

Development of the Vannsimpco Leadership Survey: A delination of hybrid leadership styles

BARRY A. VANN, AARON N. COLEMAN, JENNIFER A. SIMPSON
University of the Cumberlands, Williamsburg, KY, USA

Abstract

The study of leadership is often attempted from various disciplinary perspectives; studies, therefore, mimic the limited interests and leadership styles delineated by scholars working in business, education, community development, and sociological fields. Instruments like the commonly used Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) also tend to be written from a supervisor's viewpoint, which limits their utility as a tool for comparing perceptions of subordinates to those of their supervisors. Because of those limitations, a more versatile bi-lateral instrument with blended leadership styles was developed. The instrument is titled the Vannsimpco Leadership Survey (VLS). The rationale for its development and a discussion on its validation are included in the pages that lie ahead. Also, the results of the reliability test on the VLS are reported. A Pearson's Product Moment Correlation r produced a significant result, ($r[108] = .91, p < .001$).

Keywords: leadership style inventory, business, education, blended leadership

Introduction

With increasing globalization of economic systems which invariably invites greater competition in the marketplace, organizations are pressed to find and exploit the most efficient systems. Leadership is a method transmitted through formal and informal communication channels, and although it has been defined for many years, there is a lack of consensus on the styles of leadership that are practiced in the real world. For instance, sociologists focus on issues of power and control, symbolic meanings, or how organizations form and function. Business managers are more likely to examine leadership behaviors from a "bottom line" and "ethical" standpoint, while educators justifiably relate leadership effectiveness to student learning outcomes. The present study involves the creation of a new leadership survey form that incorporates ideas from several disciplines with an eye toward capturing the blending of styles used by situational leaders. As is shown shortly, the researchers' review of the literature suggests that while there are a number of leadership surveys in use, arguably the most commonly used instrument is the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Several factors limit transformational leadership's appeal in a business model. It relies upon stereotypical leadership styles that, in short, portray the transformational leader as the ideal and the transactional leader as detached and unconcerned about staff. The stereotyping is even more pronounced with respect to autocratic leaders; they are portrayed as cold as and even harsher than transactional leaders. It is the contention of the authors that such depictions do not reflect the manner in which most organizations are managed. Indeed, it is quite possible that a leader could practice a hybrid form of, for example, autocratic-transformational or democratic-transactional leadership styles; moreover, if a leader follows Ken Blanchard's Change Model or Malcolm Knowles' construct of from pedagogy to andragogy, many new initiatives clearly demand a leadership model that is didactic during their unfolding. Clearly that leadership style can be portrayed as autocratic.

In the pages that lie ahead, a discussion on the nature of leadership styles and their delineations are presented. Next, the development of the Vannsimpco Leadership Survey (VLS) is discussed along with its vali-

dation and its test of reliability. The paper concludes with a summary and recommendations for further study and widespread application of VLS.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is considered valid across cultures, different organizational types, and leadership levels (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The MLQ is a self-administered survey instrument, and consists of descriptive questions about different styles of leadership (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1995). These questions measure transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire styles of leadership. Ozaralli (2003) reported the MLQ is "the best validated measure of transformational and transactional leadership" (p.338). The original MLQ was first published in 1985 (Bass, 1985).

There have been various revisions to the MLQ instrument. An earlier model of the MLQ, known as MLQ 8-Y, measured eight dimensions of leadership consisting of four dimensions of transformational leadership (charisma, inspiration, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation), three dimensions of transactional leadership (contingent reinforcement/reward, management-by-exception-active, and management-by-exception-passive), and a single dimension of Laissez-Faire leadership (passive leadership) (Bass & Avolio, 1989; Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). There were several criticisms of this earlier MLQ instrument. One of the most notable issues dealt with the discrimination between management-by-exception-passive and Laissez-Faire leadership (Bass, 1985; Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997; Yammarino & Bass, 1990).

The current form of the MLQ is formally known as the MLQ 5x. The MLQ 5x contains the "full range leadership theory" consisting of five transformational leadership subscales, two transactional subscales, and two passive subscales of Laissez-Faire (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Transformational Leadership style is measured by the common 5-I's: Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behaviors, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. The transactional Leadership management styles includes: Contingent Reward, and Management-by-Exception-Active. Finally, the Laissez-Faire Leadership style includes: Laissez-Faire Passive/Avoidant and Management-by-Exception (MBE)-Passive (Barbuto, 2005). This version of the MLQ attempted to rectify the issue of Laissez-Faire and management-by-exception-

passive, which was formerly considered a transactional factor.

The current version of the MLQ, the MLQ 5x has also garnered criticism from researchers, including the revision of current factor models. Alonso, Saboya, and Guirado (2010) reported through meta-analysis that the following four factors: transformational leadership, developmental/transactional leadership, corrective leadership and avoidant/passive leadership are better fit than Bass' categories. Reviewing extensive literature on the MLQ, Muenjohn, and Armstrong (2008) noted that diverse results were reported by many researchers on the validity of the MLQ. Finally, Keshtiban (2013) argues that the MLQ is outdated and does not consider current broader analysis of leadership components.

Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE)

While the MLQ remains a popular assessment of leadership styles in the US, a group of researchers examined leadership on the global scale in 2001. The GLOBE project, developed by House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta (2004), encompassed 62 societal cultures and examined 6 leadership dimensions (House et al., 2004). Those leadership dimensions include: charismatic, or value based; team oriented; self-protective; participative; humane oriented; and autonomous. A follow-up study by Suryani, Vijver, Poortinga, and Setiadi, (2012) reported that in Indonesia the GLOBE questionnaire assessed universal leadership styles (charismatic, team-oriented, and self-protective styles). Additionally, practical implications of GLOBE research includes identification of universal traits of leadership effectiveness (integrity, charismatic-visionary, charismatic-inspirational, team-builder) (Javidan, Dorfman, de Luque, & House, 2006; Javidan & Dastmalchian, 2009).

Leadership Style Scale (LSS)

There is currently only one leadership style instrument designed to measure the hybrid factors of autocratic, democratic, transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire leadership. The LSS was developed by Tas, Celik and Tomul (2007) and aimed to measure leadership style of school administrators with 59 items. The LSS has five dimensions: autocratic leadership (10 items), democratic leadership (13 items), laissez-faire leadership (11 items), transformational leadership (15 items) and transactional leadership (10 items). The coefficient of internal consistency of the scale was determined to be .87. While the LSS covers the hybrid leadership factors, it is limited to piloting and administration to educational leaders (Inandi, Tunc, & Gilic, 2013).

In summary, the development of leadership style instruments is an area of debate and continued research. Through a review of literature, no hybrid forms of leadership surveys exists that encompass a variety of leadership factors without bias or an emphasis on one leadership factor, or one workplace setting.

Other Leadership Style Instruments

There are various leadership style instruments available electronically, although most are not referenced in scholarly peer reviewed journals. One such instrument is the Hay Group Inventory of Leadership Styles Diagnostic. This self-administered survey provides the following leadership style results: the Directive style; Visionary style, Affiliative style, Participative style, Pacesetter style; and Coaching style (Garrick, 2006). Other free self-administered questionnaires are available through online search engines free of charge to participants; however, the pilot testing information is more difficult to attain.

Current Research on Leadership Styles

Effective leadership is significantly related to job well-being in the workplace (Kuoppala, Lamminpaa, Liira and Vainio, 2008; Lopez, Green, Carmody-Bubb, & Kodatt, 2011). Most research in leadership styles focuses on one dimension of leadership style (i.e. transformational vs. transactional; or autocratic vs. democratic) related to effectiveness or employee satisfaction. For instance, Rowland and Heinritz (2007) determined that transformational leadership was related to larger profit margins than other leadership styles, and Hetland (2007) reported that transformational leadership has also been positively correlated to professional efficacy. While employees reported lower job-related tension working under a leader purporting a democratic leadership style (Omolayo, 2007). In a study of school administrators, Inandi, Tunc, and Gilic, (2013) discovered a negative relationship between autocratic or laissez-faire leadership styles and resistance to change. However, instruments designed to measure various leadership styles in isolation have been available for decades, but lack the component to evaluate combinations of leadership style in a condensed format for use in a variety of settings. The lack of an instrument generated the development of Vannsimpco, a multi-dimensional leadership style instrument.

Leadership Styles

The Vannsimpco Leadership Survey (VLS) attempts to combine various leadership traits into more realistic and applicable categories. It assumes that most leaders cannot be described in monolithic terms of transformational, transactional, democratic, autocratic, and/or laissez-faire. Rather, leaders employ a hybrid of various styles based upon their contextual situation. A brief overview and critique of each style is therefore necessary in order to understand the conceptual framework underpinning the Vannsimpco.

Transformational

The darling of the leadership studies discipline, the transformational leadership method was first elaborated upon through the historical research of Burns (1978) and, later, Bass (1985). According to these works, effective transformational leadership transcends the limitations imposed by followers and organizational structure. As Burns (2003) explains, transformational leaders “cause a metamorphosis in the form or structure, a change in the very condition or nature of thing, a change into another substance, a radical change in outward form or inner character” (p. 24). These leaders achieve their results through personal charisma, charm, clear vision, and passion. Followers of transformational leaders believe themselves valued as an individual, and often feel empowered to perform better.

Transformational leadership assumes institutions need, and require, a transformation; that innovation is always preferable to the status quo, and that followers are eager to have personal and intimate relationships with their leaders. In many ways, this definition explains as much about the researchers’ world view as it does the leadership he or she is purporting to study. If one believes in the need for constant innovation for the sake of innovation, it makes sense why transformation leadership is appealing. Yet, innovation is not always required or desired. Many followers or organizations may not want transformation or to form emotional connections to their leader, perceiving this attempts to establish emotional bonds as poor management or emotional manipulation. Furthermore, followers may misconstrue the emotional appeals of transformational leaders and become overly dependent upon their leader for personal validation (Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2003). Transformational leadership can be used by leaders who lack moral guidance and seek to wield the “dark side of charisma” (Yukl, 1989) for less than desirable reasons. Although some advocates maintain that “authentic transformational leadership foster the moral values of honesty, loyalty, and fairness,” nevertheless, one cannot ignore how the traits of the transformational leader have been used for nefarious purposes. It is this realization, demonstrated through historical experiences that should place some caution upon the degree to which transformational leadership is celebrated by educators and business leaders.

Transactional

First explicated by Max Weber in the early twentieth century, leaders who exercise transactional leadership use a quid-pro-quo approach to leading others. They tend to be task-oriented leaders, more concerned with managing followers, maintaining the chain of command, and achieving results rather than change. Many studies on transactional leadership stress how transactional leaders believe followers must be monitored closely. Because of

their result-oriented style, transactional leaders motivate their followers through a rewards/punishment system. Critics of transactional leadership accuse it of being rigid and casting blame upon the followers and not the leader. Others assert that leading through rewards appeal only to the selfish interests of the followers, thereby creating low-motivated workers (Bass & Bass, 2008). This is criticism is apt if the rewards offered are minimal or unworthy of the effort required to obtain them. Yet, in situations where the rewards offered are desirable and worthy, the role self-interest in the transactional relationship can become a strong motivation for achieving success. At the same time, and despite critics’ assertions to the contrary (Bass & Bass 2008), followers motivated to obtain better rewards and can bring great things to organizations. This potential of such self-interested rewards leading to greater organization success was first acknowledged as early as 1705 in Bernard Mandeville’s work, *Fable of the Bees*.

Democratic

As the name implies, democratic leaders seek advice and input from their followers. Democratic leaders motivate their followers by engaging their followers, listening to their ideas, and treating both the individual and their ideas as equals. Under such a leader, organization hierarchy becomes unimportant or non-existent. With such a belief in their equality, followers are motivated to work harder because they trust they have an equal share of the success of the organization (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939). Bass and Bass maintain that democratic “leadership is considerate, democratic, consultative and participative, employee-centered, concerned with people, concerned with maintenance of good working relations, supportive and oriented toward facilitating interaction, relationship oriented, and oriented toward group decision making” (Bass & Bass, 2008, p. 441).

At the same time, however, democratic leadership has several shortcomings. A democratic leadership style does not respond well to emergency situations when quick, decisive, and energetic leadership is necessary. Because it consumes time to weigh equally all advice, democratic leadership is cumbersome and slow. At the same time, equating all ideas as equal ignores the wisdom that accounts from institutional memory or longevity of position-holding. Democratic leadership also assumes that all followers possess a deep knowledge of internal workings, goals, and expectations of the entire organization. Furthermore, a leader may pose as democratic in order to placate followers but has no real intention of truly implementing the ideas of others. Ironically enough and often downplayed in the literature, in order to have a truly democratic leadership style requires someone willing to exert their will upon the group to maintain order and keep conversations and ideas germane.

Autocratic

Leaders who embrace an autocratic style concentrate all decision-making with themselves. Relying upon their own discernment, autocratic leaders believe that a clear demarcation between follower and leader must exist for effective management. Under such leadership, organizational hierarchy is strong and followers understand where all decision-making rests (Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939).

The common perception of autocratic leadership is that it is the natural embodiment of Machiavelli's famous dictum: "it is better to be feared than love, if one cannot be both" (Machiavelli, 1998, p 67). Without question, this style of leadership can be "arbitrary, controlling, power-oriented, coercive, punitive, and close-minded," (Bass & Bass 2008) thereby leading followers to resent the leadership. Not all autocratic leaders are arbitrary dictators, however. In their seminal study on the topic, Lewin, Lippit, and White (1939) noted some benefits to autocratic leadership, mainly that followers had clear understandings of what leadership expected from them. At the same time, and assuming that the leader is not arbitrary, the this style can be of benefit to an organization composed of working professionals, who have little desire to participate in leadership decisions and seek only do their job. Knowing that someone will make those decisions can become a benefit and motivator to self-motivated employees who wish simply to work to the best of their abilities.

Laissez-faire

Borrowing from the economic theory of the same name, laissez-faire leaders take a "hands off" approach to leadership. They believe that followers know their particular role and job better than they do, and, thus, should be left alone. As such, followers of a laissez-faire leader assume a greater role in the organizational structure. If done poorly, Laissez-faire leadership can produce severe dysfunction of an organization. Because of the passive nature of the leadership, followers can lose motivation and become increasingly unproductive, thereby creating large degree of apathy from followers. At the same time, however, in an organization composed of self-motivating and highly competent followers, the degree of freedom offered by this approach can lead to great results.

Situational Leadership

Situational leadership does not confine itself to one method of leadership. Rather, it permits the leader to employ various leadership methods to different situations and groups, allowing the context of events to shape the leadership's methods. Although it lacks the in-depth study that all other leadership methods have received, it is nevertheless perhaps the most applicable to real-word

situations. Given the distinctiveness and fluidity of various group dynamics, situational leadership methods can allow the leader to apply different methods as needed (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969).

Methodology

As shown in the proceeding overview of the literature, most scholars focus on delineating transactional; transformational; laissez-faire, which is referred to as avoidant/passive in the MLQ instrument, as the most commonly measured and perhaps understood leadership styles. Some scholars, especially those in workplace sociology, concentrate on democratic, autocratic, laissez-faire, expressive and instrumental styles (Tischler, Henry, & Mendelsohn, 1999). The review of the literature also suggests that the academic background of the scholar influences the leadership styles and indeed organizational paradigms he or she considers important. While not abundantly clear in the literature, logic suggests that some managers may embrace a blend of leadership styles; this would certainly be the case if the leader is driven by a philosophy that values situational leadership. It would make sense that a manager might well be autocratic in some situations and more democratic in other settings. He or she might also have a "good bedside manner" with an "iron fist in a velvet glove" while maintaining control of decision-making. Some leaders, on the other hand, may employ a democratic leadership style because of their empowered workforce (i.e., unionized plants) demands it. In such cases, the manager may be more instrumental (task oriented) rather than expressive (people centered). In other words, it might be problematic to think of the democratic leader as the only type of administrator who is considered to be a good "people person." Despite some depictions of autocratic leaders as being harsh and uncaring, they could in fact be charismatic and inspirational.

The MLQ (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) has limitations in accomplishing an accurate depiction of leadership as it unfolds in most real-world settings; nevertheless, it continues to be arguably the most widely used instrument in delineating leadership styles and practices. In addition to not measuring hybrid forms of leadership the MLQ is hampered by its limited range of leadership styles: transactional, transformational, avoidant/passive, and outcomes of leadership. Clearly this last form is not a leadership style; certainly, any desired outcomes in the workplace may be influenced by a host of other organizational and even local to global cultural and social forces. With respect to the present study, the MLQ offers little insight into the use of hybrid leadership styles. Their absence in the MLQ led to the belief among some scholars that a better, more comprehensive instrument (survey) was needed. Vann's discussions with colleagues at the University of the Cumberland (UC), regional business leaders and school administrators, as well as faculty at the SBS Swiss Business School in Zurich, crystalized

the notion that a more practical instrument should be developed.

Informed by feedback collected during those dialogues, a new instrument was developed, titled the Vannsimpco Leadership Survey (VLS). It was established to gain greater insight into the use of a broader range and blending of leadership styles, which, in effect, should capture a more nuanced use of situational leadership practices. VLS was developed by University of the Cumberland's Barry A. Vann, Jennifer A. Simpson, and Aaron N. Coleman in collaboration with SBS Swiss Business School. The instrument seeks to fill a major void in the literature on applied practices in business and organizational development (see Appendix A).

While the dialogues with leaders in the field that are mentioned above established the instrument's validity, its reliability was established in a pilot study conducted by Vann, the instrument's senior developer, at the University of the Cumberland in the summer of 2014. An eclectic body of leaders who were taking part in a leadership seminar at UC was asked to participate in the pilot study. Eleven seminar participants took part in the pilot study; they included business managers, professors, and college administrators. Reliability was established by a Pearson's Product Moment Correlation r . Data generated for the pilot study resulted from the administration of the VLS on two separate occasions among the same study participants. A correlation test comparing the first administration and second administration scores produced a statistic in a favorable range, ($r [106] = .91, p < .001$).

These data suggest that the VLS is a reliable and valid instrument that has the potential to be used in a variety of business and organizational settings. Its design facilitates its use among administrators to measure their perceptions of their leadership styles. The wording in the instrument also allows for its administration to be used to delineate the perceptions of staff and subordinates relative to their supervisors' leadership styles.

Summary

The Vannsimpco Leadership Survey (VLS) seeks to move leadership studies away from the institutional bias towards transformational leadership and the rigid, one-style-only, understanding for leadership methods. Real-world leadership application employs a hybridization of the various forms of leadership. After significant testing and data collection conducted at the University of the Cumberland and in conjunction with the Swiss Business School, a Pearson's Product Moment correction r reported a favorable range, ($r [106] = .91, p < .001$), thereby making the VLS a dependable and effective instrument for testing leadership.

The development of the Vannsimpco Leadership Survey (VLS) has implications for future researchers analyzing relationships between leadership style and effectiveness. The VLS could be paired in a correlational study with an instrument to measure professional efficacy, job satisfaction, or other measures related to professional success. The universality of the VLS allows researchers in virtually any setting to gather data to make decisions regarding leadership initiatives, training, and employment. The possibilities are limitless for innovative leaders and researchers to better understand current leadership styles of members of their selected populations.

References

- Alonso, F., Saboya, P., & Guirado, I. (2010). Transformational and transactional leadership: An analysis of the factor structure of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) in a Spanish sample. *Psicothema*, 22(3), 495-501.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1995). Construct validation and norms for the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ-Form 5X). New York: Center for leadership studies, Binghamton University, State University of New York.
- Barbuto Jr, J. (2005). Motivation and transactional, charismatic, and transformational leadership: A Test of Antecedents. *Journal Of Leadership & Organizational Studies (Baker College)*, 11(4), 26-40.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1989). *Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire technical report*. Center for Leadership Studies. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. & Bass R. (2004). *The bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. New York: Free Press.
- Bodla, M. A. & Nawaz, M. M. (2010). Comparative study of full range leadership model among faculty members in public and private sector higher education institutes and universities. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5, (4); 208-214.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burns, J. (2003). *Transforming leadership*. New York: Atlantic Books.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy Of Management Review*, 12(4), 637-647.
- Garrick, L. (2006). *Senior careers development service: Supporting guide-Hay group inventory of leadership styles diagnostic*. Hay Group.
- Hartog, D., Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal Of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 70(1), 19-34.
- Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, 23 (5), 26-34.
- Hetland, H., Sandal, G.M., & Johnsen, T.B. (2007). Burnout in the information technology sector: Does leadership matter? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16 (1), 58-75.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W. & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organization: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Inandi, Y., Tunc, B., & Gilic, F. (2013). School administrators' leadership styles and resistance to change. *International Journal Of Academic Research*, 5(5), 196-203. doi:10.7813/2075-4124.2013/5-5/B.30
- Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., de Luque, M.S., & House, R.J., (2006). In the eye of the beholder: Cross cultural lessons in leadership from project GLOBE. *Academy of Management Perspectives* 20(1), 67-90.
- Javidan, M., & Dastmalchian, A. (2009). Managerial implications of the GLOBE project: A study of 62 societies. *Asia Pacific Journal Of Human Resources*, 47(1), 41-58.
- Keshtiban, A. (2013). The challenges and benefits of the multi-factor leadership questionnaire (MLQ), in terms of gender and the level of analysis: A critical review of current research. *Proceedings Of The European Conference On Management, Leadership & Governance*, 58-65.
- Kuoppala, J., Lamminpaa, A., & Liira, J. (2008). Leadership, job well-being, and health effects – A systematic review and a meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 50 (8).
- Lewin, K., Lippit, R. & White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-301.
- Lopez, D., Green, M., Carmody-Bubb, M., & Kodatt, S. (2011). The relationship between Leadership Style and Employee Stress: An Empirical Study. *International Journal Of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, 6(3), 170-181.
- Machiavelli, N. (1998). *The Prince* translated by Harvey C. Mansfield. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mandeville, B. (1714). *Fable of the bees: Or, private vices, public benefits*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Muenjohn, N. & Armstrong, A. (2008). Structural validity of the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ), capturing the leadership factors of transformational-transactional leadership. *Contemporary Management Research*, 4 (1), 3-14.
- Omolayo, B. (2007). Effect of leadership style on job-related tension and psychological sense of community in work organizations: A case study of four organizations in Lagos State, Nigeria *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology*. 4 (2), 30-37.

- Ozaralli, N. 2003. Effects of transformational leadership on empowerment and team Effectiveness , *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(6) ,335-344.
- Rowold, J., & Heinitz, K. (2007). Transformational and charismatic leadership: Assessing the convergent, divergent and criterion validity of the MLQ and the CKS. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18(2), 121-133. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.01.003
- Stone, A.G., Russell, R.F. and Patterson, K. (2003). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(4), 349-361.
- Suryani, A. O., Vijver, F. R., Poortinga, Y. H., & Setiadi, B. N. (2012). Indonesian leadership styles: A mixed-methods approach. *Asian Journal Of Social Psychology*, 15(4), 290-303. doi:10.1111/j.1467-839X.2012.01384.x
- Tas, A., K. Celik & E. Tomul, 2007. Leadership styles of principals in elementary schools where the new program is implemented in Turkey. *J. Pamukkale Univ. Facul. Educat.*, 22: 85-98.
- Tischler, H. & Mendelsohn, R., (1999). *Introduction to sociology*. (Fort Worth: Harcourt Press).
- Yammarino, F. J. & Bass, B. M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers: Some preliminary findings. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds), *Measures of Leadership*. West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15, 251-289.

Vannsimpco Leadership Survey Key

Transactional Questions

_____ 1 Supervisors should make it a point to reward staff for achieving organizational goals.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____ 2 Supervisors should let staff members know what to expect as rewards for achieving goals.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____ 3 Supervisors should set deadlines and clearly state the positive or negative consequences of staff members' not meeting defined goals.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Democratic Questions

_____ 4 Supervisors should give staff authority to make important decisions.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____ 5 Supervisors should seek input from staff when formulating policies and procedures for implementing them.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____ 6 To solve problems, supervisors should have meetings with staff members before correcting issues.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Autocratic Questions

_____ 7 It is the supervisor's ultimate responsibility for whether the organization achieves its goals.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____ 8 Supervisors should make quick decisions in times of urgency and be more deliberate in making decisions during times of less urgency.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____ 9 Supervisors should assign specific tasks to key staff members in order to achieve specific goals.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Autocratic-Transformational

_____ 10 Supervisors should provide the goal for the organization and allow staff to work towards achieving the goal, making sure to offer them feedback concerning their efforts.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____ 11 Supervisors should retain control of decision making, but they should encourage high morale so followers can more effectively implement change.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____ 12 Supervisors are responsible for the operation of the organization or department, which includes the development of the competencies and commitment of personnel.
Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Autocratic-Transactional

_____13 In addition to having responsibility for decision-making, it is essential for a supervisor to provide incentives and disincentives for staff with respect to work they have done on assigned projects.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____14 Supervisors should state clearly the incentives and disincentives to followers while maximizing oversight on the most critical decisions.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____15 Supervisors make the key decisions for the organization and get most of the credit or blame, but they should make sure that their promises for rewards and disincentives made to workers are kept.

Strongly disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Democratic-Transformational

_____16 Supervisors should provide opportunities for staff members to be involved in decision making while serving as mentors during times of change.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____17 Supervisors should be open to others' ideas, yet he or she should guide employees to become stronger workers.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____18 Supervisors should be highly concerned about developing staff's ability to contribute to making important organizational decisions.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Democratic-Transactional

_____19 Supervisors should be comfortable working with groups to seek their input in making decisions while providing incentives and disincentives for the quality of their work.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____20 In order to make decisions, supervisors should discuss issues with all of the staff members while considering which incentives and disincentives should be used in response to the quality of their work.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____21 Supervisors should be concerned about building consensus among staff members while making sure they understand the timelines, as well as their benefits and penalties in relation to achieving goals.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Transformational

_____22 Supervisors should rely on personal influence and relationship building rather than on position or title to get staff to do work tasks.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____23 Supervisors should develop strategies to develop the staff's competence and commitment.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____24 Supervisors should look for ways to develop the strengths of staff members.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

Laissez-faire

_____25 Supervisors' jobs are to read reports and "see the big picture;" nearly all of their work should involve little or no direction of the staff members who make point of contact decisions.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____26 Staff members should be hired with skills necessary to make decisions in the workplace. If staff members need direct supervision, they should not be working in the organization.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

_____27 Supervisors should hire competent and committed staff members, which relieves the "manager" from making most of the day-to-day decisions.

Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Neutral 3 Agree 4 Strongly Agree 5

