

Pseudo-Transformational Leadership: Model Specification and Outcomes¹

AMY CHRISTIE²

*School of Business and Economics
Wilfrid Laurier University*

JULIAN BARLING

*Queen's School of Business
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada*

NICK TURNER

*Asper School of Business
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada*

A model of pseudo-transformational leadership was tested in 4 experiments. Pseudo-transformational leadership is defined by self-serving, yet highly inspirational leadership behaviors, unwillingness to encourage independent thought in subordinates, and little caring for one's subordinates more generally. Study 1 ($N = 167$) used vignettes to differentiate among transformational, pseudo-transformational, and laissez-faire leadership styles. Study 2 ($N = 179$) replicated this model using ratings of characters in the film *12 Angry Men* (Fonda, Rose, & Lumet, 1957). Study 3 ($N = 120$) tested the model, controlling for participant perceptions of leader affect and prototypical leadership behaviors. Study 4 ($N = 127$) extended the ecological validity of the model and range of outcomes. Across the studies, support was obtained for the model.

The ethics of transformational and charismatic leadership (terms often used interchangeably in the literature) have been debated actively (e.g., Barling, Christie, & Turner, 2008; Conger, 1990; Howell & Avolio, 1992; Price, 2003; Turner, Barling, Epitropaki, Butcher, & Milner, 2002), perhaps because the influential appeal of these types of leaders yields the potential for opportunistic behavior. A distinction can be made between the behaviors of

¹The authors thank Kate Dupré, Michelle Inness, seminar participants at the University of Alberta's School of Business, and members of the Thursday Afternoon Research Group for constructive comments on earlier versions of the manuscript. Earlier versions of the manuscript were presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Atlanta, GA, August 2006; and the annual convention of the Association for Psychological Science, New York, NY, May 2006. Financial support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada to all three authors is gratefully acknowledged.

²Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Amy Christie, School of Business and Economics, Wilfrid Laurier University, 75 University Avenue West, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3C5. E-mail: achristie@wlu.ca

authentic transformational leaders (or socialized charismatic leaders) and pseudo-transformational leaders (or personalized charismatic leaders; e.g., Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; House & Howell, 1992; Howell & Avolio, 1992).

While inspiring and influencing others is not inherently ethical or unethical (Howell & Avolio, 1992), authentic transformational leaders inspire and use their influence to empower others. In contrast, pseudo-transformational leaders inspire and use their influence for self-gain (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). We believe that this distinction reaches the core of transformational leadership, where leadership that abuses power by maximizing self-interest, irrespective of followers' interests, is antithetical to authentic transformational leadership. Our purpose in this paper is to extend and integrate previous models of pseudo-transformational leadership and to test the primary tenets of our model in four experimental studies.

Pseudo-Transformational Leadership in Past Research

A number of complementary conceptual models of pseudo-transformational leadership have emerged in the literature. Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) initially labeled the *unethical charismatic leaders* described by Conger and Kanungo (1998) as *pseudo-transformational leaders*, distinguishing them from authentic transformational leaders. Bass and Steidlmeier defined pseudo-transformational leaders as failing to uphold the standard required for leadership to be transformational; that it "must rest on a moral foundation of legitimate values" (p. 184). Like Bass and Steidlmeier, Price (2003) took a behavioral approach to understanding pseudo-transformational leadership, suggesting that leaders can be pseudo-transformational as a result of unethical values, unethical behaviors, or both.

Dasborough and Ashkanasy (2002) expanded the conceptualization of pseudo-transformational leadership by considering the leader–follower relationship more broadly. These authors focused attention on how the emotions and attributions that followers make about the motives of their leaders shape their evaluations and labeling of the leadership. The leader–follower relationship is proposed to suffer when followers perceive their leaders as pseudo-transformational. Barling et al. (2008) conceptualized and tested a model of pseudo-transformational leadership that included two of the four transformational leadership behaviors as perceived by followers; namely, idealized influence and inspirational motivation. Using a sample of executives, they found that followers of pseudo-transformational leaders perceived these leaders to be more abusive; felt more dependent on, obedient to, and fearful of their leaders; and had higher levels of job insecurity, as compared to the followers of transformational and laissez-faire leaders. The behavioral model

of pseudo-transformational leadership that we propose in this paper diverges from an attributional approach and goes beyond Barling et al. by including all four of the transformational leadership behaviors.

Expanding the Conceptualization of Pseudo-Transformational Leadership

Prior conceptualizations of pseudo-transformational leadership have differed in focus and scope. We draw on similarities of existing models, particularly House and Howell (1992), Bass and Steidlmeier (1999), and Barling et al. (2008) to expand the conceptualization of pseudo-transformational leadership to include all four of the facets of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1998).

Idealized influence is defined by the values, morals, and ethical principles of a leader and is manifest through behaviors that suppress self-interest and focus on the good of the collective (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Gardner & Avolio, 1998). Research has shown that leaders who have higher moral reasoning (Turner et al., 2002), who are ethical (Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005), or who are self-sacrificing (De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2004; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005; Yorges, Weiss, & Strickland, 1999) are perceived as more transformational or charismatic. In contrast, pseudo-transformational leaders are dominated by self-interest, create and transmit visions that exclude the best interests of followers, and use positional power to achieve their own ends. These leaders are most interested in absolute power and personal gain (Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002).

While idealized influence can be used to contrast transformational and pseudo-transformational leaders, the *means* of influence (i.e., inspirational motivation) is similar across the two types of leadership. The existing literature suggests that the behaviors of transformational and pseudo-transformational leaders can appear similar, particularly to those socially distant from the leader, such that their influence tactics may be indistinguishable to some followers (e.g., Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002; Price, 2003). We argue that the inspirational motivation or *charisma* of pseudo-transformational leaders is a testament to their ability to manipulate followers' perceptions (Weierter, 1997). However, impression management will not blind followers to these leaders' self-aggrandizing values (Barling et al., 2008).

We argue that followers will often be conscious of these leaders' self-interest, egotistic values, and need to dominate. This is the way these leaders ensure the achievement of their personalized goals (Bass & Steidlmeier,

1999). For example, Howell and Avolio (1992) provided an example of a leader who was openly understood to be self-interested and egotistical; namely, F. Ross Johnson, the former chief executive officer and president of RJR Nabisco. According to Howell and Avolio, "Over his career, Johnson gained the reputation as a glib, self-serving, 'win at all costs' executive with 'a patina of charisma'" (p. 49).

Laissez-faire leaders, who are both indifferent and passive, are unlikely to display either idealized influence or inspirational motivation (Kelloway, Sivanathan, Francis, & Barling, 2005; Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland, & Hetland, 2007). Like pseudo-transformational leaders, *laissez-faire* leaders fail to manifest strong idealized influence. This occurs not because *laissez-faire* leaders are self-interested, but because they are disinterested in furthering either the group or themselves. *Laissez-faire* leaders also disengage from any attempt at inspiring followers to achieve future goals or challenges.

Little empirical attention has been directed at exploring these distinctions. O'Connor, Mumford, Clifton, Gessner, and Connelly (1995) took a historical approach and classified two groups of publicly known Western leaders in the 20th century: those who were charismatic and constructive to followers, and those who were charismatic but destructive to their followers. The constructive and destructive charismatic leaders could be distinguished on a number of specified personal characteristics, including narcissism, self-regulation, use of others for self-gain, and need for power and self-protection. Destructive charismatic leadership showed a positive relationship between these qualities and harm to the social system in which the leader was based.

Most recently, Barling et al. (2008) tested a model that differentiated between transformational leadership (i.e., high idealized influence and high inspirational motivation), pseudo-transformational leadership (i.e., low idealized influence and high inspirational motivation), and poor leadership (i.e., low idealized influence and low inspirational motivation). Fear of the leader, obedience to the leader, dependence on the leader, perceptions of abusive supervision, and personal feelings of job insecurity were highest under pseudo-transformational leadership.

Notwithstanding the importance of previous findings, we suggest that conceptual advances are warranted. The limited research that relates to pseudo-transformational leadership focuses on two behavioral distinctions; namely, enacted values and inspiration. Like others (i.e., Barling et al., 2008), we suggest that a comprehensive model of pseudo-transformational leadership must take into account the full range of transformational leadership behaviors, which also clearly distinguish these leaders from their authentic counterparts. We extend past models to include intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration.

Intellectually stimulating leaders encourage followers to think critically, to question underlying assumptions, and to find creative solutions (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Howell & Avolio, 1992). Intellectually stimulating leaders do not impose their ideas on others; they are energized by thoughts emanating from their followers, actively encouraging followers' participation and input (Howell & Avolio, 1992). Unlike transformational leaders, pseudo-transformational leaders cannot afford to allow followers to think for themselves, as this could interfere with the achievement of their self-serving goals. Thus, pseudo-transformational leaders censor opposing views and manipulate information, sometimes hiding relevant details from followers to achieve their selfish goals (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Pseudo-transformational leaders discourage followers from doubting or debating their vision, instead seeking absolute obedience (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Thus, we argue that pseudo-transformational leaders do not simply lack intellectual stimulation; instead, they actively attempt to stifle the independent thought of followers. While transformational leaders attempt to nurture followers' intellectual talents, pseudo-transformational leaders attempt to overwhelm followers' intellectual abilities.

Like pseudo-transformational leaders, laissez-faire leaders do not engage in intellectual stimulation. However, unlike pseudo-transformational leaders, they also do not attempt to dissuade followers from thinking creatively and critically. Their decision neither to facilitate nor to interfere with employees' intellectual development derives from their general indifference to independent thinking by their followers.

Individualized consideration is the final behavior involved in transformational leadership, and occurs when leaders pay attention to and support the needs of each follower (Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006). In contrast, pseudo-transformational leaders value people to the extent to which they can use them as tools or objects for helping them reach their own personal agendas (O'Connor et al., 1995). Individualized consideration is absent from the behavioral repertoire of laissez-faire leaders. However, in contrast to pseudo-transformational leaders who exploit their followers, laissez-faire leaders simply ignore them. They care little about the needs of individual followers or developing their leadership potential.

Model Summary and Measurement Issues

While transformational and pseudo-transformational leaders share inspirational motivation, they can be distinguished in terms of idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Specifically, pseudo-transformational leadership will be reflected in leaders who enact

self-serving values, actively discourage creative thought, and exploit their followers, yet manifest strong inspirational talent and appeal. Together, these behaviors allow pseudo-transformational leaders to manipulate followers into achieving the leaders' self-interested goals. We believe that it is a leader's ability to motivate followers—while ignoring the collective good and stifling independent thought—that makes this variant of leadership so threatening to the welfare of followers. Leaders who have self-interested values, but do not inspire others, are unlikely to be successful manipulators. They simply cannot gain actionable support from their followers. In contrast, transformational leaders tend to be strong, and laissez-faire leaders tend to be weak in all four components of transformational leadership. Table 1 outlines these distinctions.

Two comments are warranted on measurement issues in prior research on transformational and pseudo-transformational leadership. First, the consistent significant and substantial correlations among measures of the four facets of transformational leadership behaviors that routinely result when using Bass and Avolio's (1995) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; e.g., Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995) require caution in interpreting interaction effects, and limit the extent to which the unique effects of the four transformational behaviors can be assessed (Barling et al., 2008).

Second, the MLQ may underestimate the nature of pseudo-transformational leadership. Prior empirical research (Barling et al., 2008) used low scores on idealized influence and high scores on inspirational motivation as a reflection of pseudo-transformational leadership. Our model suggests that pseudo-transformational leadership is not just the absence of idealized influence, or the infrequent extent to which leaders challenge employees to think for themselves (i.e., intellectual stimulation). Instead, it is the dominance of self-serving values and the conscious decision not to allow one's employees to think for themselves that characterize pseudo-transformational leadership. Accordingly, we go beyond past research and test the proposed model using an experimental approach to distinguish between leadership styles.

Study 1

We expect that pseudo-transformational leadership will have different outcomes on the leader–follower relationship than will either transformational leadership or laissez-faire leadership. Here, we develop hypotheses for five outcomes; specifically, followers' fear of the leader, perceptions of job insecurity, trust in the leader, satisfaction with the leader, and reverence for the leader.

Table 1

Leadership Styles Contrasted

	Transformational leadership	Pseudo-transformational leadership	Laissez-faire leadership
Idealized influence	Create visions that are based on the collective good and align the morals and aspirations of followers	Create visions that are driven by self-interest and exclude the best interests of followers	Create visions that are neither dominated by the collective good nor centered on self-interest
Inspiration motivation	Influence followers to envision and work toward future goals by expressing a vision of the future	Influence followers to envision and work toward future goals by expressing a vision of the future, often through deception	Infrequent displays of influence and motivation
Intellectual stimulation	Encourage followers to examine problems in different ways, think critically, and find creative solutions	Discourage opposing viewpoints, independent thought, and critiques from followers	Indifferent to the intellectual development of followers
Individualized consideration	Consider the individual needs of followers, acting as a coach or a mentor	Exploit followers, using them as a means to an end	Care little about developing followers individually

First, several factors support our hypothesis that fear of the leader will be greater under pseudo-transformational leadership than under transformational leadership or laissez-faire leadership. Followers of pseudo-transformational leaders may be fearful of their leaders because they are unable to expect their leaders to act for the collective good. Pseudo-transformational leaders take advantage of and manipulate others for their own purposes. Thus, followers may fear the consequences of dissenting from the leader's ideas (Howell & Avolio, 1992). By contrast, followers are unlikely to fear transformational leaders who show followers that they are interested in achieving collective goals and developing their followers, or laissez-faire leaders who are simply passive.

Second, we expect that pseudo-transformational leadership will predict follower perceptions of job insecurity. Because pseudo-transformational leaders are dominated by self-interest, but disinterested in their followers' best interests, followers of pseudo-transformational leaders would be in a tenuous position (Conger & Kanungo, 1998) during difficult times and when organizations are faced with tough choices. Followers may sense their leader's motives, leading to increased anxiety and insecurity about the future. Similarly, laissez-faire leaders' passivity, especially during difficult times, might leave employees in a vulnerable position. These leaders would be less likely to communicate effectively with their followers in a way that would alleviate any insecurity. In contrast, transformational leaders instill feelings of security in followers by putting followers' needs at the forefront and providing reassurance during stressful events.

Third, a different pattern of findings is predicted for the effects of positive outcomes on the leader–follower relationship. Followers may regard the development of mutual trust as a most desired leader quality (e.g., Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Zand, 1972). Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) argued that mutual trust between the leader and the follower is vital for authentic transformational leadership. Several studies have documented significant relationships between trust and transformational leadership (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Bommer, 1996) or charismatic leadership (Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and Werner (1998) identified five behaviors that reflect managerial trustworthy behavior and are likely to elicit trust from employees—specifically, behavioral consistency, integrity, communication, consideration, and encouraging employee control—all of which are core behaviors within transformational leadership. In contrast, the behaviors of pseudo-transformational leaders are inconsistent, inconsiderate, and lacking in moral integrity as a result of which such leaders are arguably unlikely to be trusted by their followers (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Similarly, by taking inactive leadership roles, laissez-faire leaders do not enact the behaviors that are necessary to build trust.

Fourth, we argue that satisfaction with the leader will be significantly higher for transformational leaders than for pseudo-transformational leaders or laissez-faire leaders. Consistent, significant correlations emerge between satisfaction with the leader and the components of transformational leadership because these behaviors are generally viewed positively by followers (e.g., Bycio et al., 1995; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Similarly, because the actions of pseudo-transformational leaders are inconsistent and laissez-faire leaders are disengaged, they should be less likely to satisfy followers than should transformational leaders.

Finally, we hypothesize that transformational leaders will invoke higher levels of reverence from followers than will either pseudo-transformational leaders or laissez-faire leaders. Reverence goes beyond satisfaction in the extent to which it represents a follower's respect for the leader and for the leader's role fulfillment (Conger et al., 2000). Transformational leaders should earn this respect from followers by paying attention to their individual needs and developing their strengths. As pseudo-transformational leaders are controlling and deceitful, followers are less likely to respect the leader's motives or admire the leader's leadership style. Thus, it is unlikely that pseudo-transformational leaders will engender widespread feelings of reverence from their followers. Laissez-faire leaders are withdrawn from the leader-follower relationship and are unlikely to create opportunities to engage in the behaviors that would foster reverence.

Method

Participants

Of the 198 students (113 males, 85 females) from a mid-sized Canadian university who volunteered to participate, 167 provided complete responses to the survey. The participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: transformational leadership ($n = 52$), pseudo-transformational leadership ($n = 69$), or laissez-faire leadership ($n = 46$). The mean age of the sample was 19.8 years ($SD = 1.3$). Participants received one bonus mark for course credit in exchange for their participation.

Instruments

Participants in all three experimental groups read the identical information that was adapted from one of Frost's (2003) stories describing a chief executive officer (CEO) whose company was facing economic uncertainty:

Chief Executive Officer Harry Smith walked into the quarterly meeting with his staff and saw people with their heads in their hands. The company, Fountain Pharmaceuticals, a medium-sized provider of prescription medicine, was going to miss its targets by as much as 50% for the third quarter in a row, and the company was finding it hard to bridge the gap. "The numbers simply aren't there," the Financial Committee had told Harry earlier that morning. At the quarterly meeting later that morning, Harry gave the following speech to his staff.

To manipulate leadership style, we varied the four transformational leadership behaviors within the CEO's speech, thereby portraying the CEO either as a transformational, pseudo-transformational, or laissez-faire leader.

Participants in the transformational condition read a version of the vignette in which the CEO displayed idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration; while participants in the laissez-faire leadership condition read a version in which the CEO did not display these behaviors. The pseudo-transformational condition combined parts of the speech that demonstrated high inspirational motivation, together with the CEO's self-interested motivation (in contrast to the high levels of idealized influence displayed in the transformational condition and the low levels of idealized influence displayed in the laissez-faire condition). The pseudo-transformational leader actively discouraged intellectual stimulation and was devoid of individualized consideration. Excerpts from the vignettes are provided in Table 2.

Dependent Measures

Once they had read the vignette, we asked participants to think about how they would feel as a company employee after hearing the speech given by the CEO. Descriptive statistics, correlations, and scale reliabilities are presented in Table 3.

Fear of the leader. We used a four-item assessment of fear of the leader (e.g., [As an employee of Fountain Pharmaceuticals, . . .] "I would be afraid of the CEO's behavior at work"; "I am afraid of what the CEO's response to unsatisfactory work would be"), widely anchored on the fear component of Rogers and Kelloway's (1997) Fear of Violence Scale. Responses were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Job insecurity. We used Hellgren, Sverke, and Isaksson's (1999) three-item measure of job insecurity (e.g., "As an employee of Fountain Pharmaceuticals, I would be worried about having to leave my job before I would like

Table 2
Excerpts From Vignettes Across Experimental Conditions

Transformational leadership	Pseudo-transformational leadership	Laissez-faire leadership
<p>I come to you today with a great challenge. Unfortunately, due to the loss of some key customers, Fountain Pharmaceuticals has met substantial financial difficulties. In the following weeks, we will need to restructure. We are completely committed to doing the right thing and exploring all possible alternatives, rather than focusing on short-term solutions . . .</p> <p>We valued your opinion up until now, and the quality of your input and suggestions has been vital to our success. We really want your ideas right now. I urge you to come to us with suggestions for overcoming these hard times . . .</p> <p>I will be available following this meeting, for as long as you need, to listen to you, answer your individual questions about this process, and address any of your concerns . . .</p> <p>I know that each one of us will overcome this hardship, stronger and more resilient than ever before . . .</p>	<p>I come to you today with a great challenge. Unfortunately, due to the loss of some key customers, Fountain Pharmaceuticals has met substantial financial difficulties. In the following weeks, we will need to restructure. We are completely committed to getting a cost-effective solution by whatever means necessary and as soon as possible . . .</p> <p>My opinions and suggestions up until now have been vital to our success. We really need good ideas like these right now. I urge you to comply with my suggestions for overcoming these hard times . . .</p> <p>I will be available following this meeting, for as long as I have time, to answer questions from the group about this process, and address any collective concerns . . .</p> <p>I know Fountain Pharmaceuticals will overcome this hardship, stronger and more resilient than ever before . . .</p>	<p>I come to you today with terrible news. Due to the loss of some key customers, Fountain Pharmaceuticals has met substantial financial difficulties. In the following weeks, we will need to restructure. We are committed to getting a cost-effective solution by whatever means necessary and as soon as possible . . .</p> <p>I've valued your management team's opinions up until now, and the quality of their input and suggestions has kept us afloat. We really need their ideas right now . . .</p> <p>I can only be available briefly following this meeting to answer one or two of your most pressing questions about this process . . .</p> <p>I hope that the company will overcome these hardships, and remain afloat in this turbulent climate . . .</p>

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations: Study 1

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Age	19.43	0.97	—						
2. Gender	0.43	0.50	.12	—					
3. Trust in leader	3.17	1.41	.16*	.16*	.90				
4. Satisfaction with leader	3.43	1.21	.06	.07	.74**	.90			
5. Reverence for leader	3.67	1.31	.05	.15	.68**	.86**	.96		
6. Fear of leader	3.91	1.88	-.06	-.04	-.24**	-.22**	-.13	.79	
7. Job insecurity	4.15	0.84	-.06	-.07	-.21**	-.17*	-.12	.19*	.92

Note. *N* = 167. Coefficient alphas appear on the diagonal. Gender: 0 = male, 1 = female.

p* < .05. *p* < .01.

to”). The items were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Trust. We measured trust using five items that were adapted from McAllister’s (1995) affective trust subscale (e.g., “As an employee of Fountain Pharmaceuticals, I am confident that I could talk freely to the CEO and know that he would want to listen”). Responses were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Satisfaction with leader. We assessed satisfaction with the leader using three items (e.g., “As an employee of Fountain Pharmaceuticals, I am satisfied that the CEO’s style of leadership is the right one for getting the job done”) that were developed by Conger et al. (2000). The items were rated on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*).

Reverence for leader. We measured reverence for the leader with three items (e.g., “As an employee of Fountain Pharmaceuticals, I hold the CEO in high respect”). The items were rated on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*; Conger et al., 2000).

Manipulation Check

As a manipulation check, we developed short descriptions of the three focal leadership styles. We asked a separate sample of 105 undergraduate students to indicate which description of leadership accurately described the behavior of the CEO in the scenario. Participants were given the option to indicate that none of the styles was an accurate descriptor of the CEO’s behavior, or that they were unsure of the accurate leadership style.

Results

The results of the manipulation check yielded support for the construct validity of the vignettes. We hypothesized that respondents would accurately identify the leadership style that had been portrayed by the CEO in the vignette when given a choice between the five options presented (i.e., transformational, pseudo-transformational, laissez-faire leadership, none, or unsure). To test this, we used chi-square tests with equivalent expected values. Significant differences emerged for transformational leadership, $\chi^2(2, N = 35) = 35.37, p < .01$; pseudo-transformational leadership, $\chi^2(3, N = 34) = 30.24, p < .01$; and laissez-faire leadership, $\chi^2(4, N = 35) = 30.00, p < .01$.

Having established the validity of the manipulation, we conducted a MANOVA, which showed a significant main effect of condition, $F(10,$

320) = 8.56 $p < .01$. We next computed a series of one-way ANOVAs with a priori contrasts to assess the effects of leadership on each of the dependent variables, which provides a stringent test of our hypotheses. The results are presented in Table 4.

We first predicted that the pseudo-transformational leader would score higher in terms of fear of the leader and job insecurity than would the transformational leader or the laissez-faire leader. Significant differences emerged for fear of the leader, which was higher under pseudo-transformational leadership than under transformational and laissez-faire leadership. Partial support of our hypothesis emerged for job insecurity. Although the pseudo-transformational leader scored significantly higher than did the transformational leader, there was no significant difference between pseudo-transformational and laissez-faire leadership.

In contrast, we predicted that the transformational CEO would score higher than would the pseudo-transformational or laissez-faire CEO in terms of the three positive dependent variables. Trust, satisfaction with the leader, and reverence for the leader were significantly higher for the transformational leader than for both the pseudo-transformational leader and the laissez-faire leader, who did not differ significantly from one another. These results support our hypotheses.

Discussion

Study 1 provides initial support for our model of pseudo-transformational leadership. Pseudo-transformational leaders differed from transformational and laissez-faire leaders in all hypothesized cases, with the exception of job insecurity, in which no significant differences emerged between the pseudo-transformational and laissez-faire leadership conditions.

Study 2

The purpose of the second study is to replicate the model, and to begin to focus on external validity using a more complex representation of behavior than that allowed in a vignette study. Participants watched the film *12 Angry Men* (Fonda, Rose, & Lumet, 1957) and responded to the leadership behaviors of four specific characters who display transformational, pseudo-transformational, or laissez-faire leadership styles.

From an experimental perspective, the film *12 Angry Men* (Fonda et al., 1957) serves as an ideal stimulus in which to test pseudo-transformational leadership for six reasons. First, the four characters (i.e., Jurors #1, #3, #8,

Table 4
ANOVA Results: Study 1

Leadership	Outcome variable														
	Fear of leader			Job insecurity			Trust in leader			Satisfaction with leader			Reverence for leader		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Transformational	3.39 ^a	1.18		3.73 ^{ab}	0.95		4.08 ^{ab}	1.19		4.26 ^{ab}	0.83		4.54 ^{ab}	.97	
Pseudo-transformational	4.44 ^{ac}	1.09		4.30 ^a	0.69		2.79 ^a	1.37		3.18 ^a	1.25		3.40 ^a	1.31	
Laissez-faire	3.70 ^c	1.03		4.43 ^b	0.74		2.69 ^b	1.21		2.92 ^b	1.01		3.15 ^b	1.16	
<i>F</i>	F(2, 163) = 14.27**			F(2, 164) = 11.15**			F(2, 163) = 19.43**			F(2, 164) = 23.03**			F(2, 164) = 20.95**		
η^2	.15			.12			.19			.22			.20		

Note. *N* = 167.

^aSignificant mean difference between transformational and pseudo-transformational leadership conditions ($p < .01$). ^bSignificant mean difference between transformational and laissez-faire leadership conditions ($p < .01$). ^cSignificant mean difference between pseudo-transformational and laissez-faire leadership conditions ($p < .01$).

** $p < .01$.

and #9) on whom we focus receive similar screen times, although Jurors #3 and #8 do have larger roles. Second, the setting is controlled insofar as it takes place in one location (i.e., the jury room) where all characters are viewed. Third, the movie begins after the adjournment of the focal court proceedings, limiting the likelihood that viewers might make preliminary judgments about the case, which could bias their impressions of the characters. Fourth, the plot is focused on the deliberation and the behaviors, interactions, thoughts, feelings, and rationalizations of each jury member. Fifth, the jury members had no relationship with one another prior to or following the court proceedings, allowing the viewer to derive context-specific impressions of the characters and how they interact. Sixth, the film provides little background information about the characters that might bias the viewer. In this way, the movie isolates the experimental context and relationships among characters, yet provides a more sophisticated setting than a simple vignette.

After participants viewed *12 Angry Men*, we measured fear of, trust in, satisfaction with, and reverence for each of the four focal jurors. Given the context of the movie, we also measured obedience to the particular juror. Past research has acknowledged that pseudo-transformational leaders develop obedience in their followers (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Enthralled in their sense of self-importance (Howell & Avolio, 1992), pseudo-transformational leaders reject the input of followers, but encourage followers to trust them without question. Likewise, followers of pseudo-transformational leaders often view their leaders as extraordinary, and may develop a sense of personalized identification with them (Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003), as a result of which followers accept their leaders' visions absolutely. Moreover, in contrast to transformational leaders, who offer latitude to followers, pseudo-transformational leaders seek out followers who willingly submit to their power and are unlikely to question their intentions and decisions (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Howell & Avolio, 1992). Thus, we focus on obedience to the leader, as it is central to attempts made by several of the characters to convince others in the film of their opinions.

Method

Participants

Study participants were 179 undergraduate students (85 males, 91 females, 3 did not disclose their gender) from a Canadian university, who received two bonus marks for course credit as compensation. Participants' mean age was 18.9 years ($SD = 0.9$).

Procedure

Participants viewed *12 Angry Men* in classrooms in groups ranging from 40 to 80 students. Upon entering the classroom, each participant was randomly assigned to one of four experimental groups, each of which corresponded with one of the four focal characters in the film. Participants were given the juror number and a picture of the character to whom they were assigned. They were asked to pay particularly close attention to that character throughout the movie because they would be asked some questions about him afterward. To manipulate leadership style, we chose characters who displayed distinct leadership behaviors, only one of whom (i.e., jury foreman) had a formal leadership role.

The first two characters (Jurors #8 and #9) displayed transformational leadership; however, Juror #9 did so to a lesser extent. Pseudo-transformational leadership was personified by Juror #3, while Juror #1 reflected laissez-faire leadership. Following the film, the participants completed questionnaires about their assigned characters. Between 44 and 47 participants rated each of the four characters.

Instruments

Movie. The classic movie *12 Angry Men* (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2004) features the deliberations of 12 jurors following what initially seemed to be a straightforward murder case. For the majority of the jury, the overwhelming evidence presented by the prosecution initially appears to incriminate a young man in the death of his father. All members of the jury (except Juror #8) vote “guilty” in an initial ballot. The film takes the viewer through the process by which the 12 jury members explore the evidence and come to consensus after grueling debate. At the conclusion of the movie, the jury unanimously casts a “not guilty” verdict.

We identified Juror #8 as a transformational leader and Juror #3 as a pseudo-transformational leader. In terms of idealized influence, Juror #8 was driven by altruism. He was committed to providing the defendant with a fair process, and advocated the need to uphold the values of the law, making salient the immense responsibility given to each juror. For example, when he places the only “not guilty” vote, Juror #8 states, “It’s not easy to raise my hand and send a boy off to die without talking about it first. We’re talking about somebody’s life here. We can’t decide in five minutes.” Juror #8 manifests intellectual stimulation, challenging other jurors to think differently about the issue when he closes his statement by saying “Supposin’ we’re wrong?” Juror #8 inspired the jury to re-examine the credibility of the

evidence—and their own assumptions and biases—asking open-ended questions and encouraging the others to talk freely and critically about facts of the case, thereby displaying both inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation. Finally, Juror #8 addressed the individual concerns of each jury member, encouraging them to evaluate the evidence that they found most incriminating.

Juror #3 was riddled with passion and fury. He accused the other jurors of being soft-hearted and overthinking the facts, demanding that they conform to his (predetermined) verdict. Juror #3's inspirational motivation was displayed throughout the film. He made clear his vision for the jury and championed it powerfully. He often railed against the other jury members, increasing the intensity of the deliberation process and energizing the debate, at one point shouting "What's the matter with you guys? You all know he's guilty! He's got to burn! You're letting him slip through our fingers." This juror had the ability to influence the responses and actions of the other jury members against Juror #8's arguments. Juror #3's passion for his decision engaged the others and, at one point in the film, his behavior led another jury member, who had become doubtful, to switch his vote back to "guilty," illustrating Juror #3's power to inspire.

Furthermore, Juror #3 dissuaded intellectual stimulation entirely, arguing "What's there to think about?" Creative approaches to understanding the evidence threatened Juror #3's self-interested intentions; thus, he discouraged the other jury members from participating in these activities. For Juror #3, the accused was guilty without question. However, in a critical point near the end of the movie, it becomes evident that Juror #3 was dominated throughout by self-interest, rather than the merits of the available evidence. The final scenes of the film reveal that Juror #3's motives were driven by his troubled relationship with his own son, demonstrating the severe conflict between his own egotistical behaviors and those that would be directed by idealized influence.

The film presents two further comparisons between other jury members who displayed leadership. Like Juror #8, Juror #9 displayed transformational leadership by behaving courageously, emphasizing the magnitude of the jury's responsibility and eventually using intellectual stimulation powerfully to discredit the testimony of the prosecution's star witness by inspiring other jurors to think for themselves, rather than providing them with answers. The jury foreman (Juror #1) consistently displayed laissez-faire behavior: He was reluctant to become involved in the debate and remained disengaged from his formal role, at one point volunteering to give up his role completely.

Measures. Fear of the leader, trust, satisfaction with the leader, and reverence for the leader were measured as in Study 1, adjusted for the 12

Angry Men context. The participants were asked to consider how the focal juror's behavior throughout the film affected the rest of the jury members.

Obedience was measured with a five-item scale that was adapted (to reflect the compliance component of the measure) from Neal, Griffin, and Hart's (2000) measure of compliance to safety rules. The items were rated on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*; e.g., "The other jury members worked according to Juror # [1, 3, 8, or 9]'s instructions as closely as possible"; "The other jury members did not take risks that could result in disapproval from Juror # [1, 3, 8, or 9]").

Manipulation Check

We conducted a manipulation check, assessing with a separate sample whether the four characters selected from the movie could be differentiated in terms of their leadership styles. We surveyed a sample of 88 students, who received bonus marks for their participation. After watching *12 Angry Men*, the participants were asked to read three descriptions of leadership (modified slightly from Study 1 to suit the *12 Angry Men* context). For each of the four jury members, the participants were asked to indicate the leadership style that accurately described the jurors' behaviors. Participants were also given the opportunity to indicate that none of the leadership styles was appropriate, or that they were unsure.

Results

The results of the manipulation check provide support for the manipulation. For each jury member, we analyzed the data using a chi-square test with equivalent expected values. The results support our original classifications of Juror #1 (laissez-faire leadership), $\chi^2(4, N = 86) = 76.56, p < .01$; Juror #3 (pseudo-transformational leadership), $\chi^2(3, N = 87) = 153.87, p < .01$; Juror #8 (transformational leadership), $\chi^2(2, N = 87) = 150.90, p < .01$; and Juror #9 (transformational leadership), $\chi^2(4, N = 86) = 49.58, p < .01$.

Descriptive statistics, correlations, and scale reliabilities for the variables are presented in Table 5. As in Study 1, we first confirmed a multivariate main effect of condition on the dependent variables, $F(15, 513) = 23.26, p < .01$, and then computed a series of one-way ANOVAs with a priori contrasts to assess the effects of leadership on each variable. We first hypothesized that the pseudo-transformational leader would score higher on fear of the leader and obedience to the leader than would either the transformational leader or the laissez-faire leader. As can be seen in Table 6, these hypotheses were supported.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations: Study 2

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Age	18.81	0.92	—						
2. Gender	1.52	0.50	.01	—					
3. Trust in leader	4.30	1.52	-.02	.18*	.91				
4. Satisfaction with leader	3.67	1.51	-.04	.16*	.85**	.91			
5. Reverence for leader	3.68	1.62	-.02	.11	.82**	.85**	.94		
6. Fear of leader	2.69	1.85	.02	-.20**	-.68**	-.70**	-.57**	.91	
7. Obedience	2.60	1.09	-.01	-.22**	-.44*	-.40**	-.32**	.66**	.90

Note. *N* = 179. Coefficient alphas appear on the diagonal. Gender: 1 = male, 2 = female.

p* < .05. *p* < .01.

Table 6

ANOVA Results: Study 2

Leadership	Outcome variables											
	Fear of leader		Obedience		Trust in leader		Satisfaction with leader		Reverence for leader			
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Transformational (Juror #8)	2.11 ^{ac}	0.95	2.34 ^a	1.09	5.49 ^{ac}	0.85	4.67 ^{ac}	1.04	5.11 ^{ac}	0.93		
Transformational (Juror #9)	1.76 ^b	0.81	2.07 ^b	0.81	5.0 ^{bd}	0.83	4.28 ^b	0.83	4.31 ^{bd}	0.93		
Pseudo-transformational (Juror #3)	5.46 ^{abc}	1.27	3.54 ^{abc}	0.96	2.22 ^{abc}	0.75	1.59 ^{abc}	0.73	1.71 ^{abc}	0.88		
Laissez-faire (Juror #1)	1.48 ^{ce}	0.67	2.52 ^c	0.92	4.39 ^{cde}	0.97	4.11 ^{ce}	1.01	3.57 ^{cde}	1.32		
<i>F</i>	<i>F</i> (3, 174) = 165.83**		<i>F</i> (3, 173) = 20.35**		<i>F</i> (3, 174) = 135.18**		<i>F</i> (3, 174) = 105.42**		<i>F</i> (3, 174) = 89.32**			
η^2	.74		.26		.69		.64		.60			

Note. *N* = 179.

^aSignificant mean difference between Juror #8 and Juror #3 (*p* < .05). ^bSignificant mean difference between Juror #9 and Juror #3 (*p* < .05). ^cSignificant mean difference between Juror #8 and Juror #1 (*p* < .05). ^dSignificant mean difference between Juror #9 and Juror #1 (*p* < .05). ^eSignificant mean difference between Juror #3 and Juror #1 (*p* < .05). ***p* < .01.

We next hypothesized that both transformational leaders would score higher than would either the pseudo-transformational leader or the laissez-faire leader on trust, satisfaction with the leader, and reverence for the leader. Significant differences emerged. Trust and reverence were higher for Juror #8 and Juror #9 than for both Juror #3 and Juror #1. Likewise, Juror #8 was rated higher than Juror #3 and Juror #1 on satisfaction with the leader. However, while Juror #9 scored higher than did Juror #3 on satisfaction with the leader, he did not differ significantly from Juror #1. It is noteworthy that the pseudo-transformational leader scored significantly lower on trust, satisfaction, and reverence than did the three other jury members. The results for all variables are presented in Table 6.

Discussion

The primary goal of Study 2 was to replicate the model of pseudo-transformational leadership within a more contextualized experimental context. Doing so demonstrated that pseudo-transformational leadership can be distinguished from transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership. Using a film study as the stimulus in this Study 2 (rather than the limited contextual information provided in a vignette study), we provided participants with a comprehensive depiction of various leadership styles. However, by doing so, we also sacrificed some experimental control. For example, we could not hold constant the individual dispositions or perceived personalities of the jurors in the film, and thus cannot disentangle these factors from the results of the study. This may be particularly relevant to the emotionality of Juror #3, which may have contributed to his ratings. We turn to our next two studies to ensure that pseudo-transformational leadership is not confounded artificially by affective perceptions and implicit expectations of leadership behavior.

Study 3

While Studies 1 and 2 provide support for our model, further investigation is needed to exclude the possibility that any effects that emerged are a function of differences in leader affect, or prototypical and antitypical leadership behaviors. We address these questions in Study 3 for several reasons. First, leader positive or negative affect may influence followers' perceptions of leadership and their reactions to leadership. For example, Gaddis, Connelly, and Mumford (2004) found that leader negative affect was negatively related both to attributions of leader effectiveness and quality of group

performance. Similarly, Cherulnik, Donley, Wiewel, and Miller (2001) showed that displays of leader charisma where facial expressions reflected affect were reciprocated in the responses of followers. These expressions of affect are likely to vary across leadership styles, and thus may confound perceptions of leadership behavior.

Second, past research has shown individuals' implicit notions of how leaders should be or how they should behave influence responses to the leader. Evidence has suggested that when a follower's perceptions of a leader's characteristics are congruent with the follower's prototype of an ideal leader, perceptions of the quality of the leader–follower relationship is higher (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005). From a validity perspective, it is important to show that the differences between transformational, pseudo-transformational, and laissez-faire leadership go beyond basic perceptions of positive and negative leadership, which could otherwise account for their differential effects. Accordingly, in this third study, we test the relationship between leadership style and the focal outcomes after controlling for leader affect, as well as prototypical and antitypical leader characteristics.

Method

Participants

The study participants were 120 students (69 males, 49 females, 2 did not disclose their gender) in a Canadian business school who received extra credit for their participation. They were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: transformational leadership ($n = 40$), pseudo-transformational leadership ($n = 40$), or laissez-faire leadership ($n = 40$). The mean age of the participants was 19.1 years ($SD = 1.2$).

Instruments

We applied the same stimulus used in Study 1, in which students read a short scenario describing a CEO giving a speech to followers in the midst of an organizational crisis (see Table 2). The manipulation was verified with a manipulation check (like that used in Study 1) administered to the participants following the questionnaire. We asked participants to respond by considering how they would feel as an employee of the CEO.

Fear of the leader, perceptions of job insecurity, satisfaction with the leader, and reverence for the leader were measured as they were in Study 1. We also used Kirkpatrick and Locke's (1996) measure of trust in the leader,

which includes four items that were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*; e.g., “The CEO is trustworthy”). This scale was designed specifically to measure trust in leadership in an experimental setting, and thus may be a more appropriate measure than the one applied in the first two studies.

Participants were asked to rate leader positive affect and leader negative affect by indicating the extent to which 12 adjectives from the Positive Affect Negative Affect Scale (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) described the CEO in the scenario. The items were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*; e.g., *enthusiastic, frustrated*).

We measured prototypical leadership behavior and antityypical leadership behavior using Epitropaki and Martin’s (2004) measure of implicit leadership theories. The scale contains 21 prototypical (e.g., *helpful*) and antityypical (e.g., *domineering*) leader characteristics. Participants indicated how characteristic they believed each of the traits was of the CEO. The items were rated on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 9 (*extremely so*). Descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 7.

Results

The manipulation checks support the construct validity of the leadership. A chi-square test with equivalent expected values was used to analyze the data, and yielded the following results for the transformational CEO, $\chi^2(4, N = 39) = 44.46, p < .01$; pseudo-transformational CEO, $\chi^2(3, N = 40) = 35.40, p < .01$; and the laissez-faire CEO, $\chi^2(4, N = 39) = 55.74, p < .01$.

A significant multivariate main effect of condition was found, $F(10, 204) = 3.63, p < .01$. After confirming the multivariate effect, we conducted separate ANCOVAs for each dependent variable, with negative affect, prototypical leadership behavior, and antityypical leadership behavior as covariates. We excluded positive affect as a control variable because it correlated substantially ($r = .81$) with prototypical leadership behavior, and thus could compromise the reliability of the parameter estimates. Doing so did not change the pattern of results.

Our first hypotheses were that fear of the leader and job insecurity would be higher for the pseudo-transformational CEO than for the transformational and laissez-faire CEOs. The ANCOVA for fear showed a significant main effect for leadership condition. After accounting for control variables, pairwise contrasts revealed that the pseudo-transformational leader scored significantly higher on fear of the leader than did the transformational leader, and marginally higher than the laissez-faire leader. By contrast, as can be seen in Table 8, no support was found for a condition effect on job insecurity.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations: Study 3

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Age	19.07	1.23	—										
2. Gender	0.58	0.50	-0.05	—									
3. Trust in leader	4.03	1.18	-0.14	-0.13	.85								
4. Satisfaction with leader	2.68	1.09	-0.15	-0.10	.66**	.90							
5. Reverence for leader	2.93	1.12	-0.07	.01	.68**	.85**	.95						
6. Fear of leader	4.69	1.15	.08	.04	-.53**	-.35**	-.32**	.83					
7. Job insecurity	3.88	0.81	.15	.09	-.57**	-.61**	-.49**	.49**	.83				
8. Leader prototypical behavior	5.60	0.56	-0.12	-0.10	.65**	.69**	.68**	-.26**	-.45**	.95			
9. Leader antitypical behavior	5.47	1.52	.06	.19*	-.47**	-.35**	-.30**	.50**	.44**	-.19*	.87		
10. Leader positive affect	3.33	0.80	-0.19*	-0.02	.46**	.59**	.55**	-.08	-.29**	.81**	-.04	.88	
11. Leader negative affect	2.58	0.78	.14	-0.12	-.28**	-.26**	-.19*	.25**	.37**	-.14	.22*	-.23**	.84

Note. $N = 120$. Coefficient alphas appear on the diagonal.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 8

ANOVA Results: Study 3

Condition	Outcome variables														
	Fear of leader			Job insecurity			Trust in leader			Satisfaction with leader			Reverence for leader		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Transformational leadership	4.07 ^a	1.14		3.43	0.84		4.79 ^a	0.93		3.55 ^{ab}	0.84		3.70 ^{ab}	0.92	
Pseudo-transformational leadership	5.29 ^{ad}	0.82		4.03	0.75		3.60 ^a	1.12		2.49 ^a	1.04		2.65 ^a	1.05	
Laissez-faire leadership	4.72 ^d	1.17		4.21	0.62		3.75	1.11		2.00 ^b	0.70		2.42 ^b	0.96	
<i>F</i>	<i>F</i> (2, 112) = 4.86**			<i>F</i> (2, 112) = 1.88			<i>F</i> (2, 111) = 2.68†			<i>F</i> (2, 111) = 11.04**			<i>F</i> (2, 107) = 3.23*		
η^2	.08			.03			.05			.17			.06		
Leader negative affect															
<i>F</i>	<i>F</i> (1, 112) = 2.32			<i>F</i> (1, 112) = 8.87**			<i>F</i> (1, 111) = 3.42†			<i>F</i> (1, 111) = 1.07			<i>F</i> (1, 107) = 0.38		
η^2	.02			.07			.03			.01			.00		
Leader prototypical behavior															
<i>F</i>	<i>F</i> (1, 112) = 1.79			<i>F</i> (1, 112) = 11.20**			<i>F</i> (1, 111) = 67.04**			<i>F</i> (1, 111) = 51.14**			<i>F</i> (1, 107) = 57.22**		
η^2	.02			.09			.38			.32			.35		
Leader antitypical behavior															
<i>F</i>	<i>F</i> (1, 112) = 17.42**			<i>F</i> (1, 112) = 14.34**			<i>F</i> (1, 112) = 19.33**			<i>F</i> (1, 111) = 8.55**			<i>F</i> (1, 107) = 3.72†		
η^2	.14			.11			.15			.07			.03		

Note. *N* = 120.
^aSignificant mean difference between transformational and pseudo-transformational leadership conditions (*p* < .05). ^bSignificant mean difference between transformational and laissez-faire leadership conditions (*p* < .05). ^cSignificant mean difference between pseudo-transformational and laissez-faire leadership conditions (*p* < .05). ^dMarginally significant mean difference between pseudo-transformational and laissez-faire leadership conditions (*p* < .06).
[†]*p* < .10. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01.

We hypothesized a stronger effect of transformational leadership on trust in, satisfaction with, and reverence for the leader, above and beyond the effects of covariates. ANCOVA results largely support these predictions. The transformational leader scored highest on trust, and the pseudo-transformational leader scored lowest. However, the meaning of the main effect of leadership condition on trust was reduced, given that the transformational CEO scored significantly higher than the pseudo-transformational, but not the laissez-faire CEO. Full support emerged for satisfaction with and reverence for the leader, which were highest under the transformational CEO. These results are presented in Table 8.

Discussion

Study 3 was designed to help exclude the possibility that the differential effects of leadership styles can be attributed solely to affective and prototypical or antitypical characteristics of the leader. With one exception (i.e., job insecurity), the results of Study 3 provide further support for the model. Controlling for prototypical and antitypical leadership behaviors provides a stringent test of the model, given that the behaviors controlled may constrain some of the true variation in the outcomes of any given leadership style. For example, one item from the antitypical leadership behavior scale is *selfish*, which parallels a core characteristic of pseudo-transformational leadership. On the one hand, the emergence of significant results despite the stringency of the test is noteworthy; while on the other hand, this stringency may explain the nonsignificant findings for job insecurity.

Notwithstanding these results, the artificial context of Study 3 limits the extent to which these findings can be generalized, and the strong correlations between the covariates and outcome variables raise potential concerns regarding measurement error. Further, in these first three studies, the self-interested behaviors of the pseudo-transformational leaders came at the potential expense of followers. However, self-interest does not always have to jeopardize followers directly. Leaders may manipulate others for their self-gain without incurring any substantive costs to followers. Study 4 addresses these issues.

Study 4

Our final study tests the model in an experimental context that more realistically mimics the experience of leadership. To do so, we manipulated leadership through the behaviors of a trained actor who facilitated an idea-generation activity with groups of participants using procedures similar to those used in

other experimental studies of transformational leadership (e.g., Bono & Judge, 2003; Jung & Avolio, 1999; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). Accordingly, unlike Studies 1, 2, and 3, the participants were direct recipients of one of the three leadership styles, and provided their reactions to the actor's behaviors.

Manipulating leadership style through the behaviors of an actor provides further opportunity to depict more realistically the nature of the leadership styles using differences in tone of voice and subtle nonverbal cues. In addition, the study allows for a more subtle manipulation of the pseudo-transformational leader's self-interest and, thus, a stricter test of the model.

We measured multiple positive outcomes and one negative outcome. Given the context of the experiment, job insecurity and fear of the leader were inappropriate dependent measures for Study 4. The idea-generation activity also afforded the opportunity to evaluate a behavioral response to pseudo-transformational leadership, helping to ensure that any effects of leadership style were robust to both attitudes and behaviors, and emerged across different measurement techniques. Transformational leaders enhance follower motivation by influencing follower self-engagement with the task (Bono & Judge, 2003). Specifically, Bono and Judge suggested that transformational leaders associate tasks with followers' values and interests in the collective good, which activate follower perceptions of task meaning, thereby enhancing motivation and performance. By contrast, pseudo-transformational leaders manifest self-interested goals and are unlikely to rouse the passions of followers by helping them find a sense of meaning through their work.

Research has shown that individuals who are led by leaders who do not sacrifice themselves on behalf of the group have lower performance than do those who are led by a self-sacrificing leader (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). Thus, we hypothesize that transformational leaders will motivate higher follower performance than will pseudo-transformational or laissez-faire leaders. We test this prediction after controlling for leader affect, prototypical leader behaviors, and antitypical leader behaviors. Furthermore, we controlled for participants' positive and negative affect following the manipulation because participants' affective responses to the leadership styles may also influence their attitudes and behaviors.

Method

Participants

Study participants were 127 students (65 males, 62 females) at a Canadian business school. They earned bonus credit for taking part in the study. The mean age of the students was approximately 19.8 years ($SD = 2.7$).

Procedure

Before arriving at the study, participants were told that the purpose of the session was to gather their feedback on an undergraduate textbook under development by faculty members within the school. The experiment took place across six sessions (two for each condition) held in classrooms with groups ranging from 16 to 26 participants. The participants signed up for the study online, and the total number of students participating in each condition depended on the number of people who subsequently arrived for each time slot. This resulted in 37 individuals in the transformational leadership condition, 48 in the pseudo-transformational leadership condition, and 42 in the laissez-faire leadership condition.

Upon commencement of the session, the session facilitator (a professional actor) introduced the session and its purpose, and then gave instructions for the session's idea-generation task. Participants were then distributed a short section (13 pages) of an undergraduate textbook and were asked to provide suggestions on the clarity, presentation, and information presented. The participants listed their suggestions in writing. Participants were given precisely 20 min to complete the task, at which point they placed their list of suggestions in personal envelopes.

Following the idea-generation task, the session facilitator asked participants to complete a questionnaire that was designed to help improve the textbook and the delivery of the sessions in the future. The questionnaire contained both distraction questions about the textbook and the focal scales of interest in the study. After they completed the questionnaire, the participants were debriefed and left the experiment. In total, the experiment lasted approximately 1 hr, and none of the participants reported knowledge of the study's actual purposes.

Manipulation and Measures

Leadership style was manipulated by the facilitator's behavior. He displayed one of the three leadership styles across the six sessions: He acted as a transformational leader in two sessions, a pseudo-transformational leader in two sessions, and a laissez-faire leader in two sessions. The facilitator was a male professional actor who was trained in each of the leadership styles, but was blind to the study hypotheses. To prepare for the role, he was first given a tutorial about the leadership behaviors focal to each style, and then read additional materials to understand the three leadership styles in detail. Following the initial training process, the authors worked with the facilitator to refine his behavior. Next, the facilitator practiced, first with a group of

graduate students familiar with the three leadership styles, who gave him feedback for improvement; and second with a group of graduate students who were unfamiliar with the three leadership styles, who corroborated the leadership manipulation. In total, the facilitator spent approximately 20 hr in preparation.

We manipulated the leadership behaviors displayed by the facilitator in ways that are consistent with the first three studies. First, idealized influence was communicated through a short story told at the start of the session. In all conditions, the story showed that the facilitator was concerned about the success of the textbook; however, his reasons differed across the conditions. The transformational facilitator espoused a vision that stressed the importance of participants' contributions to the educational experience of future students; the pseudo-transformational facilitator created a vision that focused on how the textbook would provide him with career and company success; and the laissez-faire facilitator provided participants with no future purpose of their involvement in the exercise. To ensure that the pseudo-transformational leader's self-interest did not seem overtly transparent or unrealistic, the actor used humor to deliver his self-interested lines. In fact, one participant offered a comment that the pseudo-transformational leader's "predominant concern was for his own work, but this is natural." This interpretation suggests that the leader's self-interest was noticed, but subtle and natural, perhaps because the business students expected the facilitator to emphasize his desire to perform well, and his self-interest had no direct influence on their general welfare. This manipulation is presented in the Appendix.

Second, inspiration motivation was held constant across the transformational and pseudo-transformational conditions. The facilitator showed power and confidence by greeting and shaking the hands of participants as they entered the room; used inspirational language; spoke excitedly, descriptively, and with conviction; and displayed nonverbal forms of expression, such as making eye contact with participants and moving about the room. In contrast, the laissez-faire facilitator did not display these inspirational behaviors and, instead, seemed distracted; for instance, by reading during the idea-generation task.

Third, intellectual stimulation was manipulated through the facilitator's instructions. The transformational facilitator, who told participants to think creatively and that there were no "right or wrong answers," provided intellectual stimulation, which was dissuaded by the pseudo-transformational facilitator who suggested that participants should not "overthink it." To contrast these approaches, the laissez-faire facilitator took no action in either promoting or discouraging intellectual stimulation.

Finally, the transformational facilitator showed individualized consideration by approaching each of the participants at one point during the idea-

generation task to address their questions. Neither the laissez-faire facilitator nor the pseudo-transformational facilitator provided this individualized attention. The pseudo-transformational facilitator avoided addressing participants on an individual basis by instead speaking only to the group as a whole.

Trust in the leader, satisfaction for the leader, reverence for the leader, prototypical leadership behavior, antitypical leadership behavior, leader positive affect, and leader negative affect were measured with the same scales and response formats that we used in Study 3. Obedience was measured with the same scale (four items) and format as we used in Study 2. All of the measures were adapted to suit the experimental context of Study 4. Like leader affect, participant positive affect and participant negative affect were each measured using 10 items from the PANAS (Watson et al., 1988). Idea generation was taken as the number of suggestions that participants made about the textbook. Upon completing the questionnaire in its entirety, the participants identified the facilitator's leadership style based on short descriptions.

Results

Descriptive statistics for the study variables are presented in Table 9. The manipulation-check data were analyzed using chi-square tests with equivalent expected values, which were statistically significant for all conditions: transformational leadership, $\chi^2(2, N = 37) = 51.95, p < .01$; pseudo-transformational leadership, $\chi^2(4, N = 48) = 54.50, p < .01$; and laissez-faire leadership, $\chi^2(4, N = 42) = 90.38, p < .01$.

The results of a MANCOVA showed a significant main effect of condition, $F(10, 200) = 4.22, p < .01$. To test the study hypotheses, separate ANCOVA analyses were conducted for all dependent measures after statistically controlling leader negative affect, prototypical leadership behavior, antitypical leadership behavior, participant positive affect, and participant negative affect. The high correlation ($r = .84$) between prototypical leadership behavior and leader positive affect made it unnecessary to include both as covariates. A summary of these results appears in Table 10.

The first hypothesis was that the pseudo-transformational facilitator would score highest on obedience to the leader. The results show a main effect of leadership condition after accounting for covariates. More specifically, the pseudo-transformational facilitator scored higher on obedience than did the transformational facilitator but, contrary to our hypothesis, not significantly higher than the laissez-faire facilitator.

The second set of hypotheses was that the transformational leader would score highest on trust, satisfaction, and reverence. While trust was higher

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations: Study 4

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Trust in leader	4.30	1.22	.84										
2. Satisfaction with leader	4.25	1.45	.65**	.89									
3. Reverence for leader	3.67	1.76	.55**	.71**	.70								
4. Idea generation	7.49	2.76	.07	—	-.03	—							
5. Obedience	3.37	1.22	-.47**	-.54**	-.40**	-.08	.79						
6. Leader prototypical behavior	5.59	1.76	.58**	.70**	.60**	.13	-.39**	.95					
7. Leader atypical behavior	4.37	1.49	-.35**	-.16	-.18	-.12	.33**	.17	.80				
8. Leader positive affect	3.08	1.12	.42**	.51	.42**	.25**	-.37**	.84**	.30**	.94			
9. Leader negative affect	1.73	0.71	-.32**	-.41**	-.18*	.01	.29**	-.32**	.20**	-.20*	.79		
10. Participant positive affect	2.18	0.78	.25**	.27**	.27**	-.06	-.26**	.32**	-.01	.34**	.10	.90	
11. Participant negative affect	1.42	0.45	-.22**	-.21*	-.16	-.03	.25**	-.12	.15	-.05	.37**	-.14	.79

Note. N = 127. Coefficient alphas appear on the diagonal. *p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 10
ANOVA Results: Study 4

Condition	Outcome variables														
	Obedience			Trust in leader			Satisfaction with leader			Reverence for leader			Idea generation		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Transformational leadership	2.60 ^a	0.99		4.99 ^a	0.90		4.97	1.22		4.27	1.22		9.25 ^{a,b}	2.17	
Pseudo-transformational leadership	3.73 ^a	1.25		3.91 ^{a,c}	1.46		4.19	1.45		3.62	1.54		7.30 ^a	2.97	
Laissez-faire leadership	3.69	1.03		4.13 ^c	0.92		3.65	1.41		3.25	2.24		6.38 ^b	2.42	
<i>F</i>	<i>F</i> (2, 105) = 4.38*			<i>F</i> (2, 106) = 5.99**			<i>F</i> (2, 106) = 0.74			<i>F</i> (2, 106) = 0.45			<i>F</i> (2, 104) = 11.22**		
η^2	.08			.10			.01			.01			.18		
Leader negative affect	<i>F</i> (1, 105) = 1.59			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 1.05			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 2.84			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 4.05*			<i>F</i> (1, 104) = 1.77		
η^2	.02			.01			.03			.04			.02		
Leader prototypical behavior	<i>F</i> (1, 105) = 11.67**			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 75.10**			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 79.01**			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 61.41**			<i>F</i> (1, 104) = 0.24		
η^2	.10			.42			.43			.37			.00		
Leader antitypical behavior	<i>F</i> (1, 105) = 11.81**			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 25.63**			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 8.39**			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 13.14**			<i>F</i> (1, 104) = 1.55		
η^2	.10			.20			.07			.11			.02		
Participant positive affect	<i>F</i> (1, 105) = 3.69			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 1.54			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 1.61			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 0.05			<i>F</i> (1, 104) = 0.63		
η^2	.03			.01			.02			.00			.01		
Participant negative affect	<i>F</i> (1, 105) = 0.19			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 0.06			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 0.05			<i>F</i> (1, 106) = 0.95			<i>F</i> (1, 104) = 0.37		
η^2	.00			.00			.00			.01			.00		

Note. *N* = 127.
^aSignificant mean difference between transformational and pseudo-transformational leadership conditions (*p* < .05). ^bSignificant mean difference between transformational and laissez-faire leadership conditions (*p* < .05). ^cSignificant mean difference between pseudo-transformational and laissez-faire leadership conditions (*p* < .05).
 p* < .05. *p* < .01.

in the transformational leadership condition than in the pseudo-transformational leadership condition, trust did not differ between the transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership conditions after controlling for covariates. It is notable that the pseudo-transformational leader was trusted the least, significantly less so than the laissez-faire leader. We did not find support for the hypothesized differences in satisfaction and reverence: No mean differences were found between the three conditions.

Our final hypothesis predicted that the behavioral outcome—that is, idea generation—would be highest for participants in the transformational leadership condition. The data support this hypothesis. Specifically, participants in the pseudo-transformational leadership condition and those in the laissez-faire leadership condition did not differ from one another, and generated significantly fewer ideas than did participants in the transformational leadership condition.

Discussion

The goal of Study 4 was to scrutinize further our model of pseudo-transformational leadership by (a) controlling for the effects of prototypical and antitypical leadership behaviors, leader affect, and participant affect; (b) introducing greater experimental realism; and (c) introducing a behavioral outcome. The results further support the proposed model. However, unlike the first three studies, participants in the pseudo-transformational leadership condition were neither less satisfied with nor did they feel less reverence for the leader, compared with participants in the transformational leadership condition. This result may be a function of the short-term nature of the intervention. Participants in the pseudo-transformational leadership condition still expressed more obedience to the facilitator, as compared to those in the transformational leadership condition, and trusted him least. Further, participants in the transformational leadership condition performed best on the idea-generation task. Thus, future research may be interested in studying how followers disentangle the charisma and the self-interested motives of pseudo-transformational leaders over longer time periods.

General Discussion

Understanding the nature of transformational leadership is a major concern to organizations. With few exceptions, past research on pseudo-transformational leadership has been conceptual in nature. Our goal was to develop and test an expanded model of pseudo-transformational leadership,

situated within the transformational leadership framework. Across the first two studies, pseudo-transformational leadership predicted negative outcomes and was negatively related to positive outcomes. With the exception of job insecurity, Study 3 showed that these effects are independent of followers' perceptions of leader affect and prototypical behaviors. Study 4 introduced a more realistic intervention and showed that pseudo-transformational leadership can be distinguished from transformational leadership in terms of both attitudinal and behavioral outcomes after controlling for participant affect. Taken together, these studies offer overall support for the model.

However, in some cases, the findings across the studies were inconsistent. The manipulation used in Study 4 in many ways differentiates the study from the first three. In Study 4, the participants were direct recipients of the facilitator's leadership behaviors enacted in large groups, and entered the experiment without any expectations of being led. These unique aspects of the study may explain why the results for satisfaction and reverence in Study 4 differed from the other studies, and also have implications for leadership in organizations. Leadership behaviors may be interpreted differently, depending on contextual factors, such as whether a leader holds a formal leadership role, the physical or emotional distance between the leader and followers, and the number of followers who are being led simultaneously by a leader.

More generally, this research enhances our understanding of the meaning of leader charisma. Our results are consistent with a double-edged sword perspective of inspiration, whereby leader inspirational motivation may be value-neutral and thus used both positively and negatively. To avoid the outward appeal of pseudo-transformational leaders, astute followers should then pay careful attention to the foundation of their leaders' visions, whether collective- or self-focused, along with the leaders' tolerance for intellectual stimulation and encouragement of followers. Leaders should also be aware of how inspirational behaviors may be interpreted by their followers. Our findings suggest that an inspirational leader wishing to gain actionable support from followers would be amiss without also actively emphasizing a collectively based mission.

A number of limitations of these studies remain to be explored by future research. First, we considered only how pseudo-transformational leadership is distinguished from transformational and laissez-faire leadership. The literature would benefit from further assessments of construct validity. Future research might assess whether pseudo-transformational leadership can be distinguished from other variables to which it might be similar, such as the need for power (McClelland, 1975), abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000), generalized ethical leadership (Brown et al., 2005), and narcissism (Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006).

Second, our test of pseudo-transformational leadership is based on behavioral patterns that are, in many ways, identifiable by followers. However, the behaviors of some pseudo-transformational leaders may not always be transparent. In fact, followers may sometimes have some difficulty differentiating between transformational or pseudo-transformational behaviors, at least initially (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Dasborough & Ashkanasy, 2002; Price, 2003). In fact, our manipulation checks show that when participants in the pseudo-transformational leadership conditions identified their condition incorrectly, the pseudo-transformational leaders were most often mistaken for transformational leaders.

Future research should focus on instances in which some followers are aware of their leader's self-interested motives, while others are not. One might hypothesize that the extent to which pseudo-transformational leadership is transparent will depend on both the structural and relational proximity of leaders to followers (e.g., Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999), as well as followers' tenure with their leaders. Enhanced exposure would provide followers with greater opportunities to discern the intentions and behaviors of their leaders. Given the experimental and short-term nature of our studies, we were unable to address these questions in this research.

Third, while the nature of the studies conducted here results in strong internal and construct validity, questions about the external validity of the model remain, as our findings do not permit statements about the frequency or effectiveness of pseudo-transformational leadership in organizational settings. Future research must focus specifically on extending the model of pseudo-transformational leadership both into and beyond organizational contexts.

Fourth, testing this model in organizational settings will be contingent on the development of a pseudo-transformational leadership measure, which cannot be assessed adequately using conventional transformational leadership scales (e.g., MLQ; Bycio et al., 1995). Use of the MLQ to measure pseudo-transformational leadership is problematic for several reasons. Substantial correlations between the different transformational components make it difficult to separate authentic and pseudo-transformational leadership (Barling et al., 2008). In addition, pseudo-transformational leadership is not merely the absence of transformational leadership, thus is not adequately reflected in the MLQ items. For example, pseudo-transformational leadership is characterized not just by failing to help followers think for themselves, but by actively discouraging them from doing so. As a result, the appropriate measurement of pseudo-transformational leadership requires the development of a measure that is separate from the MLQ, but that remains rooted in the behaviors underlying transformational leadership. Further complicating this leadership's measurement is accounting for the potential subtleties of a pseudo-transformational leader's self-interested behavior.

Fifth, a valid measure of pseudo-transformational leadership may also help researchers to explore the relative contributions of each of the four facets of transformational leadership, and thus further clarify the nature of the construct. In our studies, we manipulated all of the components simultaneously across the three leadership styles. However, of interest is whether some components drive the effects of pseudo-transformational leadership (or transformational leadership) more so than do others. Understanding the relative importance of each behavior could have significant practical implications for leader training and development. This question remains unanswered in the current research, but is a fruitful direction for future investigation.

Sixth, consistent across all studies are the high correlations between some of the dependent variables (e.g., satisfaction in the leader, reverence for the leader). Although MAN(C)OVAs were conducted to account for these correlations, verifying that leadership has unique effects on the outcome variables is important nonetheless. For instance, perhaps the self-reported measures in this research reflect participants' general attitudes—positive or negative—toward their leaders. This interpretation would be consistent with the pattern of correlations found for Study 4, where trust in, satisfaction with, reverence for, and obedience to the leader were significantly correlated with one another and uncorrelated with the one behavioral measure. Determining whether (and which) leadership outcomes can be meaningfully distinguished from one another will be a challenge for pseudo-transformational leadership research and the leadership literature more generally.

Finally, very high coefficient alphas emerged for a number of the scales (e.g., reverence for the leader, prototypical leader behavior), which could indicate item redundancy and threaten construct validity (Boyle, 1991). Our findings should be interpreted cautiously in light of this potential limitation. Replications incorporating multiple measures of the focal constructs are thus encouraged.

To conclude, we conducted four experimental studies to test a model of pseudo-transformational leadership that reflects all components of transformational leadership. While the model awaits replication in different contexts, the results provide a potentially interesting way of understanding pseudo-transformational leadership behavior in organizations, and they open up research questions worthy of future investigation.

References

- Barling, J., Christie, A. M., & Turner, N. (2008). Pseudo-transformational leadership: Towards the development and test of a model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81, 851–861.

- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for research*. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 181–217.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*, 554–571.
- Boyle, G. J. (1991). Does item homogeneity indicate internal consistency or item redundancy in psychometric scales? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *12*, 291–294.
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *97*, 117–134.
- Buchanan, D., & Huczynski, A. (2004). Images of influence: 12 Angry Men and 13 days. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *13*, 312–323.
- Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *80*, 468–478.
- Cherulnik, P. D., Donley, K. A., Wiewel, T. S. R., & Miller, S. R. (2001). Charisma is contagious: The effect of leaders' charisma on observers' affect. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *31*, 2149–2159.
- Conger, J. A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, *19*, 44–55.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*, 747–767.
- Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). Emotion and attribution of intentionality in leader–member relations. *Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 615–634.
- De Cremer, D., & van Knippenberg, D. (2004). Leader self-sacrifice and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of leader self-confidence. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *95*, 140–155.
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 611–628.

- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2004). Implicit leadership theories in applied settings: Factor structure, generalizability, and stability over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 293–310.
- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2005). From ideal to real: A longitudinal study of the role of implicit leadership theories on leader–member exchanges and employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 659–676.
- Fonda, H. (Producer), Rose, R. (Producer), & Lumet, S. (Director). (1957). *12 Angry Men* [Motion picture]. United States: United Artists Films.
- Frost, P. J. (2003). *Toxic emotions at work: How compassionate managers handle pain and conflict*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gaddis, B., Connelly, S., & Mumford, M. D. (2004). Failure feedback as an affective event: Influences of leader affect on subordinate attitudes and performance. *Leadership Quarterly, 15*, 663–686.
- Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 32–58.
- Hellgren, J., Sverke, M., & Isaksson, K. (1999). A two-dimensional approach to job insecurity: Consequences for employee attitudes and well-being. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8*, 179–195.
- House, R., & Howell, J. M. (1992). Personality and charismatic leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 3*, 81–108.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1992). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission of liberation? *Academy of Management Executive, 6*, 43–54.
- Judge, T. A., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2006). Loving yourself abundantly: Relationship of the narcissistic personality to self- and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 762–776.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 755–768.
- Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (1999). Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*, 208–218.
- Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 246–255.
- Kelloway, E. K., Sivanathan, N., Francis, L., & Barling, J. (2005). Poor leadership. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress* (pp. 89–112). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 36–51.

- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognitive-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 24–59.
- McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*. New York: Irvington.
- Neal, A., Griffin, M. A., & Hart, P. M. (2000). The impact of organizational climate on safety climate and individual behavior. *Safety Science*, *34*, 99–109.
- O'Connor, J., Mumford, M. D., Clifton, T. C., Gessner, T. L., & Connelly, M. S. (1995). Charismatic leaders and destructiveness: A historiometric study. *Leadership Quarterly*, *6*, 529–555.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behavior and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship. *Journal of Management*, *22*, 259–268.
- Price, T. L. (2003). The ethics of authentic transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 67–81.
- Rogers, K. A., & Kelloway, E. K. (1997). Violence at work: Personal and organizational outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *2*, 63–71.
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*, 80–92.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*, 178–190.
- Turner, N., Barling, J., Epitropaki, O., Butcher, V., & Milner, C. (2002). Transformational leadership and moral reasoning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 304–311.
- van Knippenberg, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2005). Leader self-sacrifice and leadership effectiveness: The moderating role of leader prototypicality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*, 25–37.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 1063–1070.
- Weierter, S. J. M. (1997). Who wants to play “Follow the Leader”? A theory of charismatic relationships based on routinized charisma and follower characteristics. *Leadership Quarterly*, *8*, 171–193.
- Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 513–530.

- Yorges, S. L., Weiss, H. M., & Strickland, O. J. (1999). The effect of leader outcomes on influence, attributions, and perceptions of charisma. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 428–436.
- Zand, D. E. (1972). Trust and managerial problem-solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 229–239.

Appendix

Manipulation of Idealized Influence: Study 4

Transformational leadership: Before we begin, let me tell you a bit about publishing textbooks. At College Press, we are completely committed to developing the minds of tomorrow. We continually ask students for ideas during the development of the textbook, and ask them to think creatively about what they think makes a great textbook. Students have rated our textbooks as more helpful in their learning process, compared to the textbooks of other publishers, and we pride ourselves on this accomplishment. My mission as a company representative is to foster your input and continue that success—I strive to publish books that give students what they need to achieve their educational goals. One of the best ways to do that is by getting feedback from people like you who work with the textbooks on a daily basis, and understand your responses and the significance that a good text has on your ability to thrive during your course work. In fact, just last year, I ran a number of sessions just like this one at universities across North America, and discovered that one of our textbooks just was not making the grade with student populations. Even though the book was then in the very late stages of development and the company would lose money by delaying its market arrival, I put in a strong recommendation to the company that the textbook was simply not going to provide the best learning experience possible to students, and that it needed further refinement. This was after getting the opinions of my colleagues. In the end, we went back to the drawing board and reworked the book with the authors to address the problems the students were identifying, and now the textbook has been greatly improved!

Laissez-faire: Before we begin, let me give you the standard blurb that we give about publishing textbooks. First, university professors design a proposal for the textbook, including the textbook name, table of contents, outline for the informational content, and sample chapters. Usually at this point, the textbook undergoes some initial screening from College Press, where we decide whether or not the book is a good project. If we decide to commit to the book, then the author or authors are given a timeline to complete the book, and submit it for editing and review. At this point, we

solicit feedback from both university instructors and students to determine the work that needs to be done to complete the text and help it become successful. Sometimes we find that the textbook is ready to be sold at that point, and there are no additional changes that need to be completed. Other times, there are extensive revisions. In fact, just last year, we ran a number of sessions just like this one at universities across North America, and discovered that one of our textbooks just was not making the grade with student populations. In the end, some of my colleagues did recommend some changes that we could make to the textbook based on student feedback, and I did end up making some of the easier changes suggested before the textbook was released, and now the textbook has been a great success.

Pseudo-transformational leadership: Before we begin, let me tell you a bit about publishing textbooks. At College Press, we take complete responsibility for the textbooks assigned to our divisions, and are rewarded according to the success of the books—in this case, I am responsible for the textbook that I will distribute to you today. Accordingly, I want this textbook to be one of the most widely used textbooks in North American universities. I am sure you can understand that if my goal is to sell as many textbooks as possible, then the textbook needs to be of superior quality, and that's why I need your help. In fact, just last year, I ran a number of sessions just like this one at universities across North America, and found that the student feedback was one of the most important determinants of the success of my textbook. I discovered through those sessions that one of my textbooks, which was targeted at upper-year students, was just not marketable to first-year and second-year students—a market that I wanted to at least have the possibility of attracting. Even though the book was then in the very late stages of development, I was not going to be in a position where the textbook would not sell widely, and it would lose out on being successful, not to mention potential bonuses [said with humor]. Thus, I put in a strong recommendation to the company that the textbook was simply not ready and that it needed further refinement. Even though some people in my division thought that we should just make minor changes, I made the final call. In the end, I went back to the drawing board and reworked the book with the authors to address the problems, and now the textbook has been greatly improved! And it certainly has made a difference in terms of the company's bottom line and, on a personal note, my own bonus [said with humor]!