to go to my program.

9. I am satisfied with my ROTC program for the time being.

10. I feel that my ROTC program is no more interesting than others I could get.

11. I definitely dislike my ROTC program.

12. I feel that I am happier in my ROTC program than most other people.

13. Most days I am enthusiastic about my ROTC program.

14. Each day of work seems like it will never end.

15. I like my ROTC program better than the average participant does.

16. My ROTC program is pretty uninteresting.

17. I find real enjoyment in my ROTC program.

18. I am disappointed that I ever entered this ROTC program.
APPENDIX E

TABLES

Table 1

*MLQ Subscale Descriptive Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Subordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>M (SD)</em></td>
<td><em>M (SD)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Attributes</td>
<td>2.986 (.5387)</td>
<td>2.872 (.8015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td>2.889 (.5506)</td>
<td>2.832 (.8250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>3.097 (.6251)</td>
<td>2.993 (.6442)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>3.125 (.5303)</td>
<td>2.714 (.7817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Considerations</td>
<td>3.069 (.4986)</td>
<td>2.693 (.8380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>3.014 (.3480)</td>
<td>2.832 (.7401)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management by Exception</td>
<td>2.218 (.5640)</td>
<td>2.414 (.7044)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Job Satisfaction Index Totals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
<th>Subordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#, %; M (SD)</td>
<td>#, %; M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-53</td>
<td>13, 38.9; 52.056 (3.244)</td>
<td>8, 54.3; 53.138 (3.702)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1, 5.6; 52.056 (3.244)</td>
<td>11, 15.7; 53.138 (3.702)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-90</td>
<td>4, 22.2; 52.056 (3.244)</td>
<td>21, 30; 53.138 (3.702)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Scores are divided into ranges representing levels of satisfaction. 18-53 is dissatisfied to low satisfaction, 54 is a neutral point, and 54-90 is satisfied to high satisfaction.