

**EFFECTIVE DEVELOPMENTAL LEADERSHIP:  
A STUDY OF THE TRAITS AND BEHAVIORS  
OF A LEADER WHO DEVELOPS BOTH  
PEOPLE AND THE ORGANIZATION**

**A Dissertation**

**Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Louisiana State University and  
Agricultural and Mechanical College  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy**

**in**

**The Department of Human Resource  
Education and Workforce Development**

**by**

**Michael Stanley Wilson  
B.S. Nicholls State University, 1976  
M.E. Tulane University, 1980  
December 2004**

**©Copyright 2004**

**Michael Stanley Wilson**

**All rights reserved**

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank my family, friends, and colleagues for supporting me through this endeavor. Specifically, I would like to thank my two sons, Shawn and Michael who have given me the support to complete this work. They have always been there for me and without them this would not have been possible.

I would also like to thank my committee, who guided me, directed me, and helped me when I stumbled. I am very fortunate to have this committee, Dr. Burnett, Dr. Johnson, Dr. Redmann, Dr. Verma, and Dr. McAllister. My committee was always there for me and helped me when I needed some direction, many thanks to them.

My colleagues have patiently waited for me to finish the PhD program and have given moral support when I needed it. Without this support, the program may have been a bit tougher to complete.

Finally, I would like to thank the rest of my family for understanding me and giving me positive reinforcement, it truly helped.

## Table of Contents

	Page(s)
Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Tables.....	vi
Abstract.....	viii
<b>Chapter 1 : Rationale.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Introduction.....	1
Rationale.....	1
Purpose.....	6
Objectives of Study.....	7
Limitations of Study.....	7
Assumptions.....	7
Definitions.....	8
<b>Chapter 2: Literature Review.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Introduction.....	10
Short History of Leadership Studies.....	10
Purpose of Leadership.....	11
Leadership Theories.....	13
Transformational Leadership Research.....	21
Followership Research.....	23
Servant Leadership Research.....	24
Effective Developmental Leadership.....	26
Summary of Literature Review.....	29
<b>Chapter 3: Methodology.....</b>	<b>31</b>
Introduction.....	31
Selection of Methodology.....	31
Method and Process.....	32
Research Was Carried Out in Multiple Steps.....	33
Step 1 .....	34
Step 2 .....	35
Step 3 .....	36
Step 4 .....	37
Step 5 .....	39
Step 6 .....	39
Step 7 .....	40
Target Population and Accessibility.....	41
Data Collection.....	41
Selection of Analysis Methodology.....	42
Threshold Analysis .....	43

<b>Chapter 4: Findings and Results .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Demographics of Survey Participants.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Objective 1.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Objective 2.....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Objective 3.....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>Identifying Key Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader.....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Factored Traits.....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Demographics and the Specific Factored Trait Means.....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Identifying Key Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader.....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Factored Behaviors.....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Demographics and the Specific Factored Behavior Means.....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>Purpose.....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>Objectives of Study.....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>Methodology.....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Findings.....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>Objective One Findings.....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>Objective Two Findings.....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Objective Three Findings.....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Conclusions.....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Recommendations.....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Recommendations for Practitioners.....</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Recommendations for Further Research.....</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>Implications for Further Research.....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>Implications for Practice.....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Limitations of the Study.....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Appendix A: EDLTI (Effective Developmental Leader Trait Instrument).....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Appendix B: EDLBI (Effective Developmental Leader Behavior Instrument)</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>Appendix C: Instructions Page for EDLTI and EDLTI.....</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>Appendix D: Research Consent Form.....</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>Vita.....</b>	<b>111</b>

## List of Tables

<b>1. Years of Work Experience Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>2. Number of Employees in the Employing Organization Reported by Full-Time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>3. Working Level of Study Participants in their Organization Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>4. Ethnicity of the Study Participants Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>5. Category of Participant’s Organization Type Reported by Full-time Employees participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>6. Category of Study Participants and Different Types of Training Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>7. Initial List of Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>8. Final List of Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader to be Included in the Survey Instrument and Administered to Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>9. Mean Ratings of Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>10. Initial List of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>11. Final List of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader to be Included in the Survey Instrument and Administered to Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>64</b>

<b>12. Mean Ratings of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader as Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>13. Factor Analysis of Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader as Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>14. Factored Traits Identifying Range of Means, Overall Means, Standard Deviation, and Classification from the EDLTI Survey as Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>15. Specific Factored Traits and Demographic Sub-Category Mean Comparisons from the Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>16. Factor Analysis of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader as Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>17. Factored Behaviors Identifying Range of Means, Overall Means, and Classification from the EDLBI Survey as Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>18. Specific Factored Behaviors and Demographic Sub-Category Mean Comparisons from the Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>19. Overall Mean Scores and Standard Deviation Scores for Factored Traits and Factored Behaviors from the Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.....</b>	<b>83</b>

## **Abstract**

In this dissertation, prior theory and empirical evidence were reviewed as to the relevant traits and behaviors of an effective developmental leader. This research is the genesis in the formation and development that validates the traits and behaviors of effective developmental leadership theory, which specifies the leader's traits and behaviors that enhance sub-ordinate performance, innovative thinking, and organizational growth.

This study identified the traits and behaviors of an effective developmental leader—one whose primary focus is the development of the people and the organization he or she lead. The study determined the traits and behaviors of a leader who possesses an effective developmental orientation towards people.

The research incorporated both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. Data was collected using both open ended questions and Likert-type scaled instruments. This data was analyzed using both statistical techniques and expert panels.

The results of this study yielded six identified traits and seven identified behaviors of a developmental leader. A developmental leader was found to possess the following traits: analytical, assertive, cooperative, dedicated, personable, and practical. A developmental leader would also possess the following behaviors: advisor, charismatic, competitive, delegator, developer, focused, and supportive.

## **Chapter 1: Rationale**

### **Introduction**

This dissertation identifies the relevant traits and behaviors exhibited by a leader whose main focus is the development and growth of the organization and the people he or she leads. The researcher defines effective developmental leaders as supporting, guiding, developing, directing, and enhancing organizational opportunities and the opportunities of the individuals who form the organization.

### **Rationale**

Post-industrial organizations of the twenty-first century face challenges of fast-changing environments for their products or services as well as challenges of large-scale inter-organizational problems and issues (Magliocca & Christakis, 2001). Bell (1973) identified the “axial principle” of the post-industrial society as theoretical knowledge -- the primary source of innovation and policy formation. An important change in the dynamics that organizations and their leaders face is that post-industrial organizations function with a changing social class of workers, i.e., “knowledge workers,” who make strategic contributions to the organization through rapid and informal team-based decision-making. Knowledge workers face increasingly complex and sophisticated emergent problems that require integration of relevant substantive knowledge of team members and interdepartmental communication and dialogue. The tightly scripted plan of the industrial organization to accomplish well-defined goals and tasks is replaced by creative, pluralistic teams trying to resolve “messy” problems (Ackoff, 1981) that are escalating in complexity. The concept of leadership in the post-industrial organization is also shifting decisively from its industrial roots.

Organizations face increasing challenges that require new waves of thought processes to manage the demand for methods to produce innovative products and provide quality services. These demands lead to real pressures to maintain sustainability in the world economy. As a result, organizations, and the people within, are pushed to produce continuously improving products and services. They are asked to do so with fewer people and resources while trying to maintain personal and organizational financial viability. Therefore, leaders are faced with new challenges as to how they operate in, communicate with, and view the future of their organization.

Increasing changes stem from global competition, a diverse workforce, an aging baby-boomer generation, speed to market demands, organizational structure changes, and fluctuating economies and markets. These external and internal forces pressure leaders to find new methods to produce high-quality products and services while maintaining high employee morale and organizational stability.

Some of the key issues are a lack of open communication, trust, and knowing employee capabilities for new positions, leader succession development, and how employees fit in the overall scheme of the organization. Leaders need to work with employees and customers to achieve higher standards of excellence in their products and services offered by the organization.

Peter Senge (1994) pointed out that organizations need to adapt to their changing environments (Bass, 2000). Local line leaders in the organization and high-level executives, as well as internal net-workers and community leaders, who can motivate and direct the organization and its members to learn to adapt to changes are needed. The changes in the economic environment--from local, to national, to global markets--require new perspectives. Interspersed with these changes are the rapidly

ever-changing developments in information technology with which the organization and its members need to become intimately involved for acquisition and processing of information from the internal and external environments. The organization has to learn how to adapt to changes in the diversity of its workforce and customers, as well as to the changing demands for social responsibility.

Organizations are changing by "dejobbing," that is, the concept of the job as a separate full-time position with a specific bundle of tasks is changing. Instead, this concept is being replaced by the unbundling of the tasks of a traditional job. Instead of an organizational member having one permanent bundle of tasks to complete, the member will need to work alone or in teams on temporary tasks and in temporary teams. Changes will coincide with changes in organization needs. Some tasks may be outsourced; some may be shifted within the organization (Bridges, 1995).

Leadership has many definitions, and within those definitions is *influence*-the influencing of people and organization to perform jobs, tasks and processes; to use methods; and to produce profits while at the same time maintaining a culture healthy for the people within the organization. The researcher believes that *influence* is only part of the picture, and that leadership is a very complex process that managers assume as they work with people within the organizational structure. Organizations seeking profitability and the ability to stay financially viable must have a workforce and an organizational structure that are constantly developing the expertise congruent with the many internal and external demands. The focus in this study is on effective developmental leadership, also called EDL.

The practice of this effective developmental leadership occurs when the leader balances his or her focus on the growth of both individual and organization. To do so

takes a higher order of thinking on the part of the leader than merely influencing employees. It requires thinking beyond self, beyond today, and into the future. The researcher proposes that, when the leader focuses on developing his or her people, learning begins to flourish throughout the organization, leading to innovation, growth, and prosperity. The researcher has observed this in the workplace over the past 30 years from personal experiences as an employee, manager, leader, consultant, and executive coach.

The researcher has concluded from experience that employees come to work for various reasons-money, satisfaction, to fulfill their potential. People need a reason to belong, a feeling of accomplishment and the satisfaction of seeing their needs attended to or least a concern for them. This kind of attention helps employees feel connected to the organization and the products or services produced. In developing employees, the leader pays attention to at least some of their needs, thereby creating a productive and more loyal workforce, and, ultimately, a more innovative and productive organization.

Organizations are found in many different designs, structures, processes, and methods of keeping pace with consumer demands in these rapidly changing times. In his book, (1982 interpretation) *War and Peace*, Tolstoy & Edmond describes the army's structure and how that structure leads to behavior of the soldiers and officers. Similarly, Peter Senge (1994) in his book *The Fifth Discipline* takes Tolstoy & Edmond's premise a step further and shows how structure leads to behavior of the employees in an organization.

The researcher asserts that leaders who demonstrate a developmental orientation understand this idea of structure dictating behavior and enable the creation

of a structure that encourages development, learning, innovation, creativity, trust, and open communication. Leaders who focus on developing the organization will find ways to solicit ideas from a workforce to constantly strive for an effective organizational structure while at the same time maintaining organizational stability and growth. This can be a difficult process for the leader, but one that an effective developmental leader understands and attempts to accomplish.

Consumers and stakeholders are attracted to organizations whose products and services are in demand and are perceived as being state-of-the-art or best value in the industry. Leaders, by developing people and the organization, create a connection between employees, the organization, consumers, and stakeholders to establish an open channel of communication, thereby allowing the organization to receive vital information and make rapid organizational product and/or service changes as these become necessary.

This research attempts to identify the key traits and key behaviors that enable a manager to become an effective developmental leader (EDL) of employees and the organization. Managers have many duties, and the primary one is developing the business and the employees in these changing times of increasing pressures. The goal of this study is to determine the attributes of leaders who provide development of employees with a vision of growth in the organization.

By identifying the effective developmental leadership traits and behaviors, an organization can identify the skills necessary for their leaders to develop the people and the organization they lead. Once these skills are identified, leadership training can be implemented to promote an effective developmental leadership style in an organization. As a result, the organization, leaders, employees, customers, and

stakeholders should reap the expected benefits of (1) improved employee performance, (2) improved organizational performance, (3) customer satisfaction, (4) improved employee morale, (5) stakeholder profits, and (6) leadership success.

Current theories, such as Transformational Leadership Theory, discuss and imply development but do not go into specific details of how leaders develop people and the organization, nor do they enumerate the specific actions they take and the results of those actions. Therefore, there is a need to supplement the current theories with an effective developmental leadership theory that will better explain the key traits and key behaviors of an effective developmental leader in an organization, with the expected results being higher performance at both the employee and organizational level.

One way of viewing the concept of leadership is, for example, to imagine a 100-piece puzzle that represents, when completed, a clear picture and understanding of what leadership is and how leaders behave. The research emphasizes that the leadership puzzle may never be completed, but continued research will bring us closer with each development in leadership theory. Each development in theory represents one piece of the puzzle, and this present research is but another effort to identify yet another piece of the leadership puzzle.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to answer the question, “What are the traits and behaviors of an effective developmental leader?”-one whose primary focus is the development of the people and the organization he or she lead? Therefore, this study’s intent was to identify those traits and behaviors of leaders who possess an effective developmental orientation towards people and the organization they lead.

## **Objectives of Study**

The study had the following objectives:

1. Identify the traits of effective, developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U.S. city.
2. Identify the behaviors of effective, developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U.S. city.
3. Determine the key traits and key behaviors of effective, developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full time employees from several organizations in a southern U.S. city.

## **Limitations of Study**

This study is limited by the use of two instruments, the Effective Developmental Leadership Trait Instrument (EDLTI) and the Effective Developmental Leadership Behavior Instrument (EDLBI), plus a demographics instrument, the study population of full-time employees from several organizations in a southern city, the time frame used to accomplish this study, and the scope of the study. This study is limited to the exploration of specific traits and specific behaviors that a leader exhibits when he or she has a focus on, and orientation to development as the primary method to increase organizational performance. There may be other traits, behaviors, and characteristics not explored in this body of research.

## **Assumptions**

In this section, the assumptions used in this study will be delineated used. The assumptions are drawn from the literature review and from experience working with leaders and organizations of many types.

1. Identification of the traits and behaviors of leaders that lead to the development of people and organizations is incomplete in previous studies. Further, those traits and behaviors have not been clearly identified.
2. Leaders develop employees and organizations through a process that leads to effective growth and performance.
3. People are motivated to maintain and enhance their performance. Their level of performance is based on their sense of development and ability to work within the organizational environment created by the leader.
4. Organizational structure is created and directed by the leader. This structure leads to behaviors of the people in the organization.

### **Definitions**

The terms used in the study are operationally defined by the researcher in this section. These are development, developmental leader's orientation, leader traits, and leader behaviors.

1. *Development* will be referred to in this study as a process that one person, the leader, applies to another person, the follower, and to the organization. *Development* is the focus of this study and means the growth, the training, the coaching, and other methods that increase the employee's capacity to improve performance. This will also apply to the organization.
2. *Developmental leader's orientation* is described as the attitude of a person in a leadership position to finding ways to develop people and organizations by various learning methods.
3. *Leader traits* are personality factors that are observable both within and outside the context of work (i.e., self-confidence, enthusiasm, or humor). They are the

inner qualities or abilities that enable a leader to function effectively in fostering growth and organizational effectiveness.

4. *Leader behaviors* are the activities engaged in by the leader, including his or her characteristic approach, that relate to his or her effectiveness.

## **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

### **Introduction**

In this dissertation, prior theory and empirical evidence were reviewed as to the relevant traits and behaviors of a effective developmental leader. This research is the genesis in the formation and development that validates the traits and behaviors of effective developmental leadership theory, which specifies the leader's traits and behaviors that enhance sub-ordinate performance, innovative thinking, and organizational growth.

Information presented in this study is a result of, in part, the researcher's 30 years of personal experience working with organizations in the public sector, large and small corporations, and non-profit organizations. This personal experience has provided rich information on all types of organizations in their day-to-day operations and, specifically, what employees and managers believe to be the needs and trends of their organizations. In addition, a large amount of information has come from researching the literature on leadership.

### **Short History of Leadership Studies**

Throughout history, scholars from Plutarch to Carlyle have studied leaders and leadership (Riggio, Ciulla, & Sorenson, 2003). Leadership studies as they are known today emerged from social science research conducted primarily in the United States and almost exclusively since the turn of the twentieth century. Explanations for the strong role played by the U.S. range from the individualistic (and thus leader-focused) nature of the American experience, to the relative stability of the American economy and democratic system, to neo-liberalism (DeMott, 1993), to the stream of leadership funding from American foundations and government. Leadership studies also evolved

as a result of America's powerful and innovative business culture, which was always hungry for new and productive ways to manage the workplace. Management research was heavily subsidized by big business and some of this work formed the building blocks of leadership studies (Ciulla, 2000).

The first large-scale research projects on leadership in the U.S. were funded by the government in the 1940s, principally as a means of improving wartime efficiency. Later, in 1966, the Smith Richardson Foundation supported Stodgill's systematic review of literature on leadership, resulting in the seminal *Handbook of Leadership*, published in 1974 (Troyer, 1997).

Many public universities played a significant role in the evolution of the empirical study of leadership, notably, Ohio State, Southern Illinois at Carbondale, and Michigan State. In small teams in these and other public universities, researchers, chiefly in the fields of psychology and sociology, conducted early research on leadership, in part the result of robust post-war funding (Sorenson & Howe, 2001).

Some independent research was undertaken in small liberal arts colleges as well. In 1978, James MacGregor Burns of Williams College published *Leadership*, a book embraced by academics and the general public alike for its interdisciplinary effort. It was viewed as a revolutionary book in that it identified the many facets and complexity of leadership and also compiled information from many years of leadership research. This work by James MacGregor Burns continues to be among the five top books used in leadership studies classes around the country (Sorenson, 2000).

### **Purpose of Leadership**

The landscape of leadership is inhabited by purpose, opportunities, and relationships (McCaslin, 2001). McCaslin sought to illuminate the relationship

aspects of this landscape. While it is difficult to gain complete understanding of the landscape by an examination of its various aspects, such an examination is offered. To gain a more complete understanding of leadership, McCaslin's research positions leadership as a meta-motivational value. From there the approach to the various levels of relationships were examined. This study views leadership as a holistic theory for developing human potential through the leadership dynamic.

Leadership has a distinctiveness surrounding its nature. It is without exception a higher order value, concept, or condition. Leadership, as a higher order value, sets itself apart from human nature by being unchanging, incorruptible, and unyielding in principle, while inspiring hope, creativity, and empowerment to unmet human potential (McCaslin, 2001).

There are as many definitions of leadership as there are researchers. One definition is "Leadership is the ability to influence others to achieve a common purpose." This is the researcher's personal definition; another one found in the literature is "Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (Dubrin, 2001). The researcher combined this definition with experience based knowledge and expanded it to include leadership of the organization.

It is important to search for those leadership traits and behaviors that foster the development of followers and organizations. A effective developmental leader is one who possesses the characteristics and engages in actions primarily focused on the growth and development of the people and organizations he or she leads.

This review seeks to identify the key traits and key behaviors of a leader whose primary focus is the development of the followers; this kind of leader believes that

development will lead to higher organizational performance and follower satisfaction. This leader will be referred to in this study as an “effective developmental leader” (EDL).

### **Leadership Theories**

In reviewing the literature of leadership theories, models, and practices much has been written on the subject of leadership over the past several decades. Many journal articles, textbooks, books, and other publications have come about as a result of leadership research. In performing the literature review, the researcher found an evolution of thought of what a leader is, what their traits are, and what their behaviors are. These areas of developmental thought are brought out in the literature.

One approach to leadership theory has been the *trait approach*. The *trait approach* has its roots in leadership theory that suggested that certain people were born with special traits that made them great leaders. Because the theory holds that leaders and non-leaders are differentiated by a universal set of traits, throughout the twentieth century, researchers were challenged to identify the definitive traits of leaders (Bass, 1990; Jago, 1982).

From the middle of the twentieth century on, several major studies questioned the basic premise of a unique set of traits that defines leadership, and shifted attention to organizational impact and the followers of a leader. Researchers began to study the actions that occur between leaders and the context of work, instead of focusing on a leader's traits (Riggio, Ciulla, & Sorenson, 2003). More recently, there are signs that trait research has come full circle because there is renewed interest in focusing directly on critical traits. This research has identified the traits of an effective developmental leader.

Through the many studies conducted on individual traits, it is clear that many traits contribute to leadership. Some of the important ones consistently identified in these studies are intelligence, self-confidence, integrity, and sociability. Some of the research that has identified these traits are Implicit Leadership Theory, Servant Leadership, Transformational Leadership, and Social Exchange Theory.

The *style approach* is very different from the trait approach. The style approach emphasizes behavior of the leader (Fleishman & Hunt, 1973). This research will also focus on a leader's developmental mindset and behavior. Researchers studying the *style approach* determined that leadership is composed essentially of two general types of behaviors: task behaviors and relationship behaviors. How leaders combine these two types of behaviors to influence others is the central purpose of the style approach, which originated from two different lines of research: The Ohio State University and the University of Michigan studies (Stogdill, 1973).

The *style approach* is not a refined theory that provides a neatly organized set of prescriptions for effective leadership behavior. Rather, the style approach provides a valuable two-dimensional (task-relationship) framework for assessing leadership behavior. Finally, the style approach reminds leaders that their impact on others occurs along both dimensions (Fleishman & Hunt, 1973).

*Contingency* theory is a leader match theory that explains the match of leaders to appropriate situations. Fiedler (1964) developed contingency theory by studying the styles of leaders who worked in different contexts, primarily military organizations. After analyzing the styles of hundreds of leaders who were both good and bad, Fiedler (1964) and his colleagues were able to make empirically grounded generalizations about which styles of leadership were best and which styles were

worst for a given organizational context. These situations that a leader may be in are level of power, structure of work group, and relationship orientation of the leader.

Contingency theory represents a shift in leadership research from focusing on the leader to looking at the leader in conjunction with the situation in which the leader works (Fiedler, 1978). To measure leadership style, a personality measure called the least preferred coworker (LPC) skill is used.

Contingency theory is backed by a considerable amount of research and is one of the first leadership theories to emphasize the impact of situations on leaders. The weakness of this theory is that it has not adequately explained the link between styles and situation and relies too heavily on the LPC scale (Rice, 1978). Furthermore, the contingency theory may not be easily used in organizations and may not fully explain how organizations can use its results in different situations.

Contingency theory suggests that a leader's effectiveness depends on how well the leader's style fits with the context. To understand the performance of leaders, it is essential to understand situations in which they lead. Effective leadership is contingent on matching a leader's style to the right setting (Fiedler, 1978). The LPC assesses situations in which leaders work and whether or not they are effective. Contingency theory is widely used in organizations and gets mixed reviews from users and theorists, but it does not explain how a leader develops or can develop the followers to achieve high-performance through innovative solutions yielding growth.

Another widely recognized approach to leadership is the *situational approach*, developed by Hersey & Blanchard (1996). It has been refined several times and used extensively in training and development for leadership in organizations. It suggests

how leaders can become effective in many different types of organizational settings involving a variety of organizational tasks.

The situational approach provides a model that suggests a leader's attention should be paid to the demands of the particular situation. The situational model describes how different leadership styles can be applied to subordinates who work at different levels of their working experience. Effective leadership occurs when the leader accurately diagnoses the development level of the subordinates in a task situation and then uses a leadership style that matches the situation (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Nelson, 1993).

Although the situational approach to leadership is widely used and is effective, the model and the theory prescribe how a leader should assist a subordinate along his or her developmental steps but not how the leader can further develop the subordinates. Specifically, it does not explain how the leader exhibits certain traits and behaviors that further the development of a subordinate.

*Path goal theory* attempts to explain how a leader guides subordinates to accomplish designated goals. Drawing heavily from research on what motivates employees, path goal theory first appeared in the leadership literature in the early 1970s in the works of House (1971) and House & Mitchell (1974). In contrast to the situational approach, which suggests a leader must adapt to the developmental level of subordinates, and in light of contingency theory, which emphasizes the match between a leader's style and specific variables, path goal theory emphasizes the relationship between a leader's style and the characteristics of subordinates and the work setting.

An assumption of path goal theory is the *derived expectancy theory*, which suggests that subordinates will be motivated if they think they're capable of

performing their work, if they believe their efforts will result in a certain outcome, and if they believe the payoffs for accomplishing this work are worthwhile (House, 1996).

Path goal theory was developed to explain how leaders motivate subordinates to be productive and satisfied with their work. It is a contingency approach to leadership because effectiveness depends on the fit between a leader's behavior and the characteristics of subordinates and the subordinates' task (House, 1996).

Most leadership theories discussed in this section emphasize leadership from the point of view of the leader, the follower, and the context. *Leader Member Exchange Theory* (LMX) takes still another approach and conceptualizes leadership as a process centered in the interactions between the leader and the followers. LMX theory makes a dyadic (two-way) relationship between leaders and followers the focal point of the leadership process. LMX theory was first described in the works of Dansereau, Graen, & Haga (1975) and Graen & Cashman (1975) and has undergone several revisions.

Prior to LMX theory, researchers treated leadership as something leaders did to individual followers. This assumption implied that leaders treated followers in a collective way as a group by using an average leadership style (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). LMX theory challenged this assumption and directed researchers' attention to the differences that might exist between the leader and each of his or her followers. LMX theory addresses leadership as a process centered in the interaction between leaders and followers. It makes the leader-member relationship the pivotal concept in the leadership process. However, LMX theory lacks in its investigation of the process, actions, and behaviors that leaders use to influence the performance of the follower (member).

*Transformational leadership* is an encompassing approach that can be used to describe a wide range of leadership processes, from specific intentions to influence followers on a one-to-one level to a broad attempt to influence organizations and even entire cultures. Although a transformational leader plays a pivotal role in precipitating change, followers and leaders are inextricably bound together in the transformation process (Bass & Avolio, 1990a).

Transformational leaders are recognized as change agents who are good role models. They create and articulate a clear vision for the organization; empower followers to achieve higher standards; act in ways that make others want to trust them; and give meaning to organizational life (Bass & Avolio, 1990b).

Current theories of *charismatic leadership* were strongly influenced by the ideas of the early sociologist Max Weber (1947). *Charisma* is a Greek word that means divinely inspired gift, such as the ability to perform miracles or predict future events. Weber (1947) used this term to describe a form of influence based not on tradition but rather on follower perceptions that the leader is endowed with exceptional qualities.

According to Weber (1947), charisma (from “Charismatic Leadership Theory”) occurs when there is a social crisis. The leader emerges to present a radical vision that offers a solution to the crisis; the leader attracts followers to believe in the vision; the follower’s experience some successes that make the vision appear to be attainable; and they come to perceive the leader as extraordinary.

*Implicit leadership theory* is founded on beliefs and assumptions about the characteristics of effective leaders. Implicit theories usually involve stereotypes about relevant traits, skills, or behaviors of leaders (Eden & Leviatan, 1975).

The primary purpose of implicit leadership theory is to differentiate leaders and non-leaders, to differentiate effective and ineffective leaders, or to differentiate among various types of leaders (Offerman, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994).

In *social exchange theory*, the amount of status and power attributed to a leader is proportionate to the group's evaluation of the leader's potential contribution relative to members or followers (Hollander, 1961).

Social exchange theory explains that the most fundamental form of social interaction is an exchange of benefits, which can include not only material benefits but also psychological benefits such as expressions of approval, respect, esteem, and affection. Individuals learn to choose to engage in social exchanges early in their childhood, and they develop expectations about reciprocity and equity in these exchanges. Member expectations about what leadership roles the person should have in the group are determined by the leader's loyalty and demonstrated competence (Hollander, 1980).

Kerr and Jermier (1978) developed a model to identify aspects of a situation that reduces the importance of leadership by managers and other formal leaders. The *Leader Substitute Theory* makes a distinction between two kinds of situational variables: substitutes and neutralizers. Substitutes make leader behavior unnecessary and redundant. They include the characteristics of the subordinates, task, or organization that ensure subordinates will clearly understand their roles, how to do their work, be highly motivated, and be satisfied with their jobs (Podaskoff, Niehoff, MacKenzie, & Williams, 1993). A neutralizer is a situational constraint that serves as a neutralizer; an example would be a leader's lack of authority to reward effective performance,.

A situational model developed by Fiedler (1986) deals with the cognitive abilities of leaders. According to *Cognitive Resources Theory*, the performance of a leader's group is determined by the complex interaction among leader's traits of intelligence and experience. One type of leader behavior is directed leadership, and two aspects of these leadership situations are personal stress and the nature of the group's task.

Cognitive resources theory examines the conditions under which cognitive resources such as intelligence and experience are related to group performance. This relationship is an important research question because organizations use measures of prior experience and intelligence in selecting managers (Fiedler, 1992).

The *Leadership attribution model* describes the reaction of a manager to poor performance as a two-step process. In the first step, a manager tries to determine what caused poor performance; in the second step, a manager tries to select an appropriate response to correct the problem. Managers generally attribute the major cause of poor performance to either something internal to the subordinates or to external problems out of the subordinates' control (Conger & Kanunga, 1987).

Another attribution theory is *follower attribution theory*. Several interrelated factors determine how followers assess leader effectiveness. One factor is the extent to which there are clear, timely indicators of performance of leaders and organizations. A leader is usually judged more confident if the leader is perceived to be successful and if the leader's actions lead to success. The performance trend will also influence follower assessment of the leader (Conger & Kanunga, 1994).

## **Transformational Leadership Research**

Bernard M. Bass (2000) stated that among the most prominent developments in recent years in the investigation of transformational leadership has been the confirmation of the utility of transformational leadership for increasing organizational satisfaction, commitment, and effectiveness, and the six-factor model of the transformational-transactional factorial structure.

The understanding of transformational dynamics has increased. The research shows how transformational leadership relates to the creation and maintenance of the “learning organization.” To do this, the meaning of transformational and transactional leadership, the full range of leadership, and how the components of transformational and transactional leadership contribute to a learning organization are discussed. The future of leadership and administration is considered in the light of the current state of affairs in leadership.

Developmental processes lie at the heart of the relationship between transformational leaders and followers (Popper, Mayseless, & Castelnovo, 2000). First, three major domains in which developmental outcomes have been mostly discussed, namely motivation, empowerment, and morality, are highlighted, expanded, and discussed. Next the analogy between transformational leaders and "good parents" is employed to explore the underlying developmental processes. Specifically, conceptualizations, notions, and findings have been utilized from the vast literature on parenting to help understand the developmental process. Several major arguments and propositions have been tested empirically. These propositions and their conceptualization can broaden the perspective about the processes that underlie many of the outcome variables so frequently investigated and discussed in the leadership

literature, and offer a major opportunity to probe the currently less explored developmental and dynamic aspects of leadership.

The researchers, Popper and Mayseless, (2002), attempt to understand how transformational leaders affect their followers in three domains: motivation, empowerment, and morality. To analyze these processes, they drew on a powerful analogy between good parents and transformational leaders. This analogy, first introduced by Freud, was expanded in transformational leadership research to highlight specific developmental processes inherent in the relationships between transformational leaders and their followers.

As both types of relationships are asymmetrical in principle, they form the basis for psychological dependence, which exists between children and parents as well as between followers and leaders. However, unlike some previous theories in the leadership literature (Lindholm, 1990), some researchers have argued that this dependence is not inherently negative. Instead, it may be seen in some occasions as a key to helping children and followers to satisfy needs, attain aspirations, and actualize capacities at the highest level. It may also serve for people to improve themselves instrumentally (by being competent and self-assured), interpersonally (by being secure and trusting), and morally (by acquiring universal values and behaving pro-socially). This can be achieved if certain psychological processes (as described above) are maintained and promoted. These processes may be conceptualized as mediators, which explicate how good parents or transformational leaders bring about the specific outcomes of motivation, empowerment, and morality

## **Followership Research**

There has been a significant amount of research in the area of *followership* following the work by Greenleaf (1983) on *Servant Leadership*. The focus here has been on the characteristics, personality types, and needs of followers to perform their work effectively and on the premise that leaders should give appropriate attention to followers.

In the writings of Densten and Gray (2001), followership is a critical area for the investigation and comprehension of leadership, and yet research in the field is limited and dominated by a few theorists such as Kelly (1992) and Hollander (1978). They investigated the contemporary views of followership and drew on educational research to provide a more comprehensive understanding of followers as learners. Kolb's (1974) Experiential Learning Model (ELM) is used to augment Kelly's (1992) "Followership Model" to strengthen the theoretical foundations of followership and to provide insight into the relationship between leadership behaviors and follower development. Implications for theory and practice are discussed, and researchers argue that viewing followers as learners will provide opportunities to advance understanding of a neglected area of leadership and should enable followership to finally come of age.

Followership represents a field of study within leadership and refers to the behavior of followers, which results from the leader-follower influence relationship. Despite the recognized importance of followership and the critical role followers play in leadership (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1999), research into followership is limited and dominated by Kelly's (1992) original conceptualization of followership. The literature continues to attribute organizational successes and failures primarily to

leaders without fully recognizing the contribution of followers (Meindl & Ehrlich, 1987). The importance of followership has been overshadowed by the sheer volume of research on leaders. This research has reinforced the subservient status of followers in the literature. Consequently, the relationship aspects of leadership have been examined almost exclusively from the leader's perspective, resulting in followers being viewed as merely the objects of leadership (Berg, 1998).

The leadership literature has focused on the effects of leaders, whereas much less attention has been given to the followers' role in shaping their leader's style (Dvir & Shamir, 2003). The study by Dvir and Shamir tested follower developmental characteristics as predictors of transformational leadership. The sample included 54 military units and their leaders, in which there were 90 direct followers and 724 indirect followers. Results at the group level of analysis indicated that followers' initial developmental level, as expressed by the initial level of their self-actualization needs, internalization of the organization's moral values, collectivistic orientation, critical-independent approach, active engagement in the task, and self-efficacy, positively predicted transformational leadership among indirect followers, whereas these relationships were negative among direct followers. The different role of followers' initial developmental level as a predictor of transformational leadership among close versus distant followers was presented in the research.

### **Servant Leadership Research**

*Servant Leadership* has received attention in the popular press, but little empirical research exists to support the theory or the anecdotal evidence used in the popular press material (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999). Farling, Stone, and Winston presented a model of servant leadership based on the variables of vision,

influence, credibility, trust, and service identified in the academic and popular press literature. A small stream of literature that emphasizes the leader as servant first (commonly described as "servant leader") emerges from Robert Greenleaf's (1983) foundational text on servant leadership. Bowman (1997), however, points out a significant problem with this literature as it currently exists. The concept of servant leadership lacks support by well-designed and published empirical research. Bowman further states that, while many of the servant-leader concept writers provide many examples of servant leadership in organizational settings, "the majority are anecdotal."

Servant leadership concepts have been investigated from the perspective of the faculty in higher education. The prospect of the comprehensive transformation of higher education provides a special opportunity to consider a new model for future faculty and future institutions. The model proposed and explored in detail is servant leadership as espoused and advocated by Robert Greenleaf (1983). That model offers at least five dimensions for the consideration of both faculty and their institutions: (1.) Identity: the curtailment and redirection of ego and image; (2.) Leadership: the employment of the old Roman standard of *primus inter pares*; (3.) Reciprocity: the circular relationship between leaders and followers, teachers and students; (4.) Commitment: the absolute devotion to the academic discipline; and (5.) The Future: the alignment of faculty and institution (Buchen, 1998).

Although the notion of servant leadership has been recognized in the leadership literature since Burns' (1978) and Greenleaf's (1983) publications, the movement has gained momentum only recently. Bowman (1997) argues that to date there is only anecdotal evidence to support a commitment to an understanding of servant leadership. For example, Spears' (1995) identification of ten characteristics of

servant leadership (i.e. listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) is based solely on his readings of Greenleaf's (1983) essays, and is not grounded in solid research studies.

Sendjaya and Sarros (2002) examined the philosophical foundation of servant leadership by extracting several value-laden principles drawn from Greenleaf's (1983) delineation of the concept. The primary intent and self-concept of servant leaders are singled out as the distinctive features of servant leadership. While empirical research studies are critically needed to develop the concepts underlying the servant leadership movement into sound theory, an accurate understanding of the conceptual roots of servant leadership is essential in the process. The current developmental stage of the servant leadership movement is explored in order to provide some useful signposts for future research directions.

### **Effective Developmental Leadership**

*Path-Goal theory* is intended to enhance employee performance and employee satisfaction by focusing on employee motivation. However, Path-Goal theory neither shows in a clear way how leaders' behaviors directly affect subordinate motivational levels nor delineates how a leader's actions and behaviors develop the employees or subordinates and the organization.

Research findings to date cannot support a full and consistent picture of the claims of Path-Goal theory. It is very leader-oriented and fails to recognize the transactional and transformational nature of the leadership, and thus does not pay attention to the needs for growth, development, and nurturing of the followers and the organization (House, 1996).

Leader Member Exchange (LMX) theory as describe on page 16 in this study, runs counter to the principles of fairness and justice in the workplace by suggesting that some members of the work unit receive special attention and others do not. The perceived inequalities created by the use of in-groups have a devastating impact on the feelings, attitudes, and behaviors of out-group members (Graen & Uhl-bien, 1995). Further LMX theory emphasizes the importance of leader-member exchanges, but fails to explain the intricacies of how one goes about creating high-quality exchanges. Although the theory promotes building trust, respect, and commitment in relationships, it does not fully explain how this takes place. There are questions regarding whether the principle of LMX theory is sufficiently refined to measure the complexities of leadership.

One of the more current approaches to leadership that has been the focus of much research since the early 1980s is the transformational approach. In fact, it has grown in popularity in the past decade. Transformational leadership is part of a new leadership paradigm. It is a process that changes and transforms individuals concerned with values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals. Transformational leadership involves assessing followers' motives, satisfying their needs, and treating them as full participants in the process that includes charismatic and visionary leadership (Bass, 1990).

The concept of effective developmental leadership theory was born out of the transformational leadership (Bass, & Avolio, 1990a), followership (Berg, 1998), and servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1983) theories. Transformational leadership theory has many positive features; however, it lacks conceptual clarity and is often interpreted as an either-or approach; it too heavily relies upon information and data about leaders.

Transformational leadership has gaps as have the others previously discussed, and does not delineate what effective leadership looks like from the standpoint of developing the people and the organization to achieve high performance, growth, and profits (Popper, Mayseless, & Castelnovo, O., 2000).

The individual consideration component of transformational leadership is in alignment with the proposed effective developmental leadership theory in that the focus is on the follower and on giving due time and consideration to his or her needs. However, the missing gap or question remains, “What would be the traits and behaviors of a leader who practiced the skill of giving individual consideration to the followers?” That is the question that was investigated in this present study.

In the past two decades, several social scientists have formulated newer versions of the charismatic leadership theory to describe charismatic leadership in organizations-Conger & Kanunga, 1994; House, 1977; Shamir, House, & Arthur (1993). These charismatic leadership researchers incorporate some of Weber's (1947) ideas, but in other respects they have departed from his initial concept of charismatic leadership.

Charismatic leadership is one of the four characteristics imbedded in the transformational leadership theory mentioned previously in this chapter. Many of the researchers have identified characteristics of a charismatic leader. However, this theory leaves short the followers and their developmental needs, and fails to identify the characteristics of a leader with a follower developmental orientation.

Followership research is ongoing and is looking at the attributes of followers, their needs, and how these characteristics affect a leader. The question remains

unanswered, “What are the traits and behaviors of a leader who focuses on developing these followers and takes into account their wants, needs, and attributes.

Servant leadership informs us that leaders should be servants first and, therefore, serve the common goal and the followers. Servant leadership tells us that a servant leader focuses on vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service (Greenleaf 1983).

Greenleaf states: “The servant leader is servant first ... It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead ... The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test and the most difficult to administer, is: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit or, at least, not be further deprived?” (p. 13)

As well developed as the servant leadership theory is, it is still missing some key ingredients, namely when the leader engages in influence and service, what are his or her traits and behaviors?

### **Summary of Literature Review**

The many theories and research reviewed in the literature show definite trends in the study and perception of who a leader is and what leadership is. Although many theories capture the idea of a leader developing people, the researcher was not able to find the key traits and behaviors of a leader whose primary focus is on the development, growth, and improvement of performance by having an orientation for developing the followers. This creates a need to identify key characteristics of a

person who the researcher calls an “Effective Developmental Leader,” whose primary focus is developing the people he or she leads for high performance. The following chapters investigate what makes an effective developmental leader with conclusions drawn from the data collected in chapter 5.

## **Chapter 3: Methodology**

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this dissertation was to identify key traits and key behaviors that are characteristic of an effective developmental leader (EDL), one who focuses on the growth and development of the people he or she leads as the main engine that drives organizational growth and performance. This will add to the body of knowledge and enable a clearer understanding of leadership.

### **Selection of Methodology**

To determine the lists of key traits and key behaviors, both qualitative-inductive and quantitative-deductive approaches were applied. In the inductive stage, research was carried out in multiple steps to collect and assimilate lists of traits and behaviors of an EDL. The deductive approach followed with the construction of two instruments, the “effective developmental leader trait instrument”, (EDLTI, see Appendix A) and the “effective developmental leader behavior instrument” (EDLBI, see Appendix B). Next, the two instruments were administered and the resulting data analyzed using factor analysis to determine the trait factors and behavior factors.

To develop a methodology, a review of existing approaches revealed one that had been widely used in the research on developing leadership characteristics. One specific body of research was the identification of characteristics of implicit leadership (Eden & Leviatan, 1975), which led to the implicit leadership theory. The researcher proceeded to replicate this method but found some problems with it, in terms of the objectives and limitations of this study.

The researcher reviewed the Q-sort and Delphi methodologies and, with guidance from the committee chairman, chose a modified version of the implicit

leadership theory trait research method and combined with an expert panel (a modified Delphi technique). The Delphi method provides an opportunity for experts (panelists) to communicate their opinions and knowledge anonymously about a complex problem, to see how their evaluation of the issue aligns with others, and to change their opinions, if desired, after reconsideration of the findings of the group's work.

### **Method and Process**

The initial step in data collection for this study took the form of brainstorming written words or short phrases of what employees from several organizations who were also graduate leadership students believed to be the traits and behaviors of an effective developmental leader. This brainstorming took place in one room where all participants had room to work and to work at their own pace. These brainstorming sessions took place in a classroom at two different southern United States universities.

The resulting two brainstorming list as mentioned in the above paragraph from full-time employees were given to expert panel number 1 (EP1) to sort through and develop a final list eliminating duplicates and synonyms. The EP1 number 1 comprised of four individuals who have extensive experience in corporate environments and in leadership positions-two professors of management who teach leadership courses, one professor of managerial communication, and one senior vice-president of a Fortune 100 corporation with 20+ years of work experience. The professorial members of the panel have teaching experience exceeding 10 years and business consulting experience in the area of leadership and management exceeding 5 years. One leadership professor and one managerial communications professor were from a private southern university, while the other professorial member of the committee was from a private southern liberal arts university.

The members of the EP1 were chosen on the basis of their teaching and/or work experience in the area of leadership and management. They came from two different universities and a major corporation so as to provide a diverse perspective when evaluating the trait words and trait phrases listed by the full-time employees who were also graduate business school students.

The two lists (traits and behaviors) were constructed into the two instruments, the EDLTI (see Appendix A) and the EDLBI (see Appendix B), and administered to employees from several organizations. The data collected were analyzed using factor analysis to define the underlying structure and determine the key traits and key behaviors of an effective developmental leader.

### **Research Was Carried Out in Multiple Steps**

1. The first step consisted of generating a list of words or short phrases perceived as traits of an effective developmental leader from the first brainstorming session in a classroom of a southern university.
2. The second step, following the completion of step 1 above, consisted of generating a list of words or short phrases perceived as behaviors of an effective developmental leader from the first brainstorming session in a classroom of a southern university.
3. The third step was the EP1's evaluation of the list of traits that were generated and, where duplication occurred, these traits were combined or eliminated. The EP1 submitted the final list to the researcher. The researcher then assembled the list into a trait instrument, the EDLTI, was built on a "Likert" scale of 1-5 from the evaluation performed by the EP1.

4. The fourth step was the EP1's evaluation of the list of behaviors that were generated and, where duplication occurred, these behaviors were combined or eliminated. The EP1 submitted the final list to the researcher. The researcher then assembled the list into a behavior instrument, the EDLBI, was built on a "Likert" scale of 1-5 from the evaluation performed by the EP1.
5. The fifth step was to administer the EDLTI, electronically, to full-time employees from several different organizations who represented different levels in these organizations. The next part of this step was to perform descriptive statistical analysis and a "factor analysis" on the data collected.
6. The sixth step was to administer the EDLBI, electronically, to full-time employees from several different organizations who represented different levels in these organizations. The next part of this step was to perform descriptive statistical analysis and a "factor analysis" on the data collected.
7. The final step was to determine the underlying factor structure for the traits and behaviors of an effective developmental leader. A second expert panel, denoted as expert panel number 2 (EP2) was used to assess the factor analysis results and to recommend nomenclature for each trait factor and each behavior factor identified. This EP2 was comprised of three professors from two southern universities and who had at least 15 years of teaching experience along with at least 10 years of business consulting experience.

### **Step 1**

The convenient sample for identifying traits consisted of 57 graduate business school students from two southern universities and who were employees or managers

from several organizations in a southern city. This sample of subjects had a minimum of three years' work experience in a variety of levels within their organization.

Respondents (n = 57) were provided a sheet of paper with instructions and 20 blank lines (as used by previous researchers in leadership), and were asked to list up to 20 traits in words or short phrases of a leader whose orientation is the development of people and the organization. Definitions of effective developmental leadership and the word trait were provided by the researcher. All participants turned in their worksheets for further evaluation by the researcher and a volunteer panel of three graduate business students who were involved in the research study.

From those worksheets, all the responses to the query about the traits of an effective developmental leader were listed on an MS-Excel spreadsheet.

## **Step 2**

The convenient sample for identifying behaviors consisted of 57 graduate business school students from two southern universities and who were employees or managers from several organizations in a southern city. This sample of subjects had a minimum of three years' work experience in a variety of levels within their organization.

Respondents (n = 57) were provided a sheet of paper with instructions and 20 blank lines (as used by previous researchers in leadership), and were asked to list up to 20 behaviors in words or short phrases of a leader whose orientation is the development of people and the organization. Definitions of effective developmental leadership and the word behavior were provided by the researcher. All participants turned in their worksheets for further evaluation by the researcher and a volunteer panel of three graduate business students who were involved in the research study.

From those worksheets, all the responses to the query about the behaviors of an effective developmental leader were listed on an MS-Excel spreadsheet.

### **Step 3**

A panel of four subject-matter experts (EP1) representing one from management in a Fortune 100 organization and three faculty members from two southern universities was formed. The expert panel member from the Fortune 100 organization has 20+ years experience developing and working with leaders in various levels from many different organizations that this panel member has worked for. The three faculty members have extensive experience working with organizations in the development of leaders and also have several years of teaching and researching experience in the area of organizational leadership.

This EP1 removed all duplicates and developed a list of *traits*, from the data collected from the information provided by the 57 respondents. The list of traits, were the perceptions of the 57 respondents of an effective developmental leader. The list of traits was used in an instrument named the Effective Developmental Leader Trait Instrument or EDLTI (see Appendix A).

Definitions of traits of an effective developmental leader, from the researcher, were provided to the EP1 members, each of whom developed a trait list from the 57 participants original list collected in step 1, eliminating duplicates where exact words were used and combining terms where they felt that the traits were clearly synonyms. The panel members worked independent of the other panel members and were allowed to complete the task at their own pace and were given the threshold points as explained later in this chapter. The panel members then submitted their draft list to determine the traits that were to be included in the instrument. After all of the trait

items were listed from all the panel members and agreed upon by the panel, they were given an opportunity, to look back over the list individually to make any changes that seemed appropriate. After changes were made the final list was sent out to each panel member for comments. This is a Delphi approach to developing a final list of traits.

A final list of traits of an effective developmental leader was developed into a survey instrument utilizing a 5-point Likert type scale. This instrument was labeled the Effective Developmental Leader Trait Instrument (EDLTI). The EDLTI was constructed to measure level of agreement for each of the trait items listed. The Likert Scale of 1-5 was constructed so that a rating of 1 indicated strong disagreement that the trait item is characteristic of an EDL, a rating of 2 indicated disagreement that the trait item is characteristic of an EDL, a rating of 3 indicated uncertainty that the trait item is characteristic of an EDL, a rating of 4 indicated agreement that the trait item is characteristic of an EDL, and a rating of 5 indicated strong agreement that the trait item is characteristic of an EDL.

#### **Step 4**

A panel of four subject matter experts (EP1) representing one from management in a Fortune 100 organization and three faculty members from two southern universities was formed. The expert panel member from the Fortune 100 organization has 20+ years experience developing and working with leaders in various levels from many different organizations that this panel member has worked for. The three faculty members have extensive experience working with organizations in the development of leaders and also have several years of teaching and researching experience in the area of organizational leadership.

This EP1 removed all duplicates and developed a list of *behaviors* from the information provided by the 57 respondents of an effective developmental leader. The list of behaviors was used in an instrument named the Effective Developmental Leader Behavior Instrument or EDLBI (see Appendix B).

Definitions of behaviors of an effective developmental leader, from the researcher, were provided to the EP1 members, each of whom developed a behavior list from the 57 participants original list collected in step 1, eliminating duplicates where exact words were used and combining terms where they felt that the behaviors were clearly synonyms. The panel members worked independent of the other panel members and were allowed to complete the task at their own pace and were given the threshold points as explained later in this chapter. The panel members then submitted their draft list to determine the behaviors that were to be included in the instrument. After all of the behavior items were listed from all the panel members and agreed upon by the panel, they were given an opportunity, individually, to look back over the list to make any changes that seemed appropriate. After changes were made the final list was sent out to the each panel member for comments. This is a Delphi approach to developing a final list of behaviors.

A final list of behaviors of an effective developmental leader was developed into a survey instrument utilizing a 5-point Likert type scale. This instrument was labeled the Effective Developmental Leader Behavior Instrument (EDLBI). The EDLBI was constructed to measure level of agreement for each of the behavior items listed. The Likert Scale of 1-5 was constructed so that a rating of 1 indicated strong disagreement that the behavior item is characteristic of an EDL, a rating of 2 indicated disagreement that the behavior item is characteristic of an EDL, a rating of 3 indicated

uncertainty that the behavior item is characteristic of an EDL, a rating of 4 indicated agreement that the behavior item is characteristic of an EDL, and a rating of 5 indicated strong agreement that the behavior item is characteristic of an EDL.

### **Step 5**

The sample for the administration of the electronic (MS-Excel) EDLTI consisted of 750 participants representing by the employee level and the management level from several different organizations in a southern city. These employees and managers had a minimum of three years work experience in a variety of levels within their organization. The EDLTI measured the level of agreement as to how characteristic each *trait* is of an effective developmental leader.

Respondents (n = 750) were provided the Likert scale Effective Developmental Leader Trait Instrument (EDLTI, see Appendix A) electronically by e-mail. There was an instruction page (see Appendix C) and a consent page (see Appendix D) stating “by completing and submitting the EDLTI you are granting permission to the researcher to use this data, and that samples will be coded so that the identity of the respondents will be protected”. The respondents returned the completed EDLTI electronically to the researcher by e-mail. From these EDLTI responses, descriptive statistics and factor analysis were performed to determine the key traits of an effective developmental leader.

### **Step 6**

The sample for the administration of the electronic (MS-Excel) EDLTI consisted of 750 participants representing by the employee level and the management level from several different organizations in a southern city. These employees and managers had a minimum of three years work experience in a variety of levels within

their organization. The EDLBI measured the level of agreement as to how characteristic each behavior is of an effective developmental leader.

Respondents (n = 750) were provided with the Likert scale Effective Developmental Leader Behavior Instrument (EDLBI, see Appendix B) electronically by e-mail. There was an instruction page (see Appendix C) and a consent page (see Appendix D) stating “by completing and submitting the EDLBI you are granting permission to the researcher to use this data, and that samples will be coded so that the identity of the respondents will be protected”. The respondents returned the completed EDLBI electronically to the researcher by e-mail. From these EDLBI responses, descriptive statistics and factor analysis were performed to determine the key behaviors of an effective developmental leader.

### **Step 7**

The sample size was 750 participants who represented by full-time employees and managers were administered the EDLTI and EDLBI instruments. There were 669 completed EDLTIs and 669 completed EDLBIs. In this step, all these responses were analyzed to determine the trait factors and the behavior factors. Following the analysis, a report on the findings was made, in both this dissertation and to the participating subjects.

The data collected using the two instruments, the EDLTI and the EDLBI, were analyzed using the SPSS statistical program. Instruments that had more than 10 percent of the items not assessed were omitted and, where less than 10 percent of the items were not assessed, the mean was substituted for the omitted value.

From the data collected, the participants were described on selected demographic characteristics. The selected demographics were chosen based on the

descriptors in the instruments and were also believed to reveal the diverse characteristics of the participants. The demographic descriptors were; age, gender, work experience in years, organizational size, working level in their organization, ethnicity, organizational type, and training type received or not received.

### **Target Population and Accessibility**

Target population: Experienced employees of organizations.

Accessible Population: This convenience sample came from two leadership classes in two different southern universities at the beginning of the semester. These business students are full-time employees or managers from several organizations in a southern city and have at least three years' working experience.

### **Data Collection**

The process for conducting the study was to request permission from the participants in a graduate business leadership course at two universities in a southern city and from the leaders of accessible organizations to administer the instruments to their volunteer participants electronically. The leaders of accessible organizations were chosen randomly from a list of organizations in the southern city.

The instruments used to collect the data were the Effective Developmental Leader Trait Instrument (EDLTI) and the Effective Developmental Leader Behavior Instrument (EDLBI). The EDLTI and EDLBI were submitted in electronic format on MS Excel. The EDLTI and EDLBI were generated in steps three and four of the data collection process. The two instruments utilized a Likert type 5-point scale to measure the level of agreement with each trait and each behavior listed on the respective instruments

The subjects were asked to participate and complete the instruments (EDLTI and EDLBI) electronically on MS Excel spreadsheets. Each instrument had a statement informing the participant that by submitting this data electronically that they are agreeing to participate in the study. Each instrument in each step took approximately 30 minutes to complete.

The trait data and behavior data of an effective developmental leader were collected from 669 volunteer employees and managers from several organizations in a southern city. The EDLTI and EDLBI were administered electronically on an MS Excel spreadsheet and the respondents were assured of data confidentiality.

### **Selection of Analysis Methodology**

Analysis of collected data required some judgment decisions to be made as to which data were useful and which were not. Data determined to be useful for this study were used in the construction of the EDLTI and EDLBI instruments and in the final analysis.

Determining the selection of useful data required that procedures needed to be established with decision or threshold points. A pragmatic approach (guided by practical experience) was used in determining the threshold points and in deciding data factors to be used in various stages of collection and analysis. Threshold points were determined to be (1) when the expert panel decided on the final list of traits and final list of behaviors, (2) when choosing which traits and which behaviors identified by the expert panel were to be used in the construction of the instruments, (3) when deciding what was acceptable instrument completion level, and (4) when deciding what would be the numerical level of the acceptable mean score for each trait and each behavior.

## **Threshold Analysis**

In performing the analysis, there were several threshold points to be considered in order to evaluate the data; (1) in the case of the submitted lists of traits and behaviors from the EP1 members, each list was compared to the other three expert panel members for duplicate elimination of traits and of behaviors in the final list, (2) the threshold used was that three members of the expert panel had to agree on a trait or behavior for that trait or behavior to be included in the draft list. In other words, a 75 percent agreement had to be reached for a trait or behavior initially to be included in the draft instruments. By the same token, for a trait or behavior to be eliminated, three members of the EP1 had to have listed that trait or behavior for elimination. That meant a necessity of a 75 percent agreement for elimination.

(3) Another threshold which had to be decided upon was to determine the usefulness of the data returned on the instruments for analysis. The returned instruments had to have no more than 10 percent of the items not completed, and it could not appear that the subject did not read each item and had just placed numbers in the response column. For example, if a subject placed all 1's or all 5's for each item then this completed instrument would be eliminated from the analysis. Further, if more than 10 percent of the items were left blank on a completed instrument, it would be eliminated. When 10 percent or fewer of the items had been left blank or not completed, the mean would be substituted for those blank items.

(4) The final threshold used was the selection of traits and the selection of behaviors to be included in the factor analysis. The threshold point for this was a mean score of 3.51 or greater on a scale of 1 to 5. All traits or behaviors that had a mean score of less than 3.51 were therefore eliminated from the factor analysis and

would not be included as a sub-factor in the final analysis. The mean score of 3.51 or greater was chosen because this is slightly greater than halfway between a score of 3 and a score of 4. In Likert scale terms, this meant that there would be a slightly stronger score that fell between “uncertain”, a 3, and “agree”, a 4. Use of the mean score of 3.51 or greater would give a score that is on the side of agreement, whereas a score of 3.5 could be on the side of either “uncertain” or “agree”, and therefore ambiguous. Thus, the 3.51 mean score would be required for each trait and each behavior to be included in the factor analysis in determining the specific traits and specific behaviors of an effective developmental leader.

## **Chapter 4: Findings**

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to answer the question, what are the traits and behaviors of an effective developmental leader whose primary focus is the development of the people and the organization he or she leads? Therefore, this study attempted to identify the traits and behaviors of leaders who possess an effective developmental orientation towards people. The objectives of this study were as follows:

Objective 1: Identify the traits of effective developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U.S. city.

Objective 2: Identify the behaviors of effective developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U.S. city.

Objective 3: Determine the key traits and key behaviors of effective developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U.S. city.

### **Demographics of Survey Study Participants**

A total of 669 out of the 750 study participants submitted completed surveys considered to have useful data. Useful data consisted of a survey that was returned had no more than 10 percent of the items not completed. Additionally, it could not appear that the participants did not read each item and had just placed numbers in the response column. From the data collected, these study participants were described on selected demographic characteristics. The selected demographics were chosen based on the descriptors in the instruments and were also believed to reveal the diverse characteristics of the participants. The first characteristic on which study participants

were described was age. The reported ages of study participants ranged from a low of 18 to a high of 65 years. Because one of the criteria for participation in the study was that the individual had completed a minimum of three years of work experience, any respondent who reported his or her age as less than 21 was contacted by email and by phone to verify the accuracy of his or her data on the measurements of age and years of work experience. No inaccuracies were found. The mean age of study participants was 34.8 years (standard deviation = 11.6).

The next demographic characteristic on which study participants were described was gender. The returned instruments used in the final analysis included 380 completed by males and 289 completed by females. This represented 56.8 percent of the study participants that were males and 43.2 percent that were females.

Another characteristic on which study participants were described was number of years of work experience. Study participants represented a wide range of years of work experience. This variable was measured as categories of work experience in the study instrument.

**Table 1: Years of Work Experience Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Years of Work Experience of Full-time Employees</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
5 or less	196	29.3
6-10	155	23.2
11-20	138	20.6
21-30	112	16.7
> 30	68	10.2
Total	669	100.0

The largest group of study participants indicated that they had less than 5 years of work experience ( $\underline{n}$  = 196, 29.3%). In addition, the majority of study participants ( $\underline{n}$  = 351, 52.5%) reported 10 years or less of work experience. However, more than 10

percent ( $n = 68$ , 10.2%) indicated that they had more than 30 years of work experience (see Table 1).

Study participants were also described on the size of the organization that employed them. This characteristic was operationalized as the total number of employees of the organization by checking the most appropriate category from the following available responses: < 100 employees, 101 to 500 employees, 501 to 1,000 employees, 1,001 to 10,000 employees, and more than 10,000 employees. The category that the greatest number of study participants reported was < 100 employees ( $n = 285$ , 42.6%). In addition, 149 (22.3%) reported that they worked for organizations that employed 101 to 500 employees. Fewer than 10 percent ( $n = 59$ , 8.8%) indicated that they worked for organizations that employed more than 10,000 people (see Table 2).

**Table 2: Number of Employees in the Employing Organization Reported by Full-Time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Category of # of Employees in the Organization</b>	<b><math>n</math></b>	<b>%</b>
<100 employees	285	42.6
100-500	149	22.3
501-1000	74	11.1
1001-10000	102	15.2
> 10000	59	8.8
Total	669	100.0

Information was also sought from study participants regarding their working level within the organization. To measure this variable, study participants were asked to indicate at which of the following levels they considered themselves to be currently working: Executive, Upper Management, Middle Management, Supervisor, or Employee. Almost half ( $n = 305$ , 45.6%) of the study participants considered themselves to be at the “Employee” level within the organization. The response that

was reported by the smallest group of study participants was the “Executive” level ( $n = 48$ , 7.2%). Overall, the majority ( $n = 364$ , 54.4%) of the study participants considered themselves to be at a level of leadership (“Supervisor” or higher) within the organization (see Table 3).

**Table 3: Working Level of Study Participants in their Organization Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Category of Working Level</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Employee	305	45.6
Supervisor	137	20.5
Middle Management	122	18.2
Upper Management	57	8.5
Executive	48	7.2
Total	669	100.0

Regarding the ethnicity of study participants, the majority ( $n = 471$ , 70.4%) indicated that they were Caucasian. The proportions of study participants who reported their ethnicity as Hispanic ( $n = 71$ , 10.6%) and African-American ( $n = 70$ , 10.5%) were very similar (see Table 4).

**Table 4: Ethnicity of the Study Participants Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Category of Ethnicity</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Caucasian	471	70.4
Hispanic	71	10.6
African American	70	10.5
Asian	32	4.8
Native American	16	2.4
Other <sup>a</sup>	9	1.3
Total	669	100.0

<sup>a</sup> “Other” category was one that the respondent did not specify.

The type of organization which the study participants were employed was another characteristic on which they were described. Study participants were provided with the following options and asked to select the type of organization that most

accurately described their employer: “Profit,” “Non-Profit,” “Military,” “Education,” and “Other.” The majority of study participants ( $n = 438$ , 65.6%) indicated that they worked for a “Profit” type organization. The next largest response category was “Education” with 112 (16.7%) reporting this type of organization (see Table 5). Individuals who indicated “Other” type of organization were contacted and asked to specify the “Other” type of organization. All 39 (5.8%) study participants who reported “Other” specified “Government” as the “Other” type of organization.

**Table 5: Category of Participant’s Organization Type Reported by Full-time Employees participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Category of Organization Type</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Profit	438	65.6
Education	112	16.7
Non-Profit	61	9.1
Other <sup>a</sup>	39	5.8
Military	19	2.8
Total	669	100.0

<sup>a</sup> “Other” responses specified were “Government”

Study participants were asked to indicate whether or not they had previously participated in selected types of training. The types of training included “Leadership,” “Management,” “Executive,” and “Supervisor,” and study participants were asked to indicate whether or not they had participated in each of the types of training listed.

**Table 6: Category of Study Participants and Different Types of Training Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Category of Training</b>	<b>Attended</b>		<b>Did Not Attend</b>		<b>Totals</b>
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	
Leadership	389	58.1	280	41.9	669/100%
Management	289	43.2	380	56.8	669/100%
Supervisor	177	26.5	492	73.5	669/100%
Executive	79	11.8	590	88.2	669/100%

The type of training reported by the largest number of study participants was “Leadership” training ( $n = 389$ , 58.1%). The type of training reported by the smallest number of study participants was “Executive” training ( $n = 79$ , 11.8%) (see Table 6).

### **Objective 1**

Identify the traits of effective developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U.S. city.

An initial list of traits of effective developmentally oriented leaders was constructed from input provided by a sample of individuals employed in a variety of organizations in a southern U.S. city, and representing different levels in an organization and number of years of experience. The 57 subjects (who were all full-time employees representing several different types of organizations and were also graduate business school students) were asked to brainstorm and write down words and phrases that they believed to be traits of an effective developmental leader. An operational definition for an effective developmental leader was provided (see Appendix A).

The initial list consisted of 226 traits. However, when the list was carefully examined by the researcher and prior to submitting to expert panel number 1 (EP1), 45 duplicate items were identified and removed from the list that was to be included in the instrument. This winnowing process resulted in 181 traits, which were used to form the first draft of the “Trait” instrument (see Table 7).

**Table 7: Initial List of Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Initial List of Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader</b>		
ability to assess others	educator	opportunistic
ability to make recommendations	effective communication	optimistic
ability to stand by decisions	efficient	organizational

**Table 7 continued:**

<b>Initial List of Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader</b>		
ability to teach	efficient & effective	organized
able to organize people	eloquent	outspoken
accommodating	emotional	passionate
accountability	emotionally intelligent	patient
active	empathetic	patient demeanor
adaptable	empowering	people oriented
aggressive	enabling	perceptive
agreeable	encouraging	persistent
alluring	enduring	personable
analytical	energetic	persuasive
approachable	engaging personality	poise
appropriate	ethical	positive
assertive	experienced	powerful/strong
authoritative	facilitator	practical
balance	fair	pragmatic
believes in others	fast-thinking	prepared
big picture	fearless	proactive
bold	flexible	productive
broad skills	focused	proud
calm and poised speech	forward thinking	provides clarity
caring	genuinely invested	quick on the draw
challenger	goal-oriented	rational
charismatic	good communicator	realistic
clear	good evaluator	respectful
coaching	good listener	responsible
coherent	hard working	risky
committed	helpful	role model
communicative	high moral standard	self-confident
compassionate	honest	self-disciplined
competent	idealistic	self-motivated
competitive	influential	skilled in time management
complex-thinker	innovative and creative	smart
concentrated	insightful	sociable
confident	inspirational	straight forward
conscientious of employee's abilities	intelligent	strategic
considerate	interesting	strong
consistent	intuitive	successful
contemporary thinking	justice	supportive
control	knowledgeable	sympathetic
cooperative	listener	tact
courageous	listening skills	tactful
creative	loyal	teach by doing
critical thinker	loyalty	teacher
decisive	magnetic	team oriented
dedicated	mediator	thinker
demanding	modesty	thinks outside the box

**Table 7 continued:**

<b>Initial List of Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader</b>		
dependable	moral	trusting
determined	motivating	trustworthy
developer	motivator	unbiased
devil's advocate	negotiator	understanding
diligent	non-abrasive tone	understands company's direction
direct	not a micro-manager	unprejudiced
disciplined	not swayed by adversity	visionary
diverse	nurturing	welcoming
down to earth	objectivity	well spoken
driven	observant	willing to give responsibility to others
dynamic	open-minded	willingness
easy going		

The list of 181 trait items were examined by a three volunteer graduate student team (VGT) to verify that the items were entered into the electronic file and were exactly the same as the items provided by the initial 57 participants in handwritten form. The VGT individuals were full-time employees who work for three different organizations at different working levels. One was a manager, the second an employee, and the third in upper management. These three individuals had work experience ranging from 7 to 20 years and represented three different industries. They were provided handwritten hard copies of the brainstormed lists and an electronic file. Any errors identified were corrected, and questionable items were re-examined by the researcher to verify the accuracy of the instrument.

The finalized version of the draft instrument was then submitted to the EP1 consisting of four individuals who have extensive experience in corporate environments and in leadership positions-two professors of management who teach leadership courses, one professor of managerial communication, and one senior vice-president of a Fortune 100 corporation with 20+ years of work experience. The

professorial members of the panel have teaching experience exceeding 10 years and business consulting experience in the area of leadership and management exceeding 5 years. One leadership professor and one managerial communications professor were from a private southern university, while the other professorial member of the committee was from a private southern liberal arts university.

The members of the EP1 were chosen on the basis of their teaching and/or work experience in the area of leadership and management. They came from two different universities and a major corporation so as to provide a diverse perspective when evaluating the trait words and trait phrases listed by the full-time employees who were also graduate business school students.

The EP1 was asked to examine the items included in the instrument and to make the following recommendations:

1. Identify any items they perceived to be duplicates of another.
2. Identify any items they perceived to be more accurately identified as a behavior rather than a trait.
3. Identify any items that they perceived to be synonyms, where two or more words or phrases say the same thing.

Each of the four members of EP1 submitted his or her complete review of the list of traits. Each panel member reviewed each trait to ensure that it was a trait and not a behavior. The list was then compared for congruency of suggested inclusion items and exclusion items. The list of traits from each EP1 member was compared to the other three for the final list of traits and of behaviors. The threshold used for this process was that three of the members of the EP1 would have to agree on a trait and only then would that trait be included in the draft list. This meant that the panel had to

reach a 75 percent agreement for a trait to be included initially in the draft list. This action resulted in a list of 84 trait items, which were then submitted to the EP1 for a second review for suggestions.

The EP1 returned the lists of 84 trait items and, again, comparisons were made from the four sets of suggestions. The EP1 found 9 trait items that should fall out of the list of 84 because they were direct synonyms that were over looked on the first review and analysis by the panel. There was a 75 percent agreement (consensus) on the exclusion of these 9 items; therefore, these items fell into the previously established threshold point used for exclusion. This resulted in a final list of 75 traits included that would constitute “the effective developmental leader trait instrument” (EDLTI).

Once the final list of traits of an effective developmental leader was established (see Table 8), the list was used to build the instrument (See Appendix A for the EDLTI) to measure the level of agreement that each trait item describes a leader whose orientation is that of developing further growth and performance of the people and organization he or she leads.

The instrument was assembled by using MS-Excel to facilitate the electronic collection and analysis of data. Named the EDLTI (Appendix A) for “Effective Developmental Leader Trait Instrument,” it was distributed to the 750 study participants.

The threshold to determine usefulness of the data returned on the instruments for analysis was that the returned instruments had to have no more than 10 percent of the items not completed, and there could not be an appearance that the subject completed the survey without reading the items. For example, if a subject placed all

1's or all 5's for each item, then this completed instrument would be eliminated from the analysis. Further, if more than 10 percent of the items were left blank, then this completed instrument would be eliminated. When 10 percent or fewer of the items were left blank or not completed, the mean would be substituted for those blank items. Consequently, of the 750 distributed instruments, 669 were useful.

**Table 8: Final List of Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader to be Included in the Survey Instrument and Administered to Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Final List of Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader</b>		
able to organize people	down to earth	opportunistic
active	driven	organized
aggressive	easy going	outspoken
agreeable	efficient	passionate
alluring	efficient & effective	patient
analytical	eloquent	patient demeanor
assertive	emotional	perceptive
authoritative	enduring	persistent
bold	energetic	personable
broad skills	engaging personality	poise
calm and poised speech	fast-thinking	powerful/strong
charismatic	fearless	practical
coherent	focused	pragmatic
competitive	hard working	prepared
complex-thinker	helpful	productive
concentrated	honest	proud
consistent	idealistic	rational
contemporary thinking	interesting	realistic
control	justice	risky
cooperative	loyal	sociable
dedicated	loyalty	strong
demanding	magnetic	tact
dependable	modesty	teach by doing
devil's advocate	non-abrasive tone	well spoken
disciplined	not a micro-manager	willingness

Each returned instrument was given a numerical code, and the data from the useable returned instruments (669) were compiled with the individual instrument scores placed in a column in a MS-Excel spreadsheet. Means and standard deviations were computed for each of the 75 items in the trait scale. The threshold used for the selection of traits to be included in further analysis was a mean score of 3.51 or greater

on a scale of 1 to 5. All traits that had a mean score of less than 3.51 would therefore be eliminated from the trait instrument and would not be included in the additional analysis of the data.

The mean score of 3.51 or greater was chosen because this figure is slightly greater than halfway between a score of 3 and a score of 4. This would indicate a score that would be slightly on the agree side on the Likert-scale. This determination would give a score that is on the side of agreement, whereas a score of 3.5 would be interpreted as “uncertain,” and therefore ambiguous. Thus, the 3.51 mean score would be required for each trait to be included in the factor analysis to determine the trait factors of an effective developmental leader.

The mean of each item was reviewed for meeting the threshold of a minimum of 3.51. Any trait that did not receive at least an “agree” mean score of 3.51 or greater was eliminated from subsequent analysis. As a result, 63 traits were included in the EDLTI, with 12 traits being eliminated from the 75 in the survey instrument. The 75 traits from the EDLTI with associated mean and standard deviation for each item are presented in Table 9.

Therefore, the 669 study participants agreed (rating of 3.51 or higher) that 63 traits are indicative of an effective developmental leader. The original list of 181 traits was narrowed to a list of 75 traits by the EP1. These traits characteristic of an effective developmental leader was refined to 63 traits by the participant’s response on the EDLTI and were included in further analysis of the data. These 63 trait items were included in the factor analysis to be addressed in objective 3 of this study.

**Table 9: Mean Ratings of Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

Mean and Standard Deviation Scores from Study Participants					
Trait Variable	Mean*	S.D.	Trait Variable	Mean*	S.D.
dependable	4.54	0.72	fast-thinking	3.99	0.88
dedicated	4.51	0.66	patient demeanor	3.98	0.85
able to organize people	4.51	0.67	charismatic	3.96	0.94
honest	4.48	0.74	concentrated	3.96	0.88
hard working	4.48	0.69	justice	3.95	0.94
productive	4.41	0.64	not a micro-manager	3.94	0.96
coherent	4.41	0.71	sociable	3.89	0.88
efficient & effective	4.39	0.71	complex-thinker	3.88	0.95
focused	4.38	0.66	down to earth	3.87	0.97
organized	4.38	0.75	poise	3.85	0.86
consistent	4.34	0.80	opportunistic	3.83	0.99
helpful	4.34	0.73	non-abrasive tone	3.80	0.96
prepared	4.34	0.73	pragmatic	3.77	0.84
willingness	4.27	0.76	strong	3.76	0.93
loyal	4.25	0.82	enduring	3.76	0.89
efficient	4.24	0.81	contemporary thinking	3.69	0.95
disciplined	4.23	0.76	control	3.68	1.01
loyalty	4.22	0.80	competitive	3.67	1.01
cooperative	4.20	0.84	powerful/strong	3.67	0.97
perceptive	4.19	0.77	bold	3.66	0.96
realistic	4.19	0.80	authoritative	3.64	1.05
rational	4.19	0.80	outspoken	3.62	1.00
persistent	4.17	0.74	interesting	3.58	0.98
assertive	4.16	0.81	agreeable	3.56	0.96
active	4.14	0.82	eloquent	3.51	0.94
broad skills	4.14	0.85	idealistic	3.50	1.00
teach by doing	4.13	0.83	modesty	3.49	1.01
driven	4.12	0.89	magnetic	3.48	0.97
well spoken	4.12	0.75	demanding	3.47	1.08
energetic	4.12	0.78	easy going	3.46	1.09
engaging personality	4.12	0.79	proud	3.46	1.02
calm and poised speech	4.12	0.86	aggressive	3.44	1.04
patient	4.11	0.83	fearless	3.42	1.07
passionate	4.11	0.86	risky	3.30	1.06
personable	4.09	0.86	devil's advocate	3.21	1.13
practical	4.06	0.76	alluring	3.19	1.09
tact	4.04	0.83	emotional	2.89	1.11
analytical	4.02	0.85			

\*Mean score is from Likert type scale of: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = uncertain; 4 = agree; and 5 = strongly agree.

## **Objective 2**

Identify the behaviors of effective developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U.S. city.

An initial list of behaviors of effective developmentally oriented leaders was constructed from input provided by a sample of individuals employed in a variety of organizations in a southern U.S. city, and representing different levels in an organization and number of years of experience. The 57 subjects were asked to brainstorm and write down words and phrases that they believed to be behaviors of an effective developmental leader. An operational definition for an effective developmental leader was provided (see Appendix B).

The initial list consisted of 324 behaviors. However, when the researcher carefully examined the list, 64 duplicate items were identified and removed from the list that was to be included in the instrument. This elimination process resulted in 260 behaviors, which were used to form the first draft of the “Behavior” instrument (see Table 10.)

The list of 260 behavior items was carefully examined by a volunteer graduate student team (VGT) of three individuals to verify that the items, as they were entered into the electronic file, were exactly the same as the items provided by the initial panel in handwritten form. The VGT individuals were full-time employees who worked for three different organizations at different working levels. One was a manager, the second an employee, and the third in upper management. These three individuals had work experience ranging from 7 to 20 years and represented three different industries. They were provided the handwritten hard copies of the brainstormed lists and the

electronic file. Any errors identified were corrected, and questionable items were re-examined by the researcher to verify the accuracy of the instrument.

**Table 10: Initial List of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Initial List of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader</b>	
accepts others' ideas	involved in community
accepts responsibility	involves everyone in the organization
acknowledges achievement and effort	is creative and innovative
active multi-tasker	is proactive
acts calm	keeps a competitive edge
acts globally	keeps his/herself updated on current events and technologies
acts positively	knows how and when to relax
acts professionally	laughs/ relaxes
adaptive to changing environments	leads by example
addresses other team members' issues or problems	learns about others
admits mistakes	learns before doing or teaching
advocates the "we" and not the "i" in team	lends a helping hand/voice
aggressive	leverages diversity
allocates resources	listens to others
allows others to share the credit	maintains focus
always questions	makes a difference
always willing to help others	makes decisions
answers questions/concerns	makes himself available
appears confident	makes others feel worthwhile
appears in charge	motivates
appreciates	motivates others
approachable	moves/acts on a unified front
asks for feedback	never stops learning
asks questions	not afraid of failure
assertive	nurtures creative ideas
assesses independently	open door policy
assigns duties	open-minded
assumes responsibility	organized
attentive	outspoken
aware of company culture and leads in that direction	passionate
behaves responsibly	passionate activity outside of work
builds leaders	patiently
builds teams	people-oriented

**Table 10 continued:**

<b>Initial List of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader</b>	
by actions and words	perceptive
calmly	personable (friendly)
cares about others' welfare	playful
charismatic	pleasant
challenges others	polite
classy	positions individuals for success
comforts	praises/ rewards
communicates openly	precise
compliments	predicts needs
confident not cocky	pride and diligence in accomplishing goals
constantly models desired actions, but not "flaky"	proactive
convincing	professional
cooperative	promotes cooperation
courteous	promotes growth / innovation / values
creates a friendly atmosphere	proud
creates a positive environment	provides the necessary resources for the team to succeed
creates benchmarks/standards	provides advice
creates comfortable working atmosphere	provides clarity
creates solutions	punctual
credits ideas of others	rational
deals aggressively with conflicts/problems in a vigorous manner	reacts
decides with finality	reads into others
decision maker	recognizes and rewards others
decisive	recognizes talent
deep	reflective
delegates	relies on followers
delegates authorities	removes barriers
delegates tasks to proper party	represents group
delegating responsibilities	respectful
desire to change and be changed	respectful of others
detects strengths	respects others' time
determines needs	responds
develops others	responsible
develops strategies and actions	rewards people
director	role model
directs	says thank you
does not assign blame	seeks knowledge
does not judge	seeks to understand
don't quit mentality	sees opportunities

**Table 10 continued:**

<b>Initial List of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader</b>	
down to earth rather than better than the rest	self-controlling
driven	sets attainable goals
educates	sets clear goals
effective organizer	sets examples/standards
efficient	sets the vision
embraces change	shares the work
embraces new ideas	shares knowledge
emphasizes key words	shares vision and knowledge
empowers others	sharp
encourages	shows diligence
encourages development of leadership skills	shows genuine concern
encourages participation	shows sense of urgency
encourages personal growth	sincere
encouraging	sincere with himself and others
energizes	smiles and cordial
enjoys the company of others	solicits input
enriching	solves problems
establishes goals	speaks clearly and concisely
evaluates all options	speaks out
evaluates talent	stands accountable
excellent communication skills	stands tall
facilitates	stands tall and never slouches
facilitates creativity	stays on course
facilitates problems	stays positive
finds common grounds	straightforward
firm handshake	strategic
focused	strives for success
follows through	strives to be the best
forms goals/strategies	suggests improvement
fosters growth	sympathetic
free flowing with information	takes blame
gathers all information	takes chances
gets involved	takes charge
gives and receives feedback openly	takes risks
gives and solicits feedback	teacher
gives back to community	team oriented
gives constructive criticism	thinks about their team
gives credit to others	thinks outside the box
gives feedback	thorough
gives personal attention	timely
good communicator	trusting of others

**Table 10 continued:**

<b>Initial List of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader</b>	
good listener	unconventional
hard working	understands feelings
has an open door policy	understands people
heightens morale	understands what motivates
helper	uses resources effectively
helps to resolve conflicts	uses time wisely
holds others accountable	values contributions
humble	values others' opinion
humble yet aggressive	walks the talk
improves morale of employees	well prepared
includes others	well thought-out
inclusive	willing to help
informs	willingly supports employees
inquisitive	with resolve
inspires others	works efficiently
interacts with others	works well with others
introduces concepts/ideas	worrier

The finalized version of the draft instrument was then submitted to the EP1, a panel of experts who have extensive experience in corporate environments and in leadership positions—two professors of management who teach leadership courses, one professor of managerial communication, and one senior vice president of a Fortune 100 corporation with 20+ years of work experience. The professorial members of the panel have teaching experience exceeding 10 years and business consulting experience in the area of leadership and management exceeding 5 years. One leadership professor and one managerial communications professor were from a private southern university, while the other professorial member of the committee was from a private southern liberal arts university.

The members of the EP1 were chosen on the basis of their teaching and/or work experience in the area of leadership and management. They came from two different universities and a major corporation so as to provide a diverse perspective

when evaluating the behavior words and behavior phrases listed by the full-time employees who were also graduate business school students.

These individuals were asked to examine the items included on the instrument and make the following recommendations:

Identify any items they perceived to be duplicates of another.

Identify any items they perceived to be more accurately identified as a trait rather than a behavior.

Identify any items they perceived to be synonyms, where two or more words or phrases say the same thing.

Each of the four members of the EP1 submitted his or her complete review of the list of behaviors. Each panel member reviewed each behavior to ensure that it was a behavior and not a trait. The list was then compared for congruency of suggested inclusion items and exclusion items. The list of behaviors from each EP1 member was compared to the other three for the final list of traits and behaviors. The threshold used for this process was that three members of the EP1 had to agree on a behavior and only then would that behavior be included in the draft list. This meant that the panel had to reach a 75 percent agreement for a behavior to be included initially in the draft list. This action resulted in a list of 115 behavior items, which were then submitted to the EP1 for a second review for suggestions.

The EP1 returned the list of 115 behavior items and, again, comparisons were made from the four sets of suggestions. The EP1 found 21 behavior items that should fall out of the list of 115 because they were direct synonyms that were overlooked on the first review and analysis by the panel. There was a 75 percent agreement (consensus) on the exclusion of these 21 items; therefore, these items fell into the

previously established threshold point used for exclusion. This resulted in a final list of 94 behavior items included in the final list that would constitute “the effective developmental leader behavior instrument” (EDLBI) (see Table 11.)

**Table 11: Final List of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader to be Included in the Survey Instrument and Administered to Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Final List of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader</b>	
acknowledges achievement and effort	humble
acts professionally	improves morale of employees
adaptive to changing environments	informs
addresses other team members issues or problems	inspires others
admits mistakes	involved in community
advocates the “we” and not the “i” in team	is creative and innovative
allocates resources	keeps a competitive edge
always willing to help others	learns about others
appears confident	lends a helping hand/voice
appears in charge	motivates
approachable	not afraid of failure
asks for feedback	open-minded
assertive	organized
assumes responsibility	passionate
aware of company culture and leads in that direction	positions individuals for success
builds leaders	predicts needs
cares about others’ welfare	proactive
challenges others	promotes cooperation
charismatic	provides the necessary resources for the team to succeed
communicates openly	provides advice
convincing	recognizes talent
cooperative	reflective
courteous	removes barriers
creates comfortable working atmosphere	respectful
creates solutions	risk taker
decisive	role model
delegates authority	seeks knowledge
determines needs	seeks to understand
develops others	sees opportunities
develops strategies and actions	sets clear goals
directs	sets the vision
efficient	shares vision and knowledge
empowers others	shows genuine concern
energizes	shows sense of urgency
establishes goals	solves problems
evaluates all options	speaks out

**Table 11 continued:**

<b>Final List of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader</b>	
evaluates talent	stays positive
facilitates	straightforward
focused	strategic
follows through	strives for success
fosters growth	team oriented
gathers all information	thinks outside the box
gets involved	thorough
gives and solicits feedback	timely
hard working	trusting
has an open door policy	uses resources effectively
helps to resolve conflicts	willingly supports employees

Once the list of behaviors of an effective developmental leader, had been established, this list was used to build the instrument (See appendix B for the EDLBI). This instrument was designed to measure the level of agreement that each behavior item describes a leader whose orientation is that of developing further growth and performance in the people and the organization he or she leads.

The instrument was assembled by using MS-Excel to facilitate the electronic collection and analysis of data. Named the EDLBI (Appendix B) for “Effective Developmental Leader Behavior Instrument,” it was distributed to the 750 study participants.

The threshold to determine usefulness of the data returned on the instruments for analysis was that the returned instruments had to have no more than 10 percent of the items not completed, and there could not be an appearance that the subject completed the instrument without reading each item. For example, if a subject placed all 1’s or all 5’s for each item, then this completed instrument would be eliminated from the analysis. Further, if more than 10 percent of the items were left blank, then this completed instrument would be eliminated. When there were 10 percent or fewer

of the items left blank or not completed, then the mean would be substituted for those blank items. Consequently, of the 750 distributed instruments, 669 were useful.

Each returned instrument was given a numerical code, and the data from the useable returned instruments (669) were compiled with the individual instrument scores placed in a column in a new MS-Excel spreadsheet. Means and standard deviations were computed for each of the 94 items in the behavior scale. The mean of each item was reviewed for meeting the threshold of a minimum of 3.51. The threshold used for the selection of behaviors to be included in the subsequent analysis was a mean score of 3.51 or greater on a scale of 1 to 5. All behaviors that had a mean score of less than 3.51 would therefore be eliminated from the behavior instrument and would not be included in further analysis of the data.

The mean score of 3.51 or greater was chosen because this is slightly greater than halfway between a score of 3 and a score of 4. This would indicate a score that would be slightly on the agree side on the Likert-scale. This determination would give a score that is on the side of agreement, whereas a score of 3.5 would be interpreted as “uncertain,” and therefore ambiguous. Thus, the 3.51 mean score would be required for each behavior to be included in the factor analysis to determine the behavior factor of an effective developmental leader.

The mean of each item was reviewed for meeting the threshold of a minimum of 3.51. Any behavior that did not receive at least a agreement (3.51 or greater) was eliminated from subsequent analysis. This process resulted in no behavior items (see Table 12) falling out of the initial list of 94 behavior items in the EDLBI.

Therefore, according to the 669 study participants, 94 behavior items emerged that are indicative of an effective developmental leader based on a participant’s level

of agreement of 3.51 or greater. As a result of these procedures, the original list of 260 behaviors, which the EP1 narrowed to a list of 94 behaviors, characteristic of an effective developmental leader, was included in further analysis of the data. These 94 behavior items were included in the factor analysis to be addressed in objective 3 of this study.

**Table 12: Mean Ratings of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader as Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader</b>					
<b>Behavior Variable</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>Behavior Variable</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>S.D.</b>
assumes responsibility	4.59	0.65	shares vision and knowledge	4.27	0.80
adaptive to changing environments	4.50	0.72	shows genuine concern	4.27	0.83
advocates the “we” and not the “i” in team	4.49	0.70	allocates resources	4.27	0.80
team oriented	4.48	0.69	aware of company culture and leads in that direction	4.27	0.81
uses resources effectively	4.48	1.69	provides advice	4.27	0.76
thinks outside the box	4.48	0.71	sets the vision	4.26	0.79
acknowledges achievement and effort	4.48	0.76	proactive	4.26	0.79
appears confident	4.46	0.66	energizes	4.26	0.80
open-minded	4.44	0.71	learns about others	4.25	0.81
organized	4.44	0.72	role model	4.24	0.81
willingly supports employees	4.43	0.71	always willing to help others	4.23	0.90
approachable	4.43	0.74	cooperative	4.23	0.81
strives for success	4.43	0.70	helps to resolve conflicts	4.23	0.83
establishes goals	4.42	0.79	informs	4.22	0.78
motivates	4.41	0.69	timely	4.22	0.78
focused	4.41	0.70	is creative and innovative	4.21	0.83
hard working	4.39	0.70	communicates openly	4.21	0.80
provide the necessary resources for the team to succeed	4.38	1.75	delegates authorities	4.21	0.80
stays positive	4.38	0.76	evaluates all options	4.20	0.85
trusting	4.37	0.84	convincing	4.19	0.80
creates comfortable working atmosphere	4.37	0.80	creates solutions	4.19	0.81
gives and solicits feedback	4.37	0.77	directs	4.19	0.83
positions individuals for success	4.36	0.71	keeps a competitive edge	4.18	0.84
recognizes talent	4.36	0.78	straightforward	4.18	0.79
respectful	4.36	0.75	thorough	4.18	0.83
appears in charge	4.34	0.76	courteous	4.16	0.85
decisive	4.34	0.79	develops others	4.16	0.80
follows through	4.34	0.79	empowers others	4.16	0.88

**Table 12 continued:**

<b>Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader</b>					
<b>Behavior Variable</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>Behavior Variable</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>S.D.</b>
improves morale of employees	4.34	0.74	lends a helping hand/voice	4.15	0.81
seeks to understand	4.34	0.80	removes barriers	4.13	0.93
acts professionally	4.33	0.79	address other team members issues or problems	4.11	0.84
admits mistakes	4.33	0.75	determines needs	4.10	0.82
asks for feedback	4.32	0.75	facilitates	4.09	0.83
efficient	4.32	0.79	challenges others	4.09	0.91
inspires others	4.31	0.80	evaluates talent	4.08	0.92
not afraid of failure	4.31	0.78	passionate	4.05	0.85
seeks knowledge	4.31	0.72	gets involved	4.05	0.87
sees opportunities	4.30	0.81	assertive	4.05	0.87
sets clear goals	4.30	0.78	gathers all information	4.04	0.90
solves problems	4.30	0.82	predicts needs	4.03	0.82
strategic	4.29	0.78	speaks out	3.99	0.88
builds leaders	4.29	0.80	reflective	3.94	0.92
cares about others' welfare	4.29	0.75	risk taker	3.85	0.94
develops strategies and actions	4.29	0.87	involved in community	3.78	0.95
fosters growth	4.27	0.78	charismatic	3.74	1.01
has an open door policy	4.27	0.77	humble	3.72	1.09
promotes cooperation	4.27	0.80	shows sense of urgency	3.51	1.13

\*Mean score is from Likert type scale of: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = uncertain; 4 = agree; and 5 = strongly agree.

### **Objective 3**

Determine the specific traits and specific behaviors of effective developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U.S. city.

The data were collected and compiled from 669 study participants who completed the instruments (EDLTI, EDLBI, & Demographics) for the trait and behavior items that met the threshold points for useful data in this study. The data were compiled in MS-Excel spreadsheets, one for trait data, one for behavior data, and one for demographic data.

## Identifying Key Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader

After the 63 traits that met the established criteria for inclusion in the final analysis were identified, the accumulated data were further analyzed to accomplish the third objective of the study: to identify the key traits of an effective developmentally oriented leader. This was accomplished using a factor analysis statistical procedure to determine if each key construct was a trait of an effective developmentally oriented leader. This analysis included the measured traits rated as “agree” (3.51) or higher, as perceived by study participants.

In conducting the factor analysis, the principal components analysis was utilized with a varimax rotation method. The first step in conducting the factor analysis was to determine the optimum number of factors to be extracted from the scale. Using a combination of the latent root criteria, the *a' priori* criteria, and the scree test criteria, the number of factors to be extracted was determined to be six. This number of factors provided the researcher with an analysis that resulted in few substantial cross-loadings and satisfactory loadings on each item in each factor. Further, each factor met the *a' priori* established criteria of a minimum of four items per factor. According to Hair (1987), a loading of a minimum of 0.30 is acceptable for exploratory research.

The results of the factor analysis, including the factor, its label based on the content of the items included in the factor, the percentage of variance explained by each factor, and factor loadings for each of the items in each of the factors. (see Table 13)

**Table 13: Factor Analysis of Traits of an Effective Developmental Leader as Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

Rotated Component Matrix						
List of Traits	Dedicated	Practical	Cooperative	Assertive	Personable	Analytical
<b>Dedicated % of Variance Explained = 22.42 %</b>						
hard working	0.67					
productive	0.65					
focused	0.61					
efficient & effective	0.61					
dedicated	0.60					
efficient	0.60					
disciplined	0.60					
prepared	0.58					
dependable	0.58					
willingness	0.58	0.30				
helpful	0.50					
coherent	0.49					
organized	0.48					
able to organize people	0.46					
consistent	0.43		0.31			
teach by doing	0.41	0.37				
persistent	0.39	0.30				
<b>Practical % of Variance Explained = 6.87%</b>						
not a micro-manager		0.61				
non-abrasive tone		0.60				
perceptive	0.40	0.52				
pragmatic		0.51				
practical	0.42	0.50				
tact		0.41				
#realistic (1)	0.54	0.40				
down to earth		0.38				
enduring		0.30				
active	0.30	0.30				
# rational (1)	0.47	0.30				
# well spoken (1)	0.37	0.30				
<b>Cooperative % of Variance Explained = 3.99%</b>						
loyal	0.32		0.70			
loyalty	0.30		0.70			
justice			0.58			
cooperative	0.35		0.49			
patient demeanor		0.36	0.45			
contemporary thinking		0.39	0.40			
patient	0.38		0.39			
agreeable			0.33			0.30
# honest (1)	0.50		0.33			
calm and poised speech			0.30			

**Table 13 continued:**

<b>Rotated Component Matrix</b>						
<b>List of Traits</b>	<b>Dedicated</b>	<b>Practical</b>	<b>Cooperative</b>	<b>Assertive</b>	<b>Personable</b>	<b>Analytical</b>
<b>Assertive % of Variance Explained = 2.58%</b>						
powerful / strong		0.35		0.61		
competitive				0.56		
authoritative				0.55		
strong		0.32		0.55		
control			0.32	0.51		
outspoken				0.49	0.33	
assertive				0.45		
opportunistic				0.44	0.42	
fast-thinking				0.39		
bold				0.39		
# driven (5)	0.37			0.34	0.45	
poise		0.42		0.31		
<b>Personable % of Variance Explained = 2.51%</b>						
engaging personality		0.23			0.59	
charismatic		0.17			0.55	
passionate					0.53	
sociable		0.30	0.36		0.48	
energetic	0.30				0.45	
personable		0.40	0.31		0.40	
interesting		0.39			0.37	
eloquent		0.49			0.32	
<b>Analytical % of Variance Explained = 2.37%</b>						
complex-thinker						0.64
analytical						0.55
concentrated						0.47
broad skills			0.33			0.33

Note: (#) denotes initial output factor number: (1 = Dedicated, 2 = Practical, and 5 = Personable)

Where there were cross-loadings of 0.30, an individual evaluation was made to determine with which factor the trait item fit best. To perform this task, a second expert panel (EP2) of three professors from two southern universities was asked to review the list of items in each factor and to determine the best conceptual fit for each. In addition, this EP2 was asked, in their opinion, to title each factor. The EP2 was comprised of professors who had at least 15 years of teaching experience along with at least 10 years of business consulting experience.

From the results of the EP2, the researcher found five traits (that had substantial cross-loadings) being changed to a different factor. Their findings resulted in the following specific factored trait names: dedicated, practical, cooperative, assertive, personable, and analytical.

Based on the results of the factor analysis, there are six key trait factors that represent a leader whose main focus is the development of both the people and the organization he or she leads to improve performance (an effective developmental leader).

### **Factored Traits**

The six traits that were factored were labeled as “Dedicated,” “Practical,” “Cooperative,” “Assertive,” “Personable,” and “Analytical”. The first trait factor, *dedicated*, explained 22.42 percent of the overall variance in the scale, and included items such as “hard working,” “productive,” “focused,” “dedicated,” “efficient,” and “disciplined.” The factor loadings ranged from a high of 0.67 to a low of 0.39.

The next factor explained an additional 6.87 percent of the overall scale variance and included items such as “not a micro-manager,” “non-abrasive tone,” “perceptive,” “pragmatic,” “practical,” and “tact.” This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from 0.61 to 0.30 and was labeled as *practical*.

The third factor, *cooperative*, had a factor loading range of 0.70 to 0.30 and included items such as “loyal,” “loyalty,” “justice,” “patient demeanor,” and “contemporary thinking.” This factor added an additional 3.99 percent of explained variance.

The fourth trait factor, *assertive*, included items such as “powerful/strong,” “competitive,” “authoritative,” “strong,” “control,” and “outspoken.” The factor

loadings ranged from 0.61 to 0.31 with an explained additional 2.58 percent of the overall scale variance.

The fifth factor explained an additional 2.51 percent of the overall scale variance and included items such as “engaging personality,” “charismatic,” “passionate,” “sociable,” and “energetic.” This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from 0.59 to 0.32 and was labeled as *personable*.

The sixth factor, *analytical*, had a factor loading range of 0.64 to 0.33 and included items such as “complex-thinker,” “analytical,” “concentrated,” and “broad skills.” This factor added an additional 2.37 percent of explained variance.

After the six trait factors and the items to be included in each were identified, the researcher computed the scale scores for each of the six identified trait factors. These scores were identified as the mean of the items included in each of the respective factors (see Table 14).

**Table 14: Factored Traits Identifying Range of Means, Overall Means, Standard Deviation, and Classification from the EDLTI Survey as Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

Factored Trait	Mean Range	Overall Mean*	S. D.	Classification
Dedicated	4.54 to 4.13	4.37	0.12	“agree”
Cooperative	4.48 to 3.56	4.06	0.27	“agree”
Practical	4.19 to 3.76	4.01	0.17	“agree”
Analytical	4.14 to 3.88	4.00	0.11	“agree”
Personable	4.12 to 3.51	3.92	0.25	“agree”
Assertive	4.16 to 3.62	3.82	0.19	“agree”

\*Mean score is from Likert type scale of: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = uncertain; 4 = agree; and 5 = strongly agree.

### Demographics and the Specific Factored Trait Means

As a supplemental analysis, the researcher compared the trait factor mean scores of the 669 study participants who completed the trait instrument by the sub-categories of each demographic category variable utilizing descriptive statistical

procedures (See Table 15). All the comparisons appear to be nearly equivalent with very little differences.

**Table 15: Specific Factored Traits and Demographic Sub-Category Mean Comparisons from the Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Specific Factored Traits→</b>	<b>Dedicated</b>	<b>Practical</b>	<b>Cooperative</b>	<b>Assertive</b>	<b>Personable</b>	<b>Analytical</b>
<b>Overall Means→</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>4.01</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>4.00</b>
<b>Gender</b>						
Male	4.32	3.99	4.04	3.81	3.91	3.96
Female	4.40	4.02	4.08	3.82	3.95	4.05
<b>Years of Working Exp.</b>						
< 5 years	4.37	3.99	4.04	3.85	3.95	4.00
5-10 yrs	4.35	4.03	4.04	3.78	3.91	3.94
10-20 yrs	4.32	3.96	4.04	3.81	3.92	3.99
20-30 yrs	4.35	4.03	4.09	3.86	3.92	4.03
> 30 yrs	4.41	4.03	4.12	3.73	3.88	4.08
<b>Organization Size</b>						
1-100	4.34	3.97	4.04	3.84	3.92	4.01
100-500	4.42	4.11	4.13	3.86	4.00	4.03
500-1000	4.34	3.99	4.08	3.72	3.90	3.86
1000-10000	4.37	4.01	4.04	3.78	3.84	4.05
10000+ employees	4.26	3.91	3.98	3.73	3.89	3.94
<b>Working Level</b>						
Employee	4.38	4.04	4.08	3.82	3.92	4.02
Supervisor	4.34	3.99	4.04	3.80	3.93	3.96
Mid Mgmt	4.31	4.00	4.03	3.80	3.95	3.99
Upper Mgmt	4.36	3.93	4.04	3.85	3.92	3.97
Executive	4.34	3.95	4.02	3.84	3.85	4.00
Profit	4.36	4.02	4.08	3.84	3.92	4.00
Non Profit	4.30	3.89	3.95	3.70	3.80	3.85
Military	4.35	4.08	4.04	3.81	3.93	3.95
Education	4.39	3.99	4.04	3.77	3.97	4.11
Government	4.30	4.06	4.04	3.87	3.99	3.93
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
Hispanic	4.43	3.96	4.03	3.82	3.90	3.95
African-American	4.38	4.06	4.04	3.85	4.02	4.00
Caucasian	4.34	4.00	4.07	3.82	3.92	4.01
Asian	4.37	4.06	4.08	3.74	3.97	4.09
Native American	4.33	3.85	3.94	3.65	3.75	3.77
Other	4.35	4.11	3.97	3.71	3.78	3.83
<b>Type of Training</b>						
Leader Training	4.38	4.03	4.08	3.82	3.93	3.98
Mgmt Training	4.38	4.01	4.05	3.83	3.93	4.00
Exec. Training	4.35	4.05	4.09	3.80	4.01	3.98
Supervisor Training	4.39	4.02	4.08	3.81	3.93	4.00
No training	4.34	3.99	4.05	3.81	3.91	4.00
Training	4.37	4.03	4.08	3.81	3.95	3.99

## **Identifying Key Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader**

After the 94 behaviors that met the established criteria for inclusion in the final analysis were identified, the accumulated data were further analyzed to accomplish the third objective of the study: to identify the key behaviors of an effective developmentally oriented leader. This was accomplished using a factor analysis statistical procedure to determine if each key construct was a behavior of an effective developmentally oriented leader. This analysis included the measured behaviors rated as “agree” (3.51) or higher, as perceived by study participants.

In conducting the factor analysis, the principal components analysis was utilized with a varimax rotation method. The first step in conducting the factor analysis was to determine the optimum number of factors to be extracted from the scale. Using a combination of the latent root criteria, the *a priori* criteria, and the scree test criteria, the number of factors to be extracted was determined to be seven. This number of factors provided the researcher with an analysis that resulted in few substantial cross-loadings and satisfactory loadings on each item in each factor. Additionally, each factor met the *a priori* established criteria of a minimum of four items per factor. According to Hair, Anderson, & Tatham (1987) a loading of a minimum of 0.30 is acceptable for exploratory research.

The results of the factor analysis for behaviors of an effective developmental leader are included the factor that was labeled based on the content of the items included in the factor, the percentage of variance explained by each factor, and factor loadings for each of the items in each of the factors (Table 16)

**Table 16: Factor Analysis of Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader as Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

Rotated Component Matrix							
	Focused	Supportive	Developer	Delegator	Advisor	Competitive	Charismatic
<b>Focused % of Variance Explained = 35.16%</b>							
strives for success	0.64						
sees opportunities	0.61					0.31	
sets clear goals	0.61						
sets the vision	0.59						
focused	0.58						
shares vision and knowledge	0.57		0.34				
follows through	0.56						
strategic	0.56					0.30	
organized	0.55						
hard working	0.52						0.32
thorough	0.51			0.39			
seeks to understand	0.48		0.40				
seeks knowledge	0.46		0.30				
timely	0.46	0.33		0.31			
straightforward	0.45						
thinks outside the box	0.42						
promotes cooperation	0.40	0.30	0.31		0.33		
<b>Supportive % of Variance Explained = 3.65%</b>							
approachable		0.61					
courteous		0.60					
always willing to help others		0.58					
asks for feedback		0.55					
cares about others' welfare		0.55	0.44				
admits mistakes		0.55					
has an open door policy		0.54					
respectful	0.35	0.54					
cooperative		0.53					0.37
creates comfortable working atmosphere		0.53					0.31
gives and solicits feedback	0.42	0.51	0.30				
humble		0.48				0.38	
trusting		0.48	0.36				
shows genuine concern		0.48	0.35				
communicates openly		0.47					0.32
lends a helping hand/voice		0.46			0.34		
willingly supports employees		0.46	0.46				
open-minded	0.41	0.43					
acts professionally		0.41		0.39			
helps to resolve conflicts	0.30	0.41			0.36		

**Table 16 continued:**

<b>Rotated Component Matrix</b>							
	<b>Focused</b>	<b>Supportive</b>	<b>Developer</b>	<b>Delegator</b>	<b>Advisor</b>	<b>Competitive</b>	<b>Charismatic</b>
<b>Supportive (continued) % of Variance Explained = 3.65%</b>							
learns about others		<b>0.40</b>	0.32		0.22	0.34	
# informs (1)	0.43	<b>0.38</b>			0.28		
# stays positive (1)	0.39	<b>0.36</b>				0.32	
<b>Developer % of Variance Explained = 2.85%</b>							
develops others			<b>0.63</b>				
empowers others			<b>0.60</b>				
positions individuals for success			<b>0.56</b>		0.35		
builds leaders			<b>0.54</b>				
acknowledges achievement and effort		0.32	<b>0.50</b>				
fosters growth	0.33		<b>0.48</b>				
advocates the “we” and not the “I” in team		0.38	<b>0.45</b>				
improves morale of employees		0.34	<b>0.43</b>				
inspires others	0.36		<b>0.43</b>				
# motivates (1)	0.44		<b>0.42</b>				
energizes			<b>0.39</b>			0.32	0.30
# team oriented (1)	0.38	0.32	<b>0.34</b>				
<b>Delegator % of Variance Explained = 2.67%</b>							
determines needs				<b>0.60</b>	0.32		
directs				<b>0.59</b>			
appears in charge				<b>0.57</b>			0.16
decisive	0.34			<b>0.56</b>			0.16
delegates authorities				<b>0.53</b>			
develops strategies and actions				<b>0.50</b>			
creates solutions				<b>0.50</b>	0.31		
allocates resources				<b>0.50</b>			
appears confident	0.31			<b>0.45</b>		0.35	
aware of company culture and leads in that direction				<b>0.40</b>			
adaptive to changing environments			0.33	<b>0.38</b>			
# uses resources effectively (1)	0.37		0.33	<b>0.35</b>			
address other team members issues or problems		0.34		<b>0.33</b>			
establishes goals				<b>0.30</b>			
efficient							
<b>Advisor % of Variance Explained = 2.30%</b>							
gathers all information					<b>0.53</b>		
removes barriers			0.31		<b>0.50</b>	0.32	
evaluates talent					<b>0.49</b>		

**Table 16 continued:**

<b>Rotated Component Matrix</b>							
	<b>Focused</b>	<b>Supportive</b>	<b>Developer</b>	<b>Delegator</b>	<b>Advisor</b>	<b>Competitive</b>	<b>Charismatic</b>
<b>Advisor (continued) % of Variance Explained = 2.30%</b>							
solves problems	0.33				<b>0.48</b>		
facilitates			0.36		<b>0.48</b>		
gets involved		0.43			<b>0.48</b>		
provides advice	0.30	0.35			<b>0.47</b>		
provides the necessary resources for the team to succeed			0.31		<b>0.47</b>		
proactive	0.31		0.30		<b>0.40</b>		
predicts needs					<b>0.39</b>	0.33	
recognizes talent			0.42		<b>0.38</b>		
evaluates all options	0.35			0.31	<b>0.38</b>		
<b>Competitive % of Variance Explained = 1.93%</b>							
risk taker						<b>0.65</b>	
keeps a competitive edge						<b>0.59</b>	0.25
involved in community		0.45				<b>0.53</b>	0.20
speaks out	0.30					<b>0.50</b>	
is creative and innovative	0.41					<b>0.44</b>	0.20
reflective	0.31	0.38			0.31	<b>0.43</b>	
passionate	0.34					<b>0.43</b>	0.22
# shows sense of urgency (5)					0.45	<b>0.42</b>	
not afraid of failure						<b>0.36</b>	
<b>Charismatic % of Variance Explained = 1.60%</b>							
convincing							<b>0.60</b>
charismatic						0.44	<b>0.47</b>
assertive				0.40		0.35	<b>0.46</b>
challenges others			0.32				<b>0.41</b>
assumes responsibility				0.37			<b>0.41</b>
role model			0.31			0.30	<b>0.35</b>

**Note: (#) denotes SPSS output factor number: (1 = Focused For Success and 5 = Competitive)**

Where there were cross-loadings of 0.30, an individual evaluation was made to determine which factor the behavior item fit best. To perform this task, a second EP2 of three professors from two southern universities was asked to review the list of items under each factor to determine the best fit for each item. In addition, the panel was asked to title each factor. This new EP2 was comprised of professors who had at least

15 years of teaching experience along with at least 10 years of business consulting experience.

From the results of this second EP2, the researcher found six behaviors being changed to a different factor, resulting in the following specific factored behavior names: “focused,” “supportive,” “developer,” “delegator,” “advisor,” “competitive,” and “charismatic.”

Based on the results of the factor analysis there are seven key behaviors that represent a leader whose main focus is the development of both the people and the organization he or she leads to improve performance (an effective developmental leader).

### **Factored Behaviors**

The seven behaviors that were factored were labeled as “Focused,” “Supportive,” “Developer,” “Advisor,” “Competitive,” “Delegator,” and “Charismatic”. The first behavior factor, *focused*, included items such as “strives for success,” “sees opportunities,” “sets clear goals,” “focused,” and “shares vision and knowledge.” The factor loadings ranged from a high of 0.64 to a low of 0.40, and explained 35.16 percent of the overall variance in the scale.

The second behavior factor, *supportive*, included items such as “approachable,” “courteous,” “always willing to help others,” “asks for feedback,” and “cares about others' welfare.” The factor loadings ranged from 0.61 to 0.36 and explained an additional 3.65 percent of the overall scale variance.

The third behavior factor explained an additional 2.85 percent of the overall scale variance and included items such as “develops others,” “empowers others,”

“positions individuals for success,” and “builds leaders.” This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from 0.63 to 0.34 and was labeled as *developer*.

The fourth behavior factor, *delegator*, had a factor loading range of 0.60 to 0.30 and had items such as “determines needs,” “directs,” “appears in charge,” “decisive,” and “delegates authorities.” This factor added an additional 2.67 percent of explained variance.

The fifth behavior factor explained an additional 2.30 percent of the overall scale variance and included items such as “gathers all information,” “removes barriers,” “evaluates talent,” “solves problems,” and “facilitates.” This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from 0.53 to 0.38 and was labeled as *advisor*.

The sixth behavior factor, *competitive*, has a factor loading range of 0.65 to 0.36 and had items such as “risk taker,” “keeps a competitive edge,” “involved in community,” “speaks out,” and “is creative and innovative.” This factor added an additional 1.93 percent of explained variance.

The seventh behavior factor explained an additional 1.60 percent of the overall scale variance and included items such as “convincing,” “assertive,” “challenges others,” “assumes responsibility,” and “role model.” This factor yielded factor loadings ranging from 0.60 to 0.35 and was labeled as *charismatic*.

Once the seven behavior factors and the items to be included in each were identified, the researcher computed the scale scores for each of the seven identified behavior factors. These scores were identified as the mean of the items included in each of the respective factors (see Table 17).

**Table 17: Factored Behaviors Identifying Range of Means, Overall Means, and Classification from the EDLBI Survey as Reported by Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Factored Behavior</b>	<b>Mean Range</b>	<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>S. D.</b>	<b>Classification</b>
Developer	4.49 to 4.16	4.37	0.12	“agree”
Focused	4.48 to 4.18	4.34	0.09	“agree”
Delegator	4.50 to 4.11	4.24	0.13	“agree”
Supportive	4.43 to 4.15	4.22	0.15	“agree”
Advisor	4.38 to 4.03	4.20	0.13	“agree”
Charismatic	4.59 to 4.05	4.14	0.28	“agree”
Competitive	4.31 to 3.51	4.02	0.25	“agree”

**Demographics and the Specific Factored Behavior Means:**

The means of the specific factors were compared to the sub-categories of each demographic category. All the comparisons are nearly equivalent; however, an examination of specific details and when comparing sub-categories with each factored behavior showing the following groups have mean scores equal to or higher than the overall mean for the factored behaviors: males; those with more than 21 years of work experience; those who work in organizations with 100 to 500 employees and 1,000 to 10,000 employees; those who work at the supervisory, middle, and upper management levels; those working for a profit, non-profit, and government organization; those who were either African-American, Caucasian, or of Native American ethnicity; and those who had received some kind of training in the areas of leadership, management, and executive or supervisory leadership.

**Table 18: Specific Factored Behaviors and Demographic Sub-Category Mean Comparisons from the Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Specific Factored Behaviors-&gt;</b>	<b>Developer</b>	<b>Focused</b>	<b>Delegator</b>	<b>Supportive</b>	<b>Advisor</b>	<b>Charismatic</b>	<b>Competitive</b>
<b>Overall Means</b>	<b>"(4.37)</b>	<b>"(4.34)</b>	<b>"(4.24)</b>	<b>"(4.22)</b>	<b>"(4.20)</b>	<b>"(4.13)</b>	<b>"(4.02)</b>
<b>Gender</b>							
Male	4.38	4.35	4.25	4.22	4.22	4.15	4.04
Female	4.35	4.33	4.22	4.23	4.17	4.09	4.00

**Table 18 continued:**

<b>Specific Factored Behaviors-&gt;</b>	<b>Developer</b>	<b>Focused</b>	<b>Delegator</b>	<b>Supportive</b>	<b>Advisor</b>	<b>Charismatic</b>	<b>Competitive</b>
<b>Overall Means</b>	<b>"(4.37)</b>	<b>"(4.34)</b>	<b>"(4.24)</b>	<b>"(4.22)</b>	<b>"(4.20)</b>	<b>"(4.13)</b>	<b>"(4.02)</b>
<b>Working Exp.</b>							
1-5 years	4.35	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.19	4.08	4.02
5-10 yrs	4.42	4.33	4.26	4.21	4.21	4.12	3.97
10-20 yrs	4.31	4.32	4.19	4.19	4.17	4.12	4.02
20-30 yrs	4.41	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.27	4.22	4.13
30+ yrs	4.35	4.37	4.29	4.24	4.15	4.13	3.99
<b>Organizational Size</b>							
1-100	4.37	4.36	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.10	3.98
100-500	4.42	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.12
500-1000	4.27	4.25	4.21	4.07	4.08	4.13	3.95
1000-10000	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.23	4.18	4.18	4.11
10000+ employees	4.36	4.22	4.18	4.14	4.15	4.11	3.94
<b>Working Level</b>							
Employee	4.33	4.30	4.19	4.22	4.15	4.08	4.00
Supervisor	4.40	4.36	4.33	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.05
Middle Management	4.41	4.42	4.29	4.22	4.27	4.13	4.09
Upper Management	4.49	4.43	4.26	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.01
Executive	4.29	4.27	4.14	4.16	4.18	4.14	3.96
Profit	4.37	4.34	4.24	4.23	4.19	4.13	4.02
Non-Profit	4.35	4.32	4.21	4.20	4.27	4.13	4.07
Military	4.25	4.21	4.20	4.05	4.10	3.85	3.93
Education	4.34	4.33	4.24	4.17	4.15	4.12	3.99
Government	4.46	4.56	4.34	4.39	4.36	4.18	4.20
<b>Ethnicity</b>							
Hispanic	4.41	4.32	4.24	4.24	4.18	4.13	3.98
African-American	4.41	4.39	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.01
Caucasian	4.36	4.35	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.14	4.05
Asian	4.25	4.22	4.13	4.07	3.95	4.02	3.86
Native American	4.43	4.49	4.38	4.30	4.27	4.15	4.05
Other	4.45	4.34	4.04	4.25	4.23	4.02	3.86
<b>Training Type</b>							
Leader Training	4.40	4.27	4.27	4.25	4.22	4.16	4.06
Management Training	4.37	4.24	4.26	4.22	4.22	4.17	4.03
Executive Training	4.35	4.27	4.27	4.25	4.24	4.15	4.06
Supervisor Training	4.36	4.26	4.29	4.23	4.25	4.15	4.05
No Training Attended	4.27	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.13	4.07	3.97
Training Attended	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.39	4.23	4.15	4.05

## Summary

This chapter described the analysis of the data, presented the findings of this research, and presented the factored traits and factored behaviors of an effective developmental leader (EDL). Fifty-seven (57) study participants contributed the initial list of traits and behaviors of an EDL. Two expert panels (EP1 and EP2) and one volunteer graduate student team (VGT) were used to assess the data. Six hundred sixty nine (669) survey study participants supplied the data on agreement levels of each trait and each behavior of an EDL. Demographic data were analyzed to supply levels of agreement by sub-category. The results of this study revealed specific factored traits and seven factored behaviors of an EDL. The factored traits and factored behaviors are presented in Table 19.

Overall, according to this study, there are six traits and seven behaviors of a person who would be considered an effective developmental leader. There was a 4.03 level of agreement for the traits and a 4.22 level of agreement for the behaviors.

**Table 19: Overall Mean Scores and Standard Deviation Scores for Factored Traits and Factored Behaviors from the Full-time Employees Participating in the Leadership Trait and Behavior Study.**

<b>Factored Trait</b>	<b>Trait Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>Factored Behavior</b>	<b>Behavior Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>
Dedicated	4.37	.12	Developer	4.37	.12
Cooperative	4.06	.27	Focused	4.34	.09
Practical	4.01	.17	Delegator	4.24	.13
Analytical	4.00	.11	Supportive	4.22	.15
Personable	3.92	.25	Advisor	4.20	.13
Assertive	3.82	.19	Charismatic	4.14	.28
			Competitive	4.02	.25
<b>Level of agreement for all Traits</b>	<b>4.03</b>	<b>.27</b>	<b>Level of agreement for all Behaviors</b>	<b>4.22</b>	<b>.18</b>

## **Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **Introduction**

This chapter summarizes the study and discusses the conclusions, implications, and recommendations drawn from its findings. The first section of this chapter provides an overview, including the purpose and specific objectives, methodology, and findings. The remainder of the chapter discusses conclusions drawn from the findings, implications of those findings, and recommendations for future practice and research.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to answer the question, “What are the traits and behaviors of an effective developmental leader”-one whose primary focus is the development of the people and the organization he or she lead? Therefore, this study’s intent was to identify those traits and behaviors of leaders who possess an effective developmental orientation towards people and the organization they lead.

### **Objectives of Study**

The study identified the set of traits and the set of behaviors by accomplishing the following objectives:

1. Identify the traits of effective developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U.S. city.
2. Identify the behaviors of effective developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U.S. city.
3. Determine the key traits and key behaviors of effective developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U.S. city.

## **Methodology**

The target population was experienced employees in organizations and the sample was drawn from graduate business students and full-time employees and managers from several organizations in a southern city and who also have at least three years' working experience. Data collection for this study began with brainstorming written words or short phrases of what graduate leadership students believed to be the traits and behaviors of an effective developmental leader. Thereafter, the two lists were given to an expert panel number 1 (EP1) to examine and subsequently develop a final list by eliminating duplicates and synonyms.

The EP1 was given the list of traits to evaluate and to determine if there were duplications and then to either combine or eliminate the duplicate items. From the finished EP1 list, a trait instrument was generated using a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The instrument was then named the Effective Developmental Leader Trait Instrument (EDLTI).

The EP1 was also given the list of behaviors to evaluate and to determine if there were duplications and then to either combine or eliminate the duplicate items. From this finished EP1 list, a behavior instrument was generated using a 1 to 5 Likert-type scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The instrument was then named the Effective Developmental Leader Behavior Instrument (EDLBI).

Next; each of the two instruments (the EDLTI & the EDLBI) were administered to full-time employees of approximately 30 different organizations. These employees represented different levels in these organizations.

Finally, the returned completed EDLTI and EDLBI instruments were analyzed to determine the underlying factors/structure for the traits and behaviors of an effective developmental leader (EDL).

## **Findings**

The findings of this study are summarized in relation to the objectives of the study.

### **Objective One Findings**

The first objective was to identify the traits of effective, developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U. S. city.

An initial list of 226 traits was generated by 57 participants. This list was reduced to 181 traits by eliminating 45 duplicates identified at the start. The list of 181 trait items was again reduced to 84 trait items by the first EP1's initial review. The panel was comprised of four members and these members attained at least a 75 percent level of agreement on items eliminated. That is, three out of four panel members were required to retain or to eliminate a trait from the list. The 84 trait items were reviewed a second time by the first EP1, and the list was reduced again, this time to 75 trait items, which were the 75 trait items included in the final list constituting "the effective developmental leader trait instrument" (EDLTI).

The instrument called the EDLTI (Appendix A), was distributed to 750 participants in the study. From the distributed instruments, 669 were useful according to the guidelines established by the researcher for useful data from the instruments. The mean and standard deviation were computed for each of the 75 trait items in the EDLTI. The mean of each trait item was reviewed for meeting the threshold level of a

minimum of 3.51 for subsequent analysis. This review resulted in another 12 trait items being removed from the list of 75 trait items, yielding 63 traits of an effective developmental leader (EDL) according to the 669 participants in the study. This instrument measured the level of agreement that each trait item is indicative of an effective developmental leader. The 63 trait items' mean score range was 3.51 to 4.53 out of a maximum score of 5.

### **Objective Two Findings**

The second objective was to identify the behaviors of effective, developmentally oriented leaders as perceived by full-time employees from several organizations in a southern U. S. city.

An initial list of 324 behaviors was generated by 57 participants. The list was reduced to 260 behaviors by eliminating 64 duplicates identified at the start. The list of 260 behavior items was then reduced to 115 behavior items by the initial review of the first EP1 of four members. The 115 behavior items were reviewed a second time by the first EP1, and the list was reduced to 94 behavior items, which were included in the final list constituting "the effective developmental leader behavior instrument" (EDLBI).

The instrument called the EDLBI (Appendix B), or effective developmental leader behavior instrument, was distributed to 750 participants in the study. From the distributed instruments, 669 were useful according to the guidelines established by the researcher for useful data from the instruments. The mean and standard deviation were computed for each of the 94 items in the behavior scale. The mean of each item was reviewed for meeting the threshold, a minimum of 3.51 for subsequent analysis. There were no behavior items that had a mean score of less than 3.51. Therefore,

there are 94 behavior items of an effective developmental leader in the EDLBI, according to the 669 participants in the study. This instrument measured their level of agreement that the behavior item is indicative of an effective developmental leader. The 94 behavior items' mean score range was 3.51 to 4.59 out of a maximum score of 5.

### **Objective Three Findings**

Objective Three sought to determine the key traits and key behaviors of an effective developmental leader as perceived by employees representing many levels in several different types of organizations in a southern U. S. city.

The factor analysis resulted in 6 trait factors and 7 behavior factors that represent a leader whose main focus is the development of both the people and the organization he or she leads. The factor analysis of the 63 traits was evaluated by a second expert panel number 2 (EP2) of three, analysis of the scree plot, and analysis of the cross-loadings. This analysis resulted in 6 factored traits: *analytical, assertive, cooperative, dedicated, personable, and practical*. The behavior factor analysis of the 94 behaviors was also evaluated by the EP2, an analysis of the scree plot and analysis of the cross-loadings. This analysis resulted in 7 factored behaviors: *advisor, charismatic, competitive, delegator, developer, focused, and supportive*.

### **Conclusions**

The conclusions that can be drawn from the findings are the following: Specific traits of an effective developmental leader are identifiable. This conclusion is based on the following findings: (1) 63 traits were identified and validated by the participants in the study as characteristic of an EDL (effective developmental leader); (2) these traits were determined to measure six constructs that were labeled by the

researcher as “analytical,” “assertive,” “cooperative,” “dedicated,” “personable,” and “practical.”

This conclusion is similar to others in previous leadership research in that leadership has been consistently determined to be a complex, multi-dimensional construct. For example, the Implicit Leadership Theory (Eden & Leviatan, 1975) identified ten leadership constructs and the Transformational Leadership Theory identified seven leadership constructs (Bass & Avolio, 1990a). These two theories used constructs to define leadership from their perspectives, but did not examine the specific developmental aspects of leadership. The contributions of this study, is to determine what traits (characteristics) and behaviors (actions) of a person in a leadership role should adopt to develop the people and the organization that he or she leads.

The specific behaviors of an effective developmental leader are also identifiable. This conclusion is based on the following findings: (1) a list of 94 behaviors was identified and validated by the participants in the study as characteristic of an EDL (effective developmental leader); (2) these behaviors were determined to measure seven constructs that were labeled by the researcher as “advisor,” “charismatic,” “competitive,” “delegator,” “developer,” “focused,” and “supportive.”

This conclusion is similar to the previous leadership research in that leadership has been consistently determined to be a complex, multi-dimensional construct. For example, Leader Behavior Style Theory, one of the early theories of leadership which investigated the behaviors of leaders, identified two main constructs (Bass 1990). The Leader Behavior Style Theory investigated the behaviors, in general of a leader, whereas this research investigates the specific behaviors of a specific type of leader,

effective developmental leader (EDL). Likewise, the Servant Leadership Theory identified five constructs defining leadership from the perspective of the leader as a servant of followers (Greenleaf 1977). However, the contributions of this study differ from the existing leadership literature in that previous studies have not examined the specific developmental aspects of leadership. This research looks into the specific behaviors of an EDL.

The traits and behaviors identified in this study have been identified individually, in many other leadership research initiatives. However, what is unique from the results of this study is that the set of traits and behaviors have not been identified as a group in describing a leader with a developmental orientation. Thus the contribution to the leadership body of knowledge is that the multi-dimensional perspective of a developmentally oriented leader would have the identified traits and behaviors.

### **Recommendations**

From the conclusions and findings of this study, the researcher recommends the following:

#### **Recommendations for Practitioners**

The findings and conclusions resulting from this research indicate that organizational leaders should use the EDL traits and the EDL behaviors identified as a diagnostic tool. The EDL traits and EDL behaviors should be used to evaluate leadership in their organization and to assess the strengths and weaknesses of managers. An assessment should be made of those aspiring employees who wish to climb the ladder to a leadership position by identifying where each person requires development to acquire these EDL traits and the EDL behaviors. They should use this

information to determine how the results of this study apply to their organization by looking at the organization's core values, vision, and strategic direction. Personnel or Human Resource departments should use these traits and behaviors as a hiring tool, an interview tool, a promotion tool, and/or a training tool.

The organization can use this research when hiring new employees at the management level by administering the EDLTI and EDLBI to determine if the potential candidates have the characteristics of an effective developmental leader and, if so, will fit into the required leadership profile for that organization.

In promoting existing employees, the organization can administer the EDLTI and EDLBI to determine which candidates have the greatest strength as an effective developmental leader and use this analysis to select a new manager or leader for that organization.

### **Recommendations for Further Research**

Much work must be done in this field of leadership study and therefore, this is just the beginning of research in constructing an effective developmental leadership theory. Researchers should administer the EDLTI and EDLBI in a new study, in other parts of the U.S. and other parts in the world to determine the validity of outcomes or the key trait factors and key behavior factors of an EDL.

Researchers can also investigate the possibility of correlating traits and behaviors to find out where they influence one another in day-to-day interaction in organizations. The demographic data should be analyzed to specifically determine each group's perception and how each group views this type of leader in an organization.

Another step would be to replicate this research in different parts of the U.S. to see if perceptions differ in various parts of the country and if there are distinct biases in the southern U.S. This same process or research study should be performed in different parts of the world to identify their perceptions and how their cultures may differ in identifying traits and behaviors of an EDL.

Finally, another recommendation for further research is to take this research a step forward and determine the impact an EDL will have in many types of organizations. In other words, further research may answer the questions, “What is the impact of an EDL in various types of organizations? Second question should be; what type of organizations?” In other words, an organization where jobs are clearly defined or repetitive operations take place might require one type of leader and an organization where creative thinking and applications are required to get the job done, as in an advertising agency or software corporation, might require another type of leader. Both cases should require an EDL but the impact of an EDL on the performance, profitability, and development might be different. So an EDL’s impact may be somewhat influenced by the type of work that the organization does.

### **Implications for Further Research**

Prior to reading the findings of this study, the reader could conclude that these findings are simply a rehash of what has been done. However, this study demonstrates that here is a new approach and new grouping of traits and behaviors for identifying leadership. This should be seen as a special situation of study to enter into the mainstream of leadership research. Scholarly evaluation of this approach will require scrutiny, testing, and analyzing to validate this theory.

This present research should be viewed as a piece of transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990) under the area of individual consideration. This research proceeds further into the depths of the nature of traits and behaviors. This differs from what this researcher has found in the literature on leadership research and specifically, transformational leadership. This study looks deeply into what other researchers have accomplished by identifying the nature of leadership attributes and what these look like when they were seen. Therefore, this research is a more detailed perspective and report on what has been accomplished and offers its findings as new information for further study and analysis of leadership. These findings are also similar to the findings presented by Greenleaf (1977) in his work on servant leadership. However, this research proposes a deeper understanding of what characteristics a person must have to demonstrate an orientation toward development.

The question this researcher has repeatedly faced was, “Does effective developmental leadership exist and, if so, what are the leader’s characteristics (that is the traits and behaviors)?” Further implications for research should be to answer these questions using the same as well as different research procedures. Thus stating this, there is much to be done to validate the results of this study.

### **Implications for Practice**

Most organizations espouse the importance that their managers adopt and assume effective practices of leadership to achieve high performance in organizations. There are many fully developed and well founded theories of leadership; however, what is missing is the identification of significant traits and behaviors of a leader that enable the growth and development of the people and the organization. This exploratory research shows that organizations should adopt these identified traits and

behaviors for their leadership development programs to produce growth and results, especially if they choose to use these traits and behaviors as tools to hire, train, assess, and promote their leaders.

This research also indicates that a number of traits and behaviors should be adopted in their organization to yield high performance. These traits and behaviors should be examined for the level of impact an EDL will have in the organizations growth and development in achieving the vision, mission and overall desired results.

There can be gain in effective leadership in organizations from adopting these practices called traits and behaviors of an EDL in this research. However, the decision to utilize these leadership practices depends on the leader of the organization providing good development in leadership training to produce the kinds of leaders needed to meet organizational objectives, specifically leaders who are in alignment with the values and vision of the organization. The researcher suggests that these traits and behaviors could be applicable in any organization seeking to develop its employees and their organization.

For existing employees who aspire to leadership positions, an organization can administer the EDLTI and EDLBI to determine which characteristics the current employee possess' and which characteristic the employee needs to acquire. From this assessment, the organization can develop training modules to assist the employee in either improving or acquiring the EDL characteristics. Additionally, a set of training modules based on the identified traits and behaviors of an EDL can be developed for all employees at all levels in an organization to promote consistent leadership characteristics.

## **Limitations of the Study**

Despite the strengths of this study, certain limitations to this exploratory research should be noted:

1) The data received was incomplete in some instances and caused concern. For example, some surveys, 81 or 10.8 percent of the total distributed surveys, had missing data and thus, were eliminated from this research. Although the return rate on this survey was very good, it still leaves some question as to what the findings would be if some or all of these 81 surveys had been usable.

2) In this research, the south Louisiana culture could play a role in biasing the findings of this study. Southern culture could contribute to perceptions, thoughts, and experiences in the organizations from which the participants came. Cultures in different parts of the United States could display slightly different findings. Thus, this present study could be culturally biased.

## **Summary**

In the past several decades, much research has been conducted based on the desire to identify the nature of leadership and how it is exercised in organizations. The word *influence* appears in most of the major theories and definitions of leadership. The identification of traits and behaviors, which was the main area of research in the 1940's and the 1950's, has since come full circle. Researchers have identified different traits and behaviors of a leader and how a leader interacts with the follower, the team, and the organization. This present study is but another piece of leadership research that hopes to contribute to the identification of leadership and what actions or behaviors a leader exhibits in his or her organization.

The focus of this research was to begin to build the construct of an effective developmental leader (EDL) theory in an organization in terms of his or her traits and behaviors. The effective developmental leadership theory begins with the identification of key traits and key behaviors of a person whose orientation would be to focus on the development of the people and the organization he or she leads. In this research, 6 key trait factors were derived from 63 agreed upon traits in the instrument named the effective developmental leadership trait instrument (EDLTI). Seven key behavior factors were derived from 94 agreed upon behaviors in the instrument named the effective developmental leadership behavior instrument (EDLBI).

This research shows the specific or key characteristics that a leader should adopt to further the development of his or her organization and his or her followers to increase growth and profitability. Their leadership development programs should apply these traits and behaviors through effective training, mentoring, and coaching, with the expectation of producing substantial results, especially if management uses these traits and behaviors as a hiring, evaluation, and promotion tool for existing and aspiring leaders.

The development of this new theory called “effective developmental leadership theory (EDL)” can progress only through carrying it through the continuum of research to its full experimental phase. Further, how effective this theory is in helping organizations can only be determined by its use in organizations and by validating or invalidating some or all of the traits and behaviors delineated in this research.

Finally, like many other theories, this EDL theory can only be realized if developed to a point where positive outcomes are observed and measured by organizations applying these traits and behaviors by their leaders. This application

should help to determine the traits and behaviors that are effective when looking to obtain organizational growth and profitability. Application of this theory should help determine how these traits and behaviors enable an employee to improve his or her skills, performance, and promotion capability. Now, a critical review of this research, its theory, and its application in organizations is needed.

## References

- Ackoff, R.L. (1981). *Creating the Corporate Future*, John Wiley, New York.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of Leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1990a). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14, 21-27.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1990b). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. In W. Pasmore and R.W. Woodman (Eds), *Research in Organizational Change and Development v4* (pp. 231-272). Greenwich, CT:JAI Press.
- Bass, B.M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, v7 (3), 18-40.
- Bell, D. (1973). *The coming of post industrial society: A venture in social forecasting*, Basic Books, New York.
- Berg, D.N. (1998). Resurrecting the muse: Followership in organizations. In E.B. Klein, F. Gabelnick, and P. Herr (Eds.), *The psychodynamics of leadership*, Madison, CN: Psychosocial Press.
- Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, D., & Nelson, R. (1993). Situational leadership after 25 years: A retrospective. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, v1(1), 22-36.
- Bowman, M.A. (1997). Popular approaches to leadership. In P.G. Northouse Ed.). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bridges, W. (1995). *Surviving Transition: Rational Management in a World of Mergers., Start-ups, Takeovers, Layoff, Divestitures, Deregulation and New Technologies*, Perseus Press.
- Buchen, I.H. (1998). Servant Leadership: A model for future faculty and future institutions. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, v5(1), 125-124.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Ciulla, J.B. (2000). *The working life: The promise and betrayal of modern work*. New York: Crown Business Books.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, v13, 471-482.

Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: Perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, v15, 439-452.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G.G., & Haga, W. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership in formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, v13, 46-78.

DeMott, B., (1993). Choice academic pork, *Harper's*, December 1993, p. 61.

Densten, I., & Gray, J., (2001). The links between followership and the experiential learning model: followership coming of age. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, Summer 2001, v8, i1, p 69.

Dubrin, A.J., (2001). *Leadership: Research Findings, Practice, and Skills*; New York, Houghton-Mifflin Publishers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition.

Dvir, T. & Shamir, B. (2003). Follower developmental characteristics as predicting transformational leadership: a longitudinal field study. Available online.

Eden, D., & Leviatan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, v60, 736-741.

Farling, M.L., Stone, A.G., & Winston, B.E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, v6(1/2), 49-72.

Fiedler, F.E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 149-190). New York: Academic Press.

Fiedler, F.E. (1978). The contingency model and the dynamics of the leadership process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 59-112). New York: Academic Press.

Fiedler, F.E. (1986). The contribution of cognitive resources to leadership performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, v16, 532-548.

Fiedler, F.E. (1992). Time-based measures of leadership experience and organizational performance: A review of research and a preliminary model. *Leadership Quarterly*, v3, 5-23.

Fleishman, E. A. & Hunt, G. (1973). *Current Developments in the Study of Leadership*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, IL. November 1973.

Graen, G.B., & Cashman, J.F. (1975). A role making model of leadership in forming organizations: A development approach. In J. G. Hunt and L.L. Larson (Eds.) *Leadership frontiers* (pp. 143-165). Kent, HO: Kent State University Press.

Graen, G.B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, v6, 219-247.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1983). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (1987). *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings*. Prentice Hall

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K.H. (1996). Life-cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, v23, 26-34.

Hollander, E.P. (1961). Some effects of perceived status on responses to innovative behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, v63, 247-250.

Hollander, E.P. (1978). *Leadership dynamics: A practical guide to effective relationship*. New York: Free Press.

Hollander, E.P. (1980). Leadership and social exchange processes. In K.J. Gergen, M.S. Greenberg, and R.H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 103-118). New York: Plenum Press.

House, R.J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, v16, 321-339.

House, R.J., & Mitchell, T.R. (1974, Fall). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Contemporary Business*, v3, 81-98.

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

House, R.J., & Howell, J.M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, v3(2), 81-108.

House, R.J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, v7, 323-352.

Hughes, R.L., Ginnett, R.C., & Curphy, G.J. (1999). *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience*. Singapore: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

- Jago, A.G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Science*, v28(3), 315-336.
- Kerr, S. & Jermier, J.M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, v22, 375-403.
- Kelly, R. E. (1992). *The power of followership*. New York: Doubleday.
- Kolb, D. (1974). Learning and problem solving: On management and the learning process. In D. Kolb, I.M. Rubin, and J.M. McIntyre (Eds.). *Organizational psychology: A book of readings*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lindholm, C., (1990). *Charisma*, London, Blackwell Publishers.
- Magliocca, L. A., & Christakis, A. N. (2001). Creating a Framework for Sustainable Organizational Leadership: TheCogniScope System Approach, *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*.
- McCaslin, M., (2001). The landscape of leadership building relationships. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, Fall 2001, v8, i2, p.21.
- Meindl, J.R., & Ehrlich, S.B. (1987). The romance of leadership and the evaluation of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, v30, 90-109.
- Offermann, L.R., Kennedy, J.K., & Wirtz, P.W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Content, structure, and generalizability. *Leadership Quarterly*, v5, 43-58.
- Podaskoff, P.M., Niehoff, B.P., MacKenzie, S., & Williams, M.L. (1993). Do Substitutes for leadership really substitute for leadership? An examination of Kerr and Jermier's situational leadership model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, v54, 1-44.
- Popper, M., Mayselless, O., & Castelnovo, O., (2000). Transformational leadership and attachment. *Leadership Quarterly* v11 (2000).
- Popper, M. & Mayselless, O., (2002). Back to basics: Applying a parenting perspective to transformational leadership. (2002) Available online.
- Rice, R.W. (1978). Construct validity of the least preferred coworker score. *Psychological Bulletin*, v85, 1199-1237.
- Riggio, R., Ciulla, J., & Sorenson, G. (2003) (Unpublished chapter of book).
- Sendjaya, S. & Sarros, J., (2002). Servant Leadership: its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Fall 2002, v9, i2, p57.

Senge, P. (1994). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. Currency/Doubleday.

Shamir, B., House, R.J., & Arthur, M.B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, v4, 1-17.

Sorenson, G. (2000) An intellectual history of leadership studies: The role of James MacGregor Burns, Presented at meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Sorenson, G. & Howe, W. (2001). As strange a maze as e'er men trod: A history of leadership studies," Presented at meeting of the International Leadership Association, Miami, Florida.

Spears, L. (1995). *Servant Leadership and the Greenleaf Legacy*. In Spears, L. C. (ed.) *Reflections on Leadership*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, v25, 35-71.

Stogdill, R.M. (1973). *Handbook of Leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press

Stogdill, R.M. (1990). *Handbook of Leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press

Tolstoy, L. & Edmonds, R. (Translator) (1982). *War and Peace*. Reissue Edition. Viking Press

Troyer, Mark (1997). *The Growth of Leadership Development Programs in Higher Education*. unpublished paper. University of Kentucky. December, 1997.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations*. (T. Parsons, Trans.) New York: Free Press.

**Appendix A: EDLTI (effective developmental leader trait instrument)**

**Effective Developmental Leader:** A leader whose main focus is the growth and further advancement of the people they lead in order to strengthen and progress the business performance in a proactive manner.

**Webster’s New World Dictionary: A Trait is:** “a distinguishing quality or characteristic, as of personality.”

**To what extent do you agree that each of the following Traits are characteristic of an Effective Developmental Leader (EDL).**

Scoring						Your Score Here V
<u>Traits of an EDL</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>SA</u>	
	1	2	3	4	5	
able to organize people	1	2	3	4	5	
active	1	2	3	4	5	
aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	
agreeable	1	2	3	4	5	
alluring	1	2	3	4	5	
analytical	1	2	3	4	5	
assertive	1	2	3	4	5	
authoritative	1	2	3	4	5	
bold	1	2	3	4	5	
broad skills	1	2	3	4	5	
calm and poised speech	1	2	3	4	5	
charismatic	1	2	3	4	5	
coherent	1	2	3	4	5	
competitive	1	2	3	4	5	
complex-thinker	1	2	3	4	5	
concentrated	1	2	3	4	5	
consistent	1	2	3	4	5	
contemporary thinking	1	2	3	4	5	
control	1	2	3	4	5	
cooperative	1	2	3	4	5	
dedicated	1	2	3	4	5	
demanding	1	2	3	4	5	
dependable	1	2	3	4	5	
devil's advocate	1	2	3	4	5	
disciplined	1	2	3	4	5	
down to earth	1	2	3	4	5	
driven	1	2	3	4	5	

**Appendix A: continued**

easy going	1	2	3	4	5	
efficient	1	2	3	4	5	
efficient & effective	1	2	3	4	5	
eloquent	1	2	3	4	5	
emotional	1	2	3	4	5	
enduring	1	2	3	4	5	
energetic	1	2	3	4	5	
engaging personality	1	2	3	4	5	
fast-thinking	1	2	3	4	5	
fearless	1	2	3	4	5	
focused	1	2	3	4	5	
hard working	1	2	3	4	5	
helpful	1	2	3	4	5	
honest	1	2	3	4	5	
idealistic	1	2	3	4	5	
interesting	1	2	3	4	5	
justice	1	2	3	4	5	
loyal	1	2	3	4	5	
loyalty	1	2	3	4	5	
magnetic	1	2	3	4	5	
modesty	1	2	3	4	5	
non-abrasive tone	1	2	3	4	5	
not a micro-manager	1	2	3	4	5	
opportunistic	1	2	3	4	5	
organized	1	2	3	4	5	
outspoken	1	2	3	4	5	
passionate	1	2	3	4	5	
patient	1	2	3	4	5	
patient demeanor	1	2	3	4	5	
perceptive	1	2	3	4	5	
persistent	1	2	3	4	5	
personable	1	2	3	4	5	
poise	1	2	3	4	5	
powerful / strong	1	2	3	4	5	
practical	1	2	3	4	5	
pragmatic	1	2	3	4	5	
prepared	1	2	3	4	5	
productive	1	2	3	4	5	
proud	1	2	3	4	5	
rational	1	2	3	4	5	

**Appendix A: continued**

realistic	1	2	3	4	5	
risky	1	2	3	4	5	
sociable	1	2	3	4	5	
strong	1	2	3	4	5	
tact	1	2	3	4	5	
teach by doing	1	2	3	4	5	
well spoken	1	2	3	4	5	
willingness	1	2	3	4	5	

**Appendix B: EDLBI (effective developmental leader behavior instrument)**

**Effective Developmental Leader:** A leader whose main focus is the growth and further advancement of the people they lead in order to strengthen and progress the business performance in a proactive manner.

Webster’s New World Dictionary: **A Behavior is:** “the way a person behaves or acts; conduct; manners.”

**To what extent do you agree that each of the following Behaviors are characteristic of an Effective Developmental Leader (EDL).**

**Scoring**  
**1 = Strongly Disagree (SD)**  
**2 = Disagree (D)**  
**3 = Uncertain (U)**  
**4 = Agree (A)**  
**5 = Strongly Agree (SA)**

<u>Behaviors of an EDL</u>	<u>SD</u> <u>1</u>	<u>D</u> <u>2</u>	<u>U</u> <u>3</u>	<u>A</u> <u>4</u>	<u>SA</u> <u>5</u>	<u>Your Score Here</u> <u>V</u>
acknowledges achievement and effort	1	2	3	4	5	
acts professionally	1	2	3	4	5	
adaptive to changing environments	1	2	3	4	5	
address other team members issues or problems	1	2	3	4	5	
admits mistakes	1	2	3	4	5	
advocates the “we” and not the “I” in team	1	2	3	4	5	
allocates resources	1	2	3	4	5	
always willing to help others	1	2	3	4	5	
appears confident	1	2	3	4	5	
appears in charge	1	2	3	4	5	
approachable	1	2	3	4	5	
asks for feedback	1	2	3	4	5	
assertive	1	2	3	4	5	
assumes responsibility	1	2	3	4	5	
aware of company culture and leads in that direction	1	2	3	4	5	
builds leaders	1	2	3	4	5	
cares about others’ welfare	1	2	3	4	5	
challenges others	1	2	3	4	5	
charismatic	1	2	3	4	5	
communicates openly	1	2	3	4	5	
convincing	1	2	3	4	5	
cooperative	1	2	3	4	5	
courteous	1	2	3	4	5	
creates comfortable working atmosphere	1	2	3	4	5	

**Appendix B: continued**

creates solutions	1	2	3	4	5	
decisive	1	2	3	4	5	
delegates authorities	1	2	3	4	5	
determines needs	1	2	3	4	5	
develops others	1	2	3	4	5	
develops strategies and actions	1	2	3	4	5	
directs	1	2	3	4	5	
efficient	1	2	3	4	5	
empowers others	1	2	3	4	5	
energizes	1	2	3	4	5	
establishes goals	1	2	3	4	5	
evaluates all options	1	2	3	4	5	
evaluates talent	1	2	3	4	5	
facilitates	1	2	3	4	5	
focused	1	2	3	4	5	
follows through	1	2	3	4	5	
fosters growth	1	2	3	4	5	
gathers all information	1	2	3	4	5	
gets involved	1	2	3	4	5	
gives and solicits feedback	1	2	3	4	5	
hard working	1	2	3	4	5	
has an open door policy	1	2	3	4	5	
helps to resolve conflicts	1	2	3	4	5	
humble	1	2	3	4	5	
improves morale of employees	1	2	3	4	5	
informs	1	2	3	4	5	
inspires others	1	2	3	4	5	
involved in community	1	2	3	4	5	
is creative and innovative	1	2	3	4	5	
keeps a competitive edge	1	2	3	4	5	
learns about others	1	2	3	4	5	
lends a helping hand/voice	1	2	3	4	5	
motivates	1	2	3	4	5	
not afraid of failure	1	2	3	4	5	
open-minded	1	2	3	4	5	
organized	1	2	3	4	5	
passionate	1	2	3	4	5	
positions individuals for success	1	2	3	4	5	
predicts needs	1	2	3	4	5	
proactive	1	2	3	4	5	

**Appendix B: continued**

promotes cooperation	1	2	3	4	5	
provide the necessary resources for the team to succeed	1	2	3	4	5	
provides advice	1	2	3	4	5	
recognizes talent	1	2	3	4	5	
reflective	1	2	3	4	5	
removes barriers	1	2	3	4	5	
respectful	1	2	3	4	5	
risk taker	1	2	3	4	5	
role model	1	2	3	4	5	
seeks knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	
seeks to understand	1	2	3	4	5	
sees opportunities	1	2	3	4	5	
sets clear goals	1	2	3	4	5	
sets the vision	1	2	3	4	5	
shares vision and knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	
shows genuine concern	1	2	3	4	5	
shows sense of urgency	1	2	3	4	5	
solves problems	1	2	3	4	5	
speaks out	1	2	3	4	5	
stays positive	1	2	3	4	5	
straightforward	1	2	3	4	5	
strategic	1	2	3	4	5	
strives for success	1	2	3	4	5	
team oriented	1	2	3	4	5	
thinks outside the box	1	2	3	4	5	
thorough	1	2	3	4	5	
timely	1	2	3	4	5	
trusting	1	2	3	4	5	
uses resources effectively	1	2	3	4	5	
willingly supports employees	1	2	3	4	5	

## **Appendix C: Instructions Page for EDLTI and EDLTI**

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND INFORMATION. I GREATLY APPRECIATE YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY.**

**Please complete the surveys on each worksheet.  
There are 3 surveys on a different worksheet.**

The first survey is called the "Trait Instrument", this is the list of proposed traits of a Effective Developmental Leader.

**The second survey is called the "Behavior Instrument", this is the list of proposed behaviors of a Effective Developmental Leader.**

The third survey is titled "Demographics", this ask for information about you.  
There is also a "Sample Demographics" worksheet to help you in completing your demographics profile.

**This should take you about 30 minutes to complete all the instruments in this file (3 instruments).**

By completing these instruments you are giving great insight into Leadership and your help is greatly appreciated!!!!!!!

**When you complete these instruments and send them to Mike Wilson by way of email to [mwilson11@cox.net](mailto:mwilson11@cox.net), you are granting permission to use this data in the research.**

PLEASE SAVE THE COMPLETED SURVEY TO A NEW FILE NAME and send it to your colleague who is asking you to complete this survey.

**There will not be any mention of names, organizations, or any other method for readers to know who submitted the instruments.**

No names of people, organizations, schools, classes, or any other information will be included in the analysis and in the research report that will enable someone to identify a participant.

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND INFORMATION. I GREATLY APPRECIATE YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY.**

If you have any questions or concerns please contact Mike Wilson at 504-367-5008 home; 504-400-2916 cell; or email at [mwilson11@cox.net](mailto:mwilson11@cox.net)

**Appendix D: Research Consent Form**

**RESEARCH CONSENT FORM**

- 1. Study Title:** Traits and Behaviors of an Effective Developmental Leader
- 2 Investigator:** The following investigator is available for questions about this study,  
M-F, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
Michael S. Wilson (504) 736-2916 (office); (504) 367-5008 (home)
- 3 Purpose of the study:** The purpose of this study is to determine is to identify the key traits and behaviors of an effective developmental leader.
- 4 Benefits:** Study may yield and clearly define a Leadership Theory that is applicable in all organizations and will guide leaders to improve organizational performance.
- 5 Risks:** There are no risk to participants in this study. No one will know the coding number of the subjects except for the researcher. Files will be kept in a secure cabinet/computer to which only the investigator has access.
- 6 Privacy:** Results of the study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included in the publication. Subject identity will remain confidential.
- 7. Consent:**

<b>By completing this survey, saving the file to a new coded name, and submitting it the researcher, you are granting permission for the researcher to use the results of each survey included.</b>
---

**Place an X in the column to the left, if you give your consent.**

## **Vita**

Michael S. Wilson, (Mike), was born in Sydney, New South Wales, Australia in 1952 and immigrated to the United States at an early age. He was raised in a suburb of New Orleans, Louisiana where he presently resides. Mike has two boys, one who is a physician and the youngest who aspires to be a surgeon. His two boys are the center of his thoughts and are his proudest moments in life. Mike is a Scoutmaster, with the Boy Scouts of America, a volunteer coach-in many sports, a consultant, and a teacher.

Mike specializes in leadership, management, and team development, with an emphasis on developing high performance within individuals, teams, and organizations. He has worked extensively with leadership teams in the development of required skills for new initiatives and performance improvement coaching.

Mike is an Adjunct Professor of Management at Tulane University's Freeman School of Business and Loyola University's Joseph Butt's School of Business. He teaches management and organizational behavior courses at the graduate and undergraduate level.

Mike received a Bachelor of Science degree in Engineering from Nicholls State University in May 1976 and a Master of Engineering degree in Petroleum Engineering from Tulane University in May 1980. Mike entered the graduate school at Louisiana State University in the School of Human Resource Education and Workforce Development studying Organizational Leadership under the guidance and direction of Dr. Michael F. Burnett, his committee chairman. Mike will earn the Doctor of Philosophy degree in December 2004.