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Abstract

LOPEZ, CAROLINE, J., Ph.D., August 2013, Counselor Education

Personality and Leadership in Counselor Educators: The Big Five Factors, Transformational Leadership, and Transactional Leadership

Director of Dissertation: Christine Suniti Bhat

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare personality attributes of counselor educators to further the understanding of characteristics most likely related to transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style. A geographically stratified random sample was used to obtain a sample of 182 counselor educators. Participants completed three questionnaires: The Multifactorial Leadership Questionnaire (5x Short Form) (Avolio & Bass, 2004), The Big Five Inventory (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991), and a demographic questionnaire. A discriminant analysis and one-way and 2x2 factorial MANOVA were used to analyze the data.

Results of the study indicated a significant relationship between personality attributes and transformational and transactional leadership styles. A low score on Neuroticism and high scores on Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness distinguished Transformational leaders. Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Openness to Experience were the strongest predictors of a Transformational leadership Style. High scores on Extraversion and Openness to Experience distinguished Transactional leaders. Contrary to prior studies (Costa, Terraciano & McCrae, 2001; Saarnio, 2010; Zheng & Zheng, 2011), no gender differences were found in the personality attributes of Transformational or Transactional
leaders. Lastly, no racial differences were found in the personality attributes of Transformational or Transactional leaders.

Implications for this study are presented for counseling departments and educational programs that are working toward identifying, encouraging, and developing transformational leadership characteristics in faculty and students. Specific suggestions for developing leadership in female counselor educators, racially and ethnically diverse female counselor educators, and counseling students are offered.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The introduction provides an overview of leadership and personality theory. A brief background of the study is provided followed by the problem statement, research hypothesis, and significance of the study. Delimitations and limitations are addressed. Additionally, definitions of terms in the study are provided.

Background of the Study

Workforce demographics continue to change as the number of women obtaining degrees and entering the workforce continues to rise. In 2011, women comprised 57% and men 43% of bachelor degrees conferred (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011), 58% of the workforce population, and 51.4% of management and professional positions (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010). As the number of women in the workforce has increased, the number of women leaders has also increased. According to Burns (1978) a leader has been described as one who can shape, promote, protect, and model an organization’s values. Leadership has therefore significantly impacted the growth or direction of an organization (Valentine, 2011).

As an increasing number of women assume leadership positions, a growing body of literature has started to examine women in leadership (Cheung & Halpern, 2010; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003; George, Helson, & John 2011; Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010). Women have been found to demonstrate unique experiences and challenges along the journey toward leadership positions including gender role stereotyping, lack of opportunities for advancement, and balancing work and family responsibilities (Ayman, Korabik, & Morris, 2009; Cropsey, Masho, Shiang,
Sikka, Kornstein, & Hampton, 2008; Levitt, 2010). Furthermore, research in the area of personality has suggested that personality traits can influence work behavior (Barrick & Mount, 2005; Bowling & Burns, 2010). Academia has also experienced a change in workforce demographics, particularly within the field of counselor education (American Counseling Association, 2012; Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, 2012; U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). However information on the leadership characteristics of female and male faculty is limited, specifically in the field of counselor education.

**Leadership in counseling.** The guidelines established by the Council for Accreditation and Related Educational Programs (2009) have defined the model of leadership for both counselor educators and counselor education programs. While a master’s degree in counseling has served as the entry qualification into the counseling field, a doctoral degree in counselor education has prepared students to obtain advanced competencies in teaching and supervision, clinical practice, research and leadership so that they may serve as leaders within the profession (CACREP, 2009; Sears & Davis, 2003, West, Bubenzer, Brooks, & Hackney; 1995). CACREP standards have established that one of the primary objectives of a doctoral program in Counselor Education is “to prepare students to assume positions of leadership in the profession and/or their areas of specialization” (p.52). As professionals in the field, it is expected that counselor educators “understand theories and skills of leadership and demonstrate the ability to provide leadership or contribute to leadership efforts” (pp.56-57).
In addition to CACREP standards, Sears and Davis (2003) proposed five domains in which counselor educators are called on to lead the profession. These domains are: Clinical Counseling, Research, Teaching and Supervision, Writing and Publishing, and Professional Advocacy. Under Clinical Counseling, counselor educators help counseling practitioners learn from his or her experience and progress in expertise, as well as ensure appropriate service to clients. The Research domain requires that as leaders, counselor educators produce new and original research that will contribute to the advancement of the counseling profession. The Teaching and Supervision domain calls on counselor educators to participate in the teaching and supervision of the next generation of counselors. Through writing and publishing counselor educators have been expected to disseminate current and innovative research for the advancement of the profession (West et al., 2006). Lastly, counselor educators have been called on to engage in professional advocacy. As doctoral programs have experienced an increase in the number of women obtaining doctoral degrees (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2012), a new face in counselor education leadership has emerged.

The counseling profession has experienced a transformation as women have increasingly fulfilled leadership roles within its organizations (ACA, 2012; ACES, 2011). Since their establishment in 1952, both ACA and ACES have experienced an increase in the number of women serving in the role of president. Prior to 1980, five women held the position of president of the American Counseling Association (ACA), the largest counseling association in the country with over 50,000 members. Within the past 32 years that number has changed dramatically as 22 women have held this leadership
position (ACA, 2012). In the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), prior to 1980 all past presidents were male (ACES, 2011). Within the past 31 years alone, 12 women have served as the president of ACES (ACES, 2011). These figures do not account for the number of women who have held non-elected or untitled leadership roles within professional counseling organizations. As the number of women in counselor education has increased, research has started to focus on the differences in the experiences of both male and female counselor educators in academia, including motherhood, balancing career and family, gender and racial bias, and life satisfaction (Hill, 2009; Hill, Leinbaugh, Bradley, & Hazler, 2005; Stinchfield & Trepal, 2010; Trepal & Stinchfield, 2012). The focus on the experiences of female counselor educators has been helpful as their numbers continue to rise. However limited research exists comparing the leadership of men and women within the counseling profession. Scarcer has been the body of knowledge on women of color in professional leadership positions within the field of counseling.

Diversity in leadership. Despite efforts to cultivate a diverse leadership group in higher education, including strategies such as increased recruitment and mentoring, the number of racially and ethnically diverse faculty has remained relatively low compared to White faculty. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, racial and ethnic minority populations have been defined as Asian American, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, American Indian and Alaska Native (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). In 2009 the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2012) revealed
that 18.4% of university and college faculty were racially/ethnically diverse compared to 16.5% in 2005 (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2012). This is in stark contrast to current U.S. population data which indicated that approximately 36% of the population is racially/ethnically diverse (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). More specifically, population data indicated that the racial distribution in the United States is as follows: African-Americans: 12.6%, Latinos: 16.3%, White: 63.7%, Asians: 4.8% and American Indians: 0.9% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).

Current CACREP standards (2009) require that counselor education programs recruit and retain program faculty members that are representative of the population. Obstacles in the development of diverse leadership within counselor education have included poor recruitment and retention strategies and lack of leadership opportunities (Holcomb-McCoy, 2005). Holcomb-McCoy’s (2005) research on diversity in counselor education programs indicated that only 60% of CACREP accredited counselor education programs had a racially or ethnically diverse faculty member, and approximately 52% of programs had no specific strategy for recruiting diverse faculty. In a study of the career experiences of African-American counselor educators, Bradley (2004) found that half were untenured or in the lower ranks. Participation in leadership development programs and exposure to a variety of experiences were found to be contributing factors in the leadership path of Latinos in higher education (Gutierrez, 2006). Yet, a larger number of studies have shown that racially and ethnically diverse faculty face a unique set of obstacles to promotion and tenure including racism, stereotypical perceptions, systemic barriers, and feelings of isolation (Bradley, 2004; Gutierrez, 2006; Mendez-Morse, 2000).
Understanding the personal attributes of racially and ethnically diverse leaders in counselor education may provide information into the leadership qualities that help overcome such obstacles.

Academia is a field that has historically been male dominated (West & Curtis, 2006). “Between 2000 and 2010, the number of male full-time post baccalaureate students increased by 38 percent, compared with a 62 percent increase in the number of females” (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2012, Enrollment section, para 5). The number of all female faculty members rose from 27 to 43% between 1975 and 2003 (West & Curtis, 2006). During this same time period, the number of female faculty assuming full professor positions at four year universities rose from 9 to 24% (West & Curtis). However, female faculty members lagged behind male peers in a variety of ways including underrepresentation at the highest faculty ranks and lower salaries beyond entry level (West & Curtis). The number of women in academic positions decreased as faculty rank increased with women making up 57% of lecturers and instructors, 46% of assistant professors, 38% of associate professors, 24% of full professors and 23% of college presidents (West & Curtis). According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) faculty gender equity indicators, in 2006, women had less tenure appointments than men (West & Curtis). Additionally, women occupied more non-tenure track positions than tenure track positions, and men overwhelmingly comprised the majority of tenured faculty (West & Curtis). On average, female faculty members earned 81% of what male faculty members earned across all ranks and all institutional types (West & Curtis).
According to Cropsey et al. (2008), women and minority faculty left academic positions at the same or higher rate than White or male counterparts which can significantly impact an already narrow pool of minority and female faculty at institutions. Chairperson or departmental leadership issues and lack of opportunities for professional advancement were among the primary reasons for leaving academic positions for both women and minority faculty (Cropsey et al., 2008). The majority of faculty left these academic positions for other academic institutions. Turnover such as this may hinder an institution’s ability to develop women and minority faculty into leadership positions. An understanding of leadership qualities in female counselor educators could aid the development of emerging female leaders within the profession. Leadership experiences including a sense of autonomy and contribution to the profession have been found to significantly influence overall life satisfaction among female counselor educators (Hill et al., 2005). Knowing how to develop, nurture, and harness leadership qualities in female counselor educators is critical. Counselor Education programs can work toward increasing faculty retention rates for women and women of color by developing a culture that fosters leadership qualities and opportunities among its female faculty.

In order to effectively identify and support the next generation of female leaders in counselor education, it is important to understand what aspects of leadership need to be developed and nurtured. Differences in leadership styles between men and women must be understood in order to meet the unique experiences and needs of female counselor educators. For example, Hill et al., (2005) reported that supportive and growth producing interactions (e.g. positive student growth, involvement in professional
organizations, student enthusiasm, and making presentations to other professionals) with
students and other professionals are often valued by female counselor educators. In order
to cultivate a generation of genuine leaders, the counseling profession must move beyond
leadership stereotypes such as being competitive and assertive often associated with men,
and examine the unique personality attributes that support the leadership qualities of
female counselor educators and particularly racial-ethnically diverse female counselor
educators. It is through the guidance and direction of this emerging generation of leaders
that the counseling profession will continue to grow, advance and adapt to the rapidly
changing demographics in the educational landscape.

**Leadership.** According to Northouse (2007) “leadership is a process in which an
individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p.3).
Leadership has been described by a wide variety of theoretical approaches (Bass, 1990;
Gardner, 1990; Mumford, 2006; Rost, 1991). Many of these theoretical approaches have
attempted to conceptualize leadership as a trait or a behavior while others have examined
it from a relational perspective and yet others from an information processing view
(Northouse, 2007). The trait perspective suggested that leaders are individuals with
innate leadership qualities and limits who can be viewed as a leader; however a process
definition suggested that leadership is based on interactions and can be developed
through learned behaviors (Northouse). Leadership has also been defined based on a
power relationship that exists between a leader and follower while other theories have
described leadership from a skills perspective in which individuals possess a particular
set of knowledge and skills that made them effective leaders (Northouse). Lastly,
leadership has been viewed as a transformational process in which followers are motivated by leaders to go above what is expected of them (Northouse). This transformational process has commonly been referred to as transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1999).

**Transformational leadership theory.** Leadership qualities that created dramatic outcomes, influenced followers to perform at higher levels, and motivated followers to work for a greater cause were identified through transformational leadership theory (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Theorists closely examined major changes in organizations and businesses in attempts to identify the major leadership practices that contribute to such change. One of the most well-known theories that described these leadership behaviors was transformational leadership theory. Transformational leadership theory, first introduced by James Burns, assumed that people who exhibit particular leadership behaviors could inspire followers to higher levels of performance and dedication (Burns, 1978). According to Burns, transformational leadership occurred “when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p. 20). According to Bass (1999) transformational leadership moved followers beyond immediate self-interests, elevated followers’ maturity, and increased concerns for achievement, self-actualization and the well-being of others. Transformational leadership was highly correlated with outcomes in effectiveness and satisfaction of subordinates than Contingent Reward (Bass). Managers perceived transactional leadership as less important than transformational
leadership for organizational effectiveness (Rukmani & Jayakrishnan, 2010). Past research on leadership has supported the effectiveness of these transformational practices.

*The impact of transformational leadership.* A changing economic, political and technological landscape strongly impacted both private and public sectors. Areas such as government (Manasseh, 2011), health care (Curtis & O’Connell, 2011), business (Gentry & Sparks, 2012) and education (AHSE Higher Education Report, 2006) have recognized the importance of leadership within their profession. Effective transformational leadership traits in managers have been found to influence the success of an organization and its performance (Jandaghi, Matin, & Farjami, 2009), increase work engagement and satisfaction (Giallonardo, Wong, & Iwasiw, 2010) and positively influence an ethical climate (Sagnak, 2010). Moreover, leadership or lack thereof has been found to significantly impact the growth or direction of an organization (Valentine, 2011). Dysfunctional leadership has been found to lead to dysfunctional organizations. Research has found that negative internal politics leads to high employee turnover (Cropsey et al., 2008). Research on the impact of transformational leadership has indicated that in order to remain effective and relevant, organizations must build on those leadership qualities which are most effective (Gentry & Sparks, 2012).

Current studies have provided support for the use of transformational leadership on various work and performance outcomes including organizational success (Jandaghi et al., 2009), ethical climate (Sagnak, 2011), job satisfaction (Yang, 2012), and increased productivity (Gellis, 2001). According to Jandaghi, Matin, and Farjami (2009), successful organizations possessed more transformational leadership traits than
unsuccessful companies. Sagnak (2011) found that school transformational leadership was a significant predictor of ethical climate. In an examination of the perceived leadership behaviors of school principals “all dimensions of transformational leadership were positively related to caring, law and code, and ethical climate” (Sagnak, 2011, p.1135). Transformational leadership factors of inspirational motivation, idealized influence, and individual consideration were important components that predicted job satisfaction (Sagnak). Transformational practices were also found to influence job satisfaction (Yang, 2012). Yang (2012) examined the effects of transformational leadership on the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of public relations practitioners and found that when personnel perceived a higher degree of inspirational motivation and idealized influence from their supervisors, levels of both extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction rose (Yang).

Within the helping profession, transformational leadership was associated with perceptions of leader effectiveness, satisfaction with leader, and increased productivity (Gellis, 2001). A study of social workers indicated that transformational leadership behaviors in social work managers significantly affected subordinates’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness and satisfaction with leaders. Current evidence of positive work outcomes suggested that organizations would benefit from the development and identification of transformational leaders. As a result, there has been a greater demand for leaders to become more transformational and less transactional if they are to remain effective (Bass, 1998).
**Elements of Transactional leadership.** Transactional leadership has focused on the idea that a follower’s work performance can be influenced by rewards or punishments (Bass). Under this style of leadership, the transactional leader created clear structures of what is required of followers and the rewards they get for following orders. As a result, reward or punishment is contingent upon the follower’s performance. Instead of working toward a common goal, focus is placed on the individual interests of both leader and follower through the practice of Contingent Reward (CR), management-by-exception (MBE) or laissez-faire leadership (LF) (Bass, 1998).

**Contingent Reward.** This style of leadership has been described as using Contingent Reward in which directions are provided and rewards are given for carrying out an assignment. Although this style of leadership has been effective for adequate task completion, it has not encouraged followers to perform and achieve at higher levels.

**Management-by-exception.** This leadership practice has been described as either active (MBE-A) or passive (MBE-P). In active MBE-A, the leader actively monitors performance and takes corrective action when followers deviate from expected levels of performance. MBE-P is defined as passively waiting for sub-par performance, mistakes and errors to occur, and then taking corrective action after problems have arisen.

**Laissez-Faire leadership (LF.)** This has been characterized by the absence of leadership. Those in positions of leadership avoid taking any action. As a result of avoidance or absence of leadership, decisions are not made and responsibilities are ignored.
The bargaining process that has occurred between leader and follower in transactional leadership can only continue to produce needed outcomes by maintaining that process (Burns, 1978). When there was no lasting purpose that held them together, when the transactions ceased, leader and follower went their separate ways. A study by Pedrajas et al. (2006) indicated that when compared to transformational leadership, transactional leadership styles have had a negative impact on work performance. Transactional leadership style has been perceived by managers as less important than a transformational leadership style for organizational effectiveness (Rukmani & Jayakrishnan, 2010).

**Elements of Transformational leadership style.** Transformational leadership style has been characterized as requiring that leaders move beyond a simple transaction of give and take exchange. Transformational leadership moves followers beyond immediate self-interests, elevates followers’ maturity, increases concerns for achievement, self-actualization and well-being of others (Bass, 1999). This leadership style has resulted in a relationship between leader and follower of mutual stimulation (Burns, 1978). Leaders have been described as moving beyond maintaining the status quo and bringing about changes in followers’ thinking and actions (Burns, 1978). Transformational leaders motivate and inspire individuals toward meaningful work outcomes (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The transformational leadership qualities that have created these dramatic outcomes are Charismatic Leadership (CL), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and Individualized Consideration (IC).
Charismatic Leadership (or Idealized Influence, CL or II). Leaders following this component served as role models to followers. As leaders they set an example of expected performance and often demonstrate high ethical standards.

Inspirational Motivation (IM). Leaders are able to articulate a clear vision of the future and provide meaning and context to the work of followers.

Intellectual Stimulation (IS). Leaders model and encourage innovate thinking and problem solving. In this manner, the leader is able to create excitement about new perspectives and ways of doing things.

Individualized Consideration (IC). Leaders recognize and respond to the unique needs abilities and aspirations of followers.

Transactional leadership is often used to maintain the status quo and achieve lower level goals. Conversely transformational leadership practices are used to influence higher-order future-oriented goals. These practices motivate followers to work toward meaningful outcomes and perform at higher levels (Bass & Avolio, 2004). As a result, transformational leadership is believed to enhance transactional leadership in effecting positive outcomes (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Positive outcomes include increased organizational success (Jandaghi et al., 2009) and higher levels of ethical climate (Sagnak, 2011). Transformational leadership has also been found to increased job satisfaction (Yang, 2012), and productivity (Gellis, 2001). Jandaghi, Matin, and Farjami (2009) revealed that successful organizations possessed more transformational leadership traits than unsuccessful companies.
**Big Five model of personality.** Personality is defined as “emotional and psychological features of our immaterial selves that influence and indeed govern how we relate to others” (Beck, 1999, p. 18). Leadership in organizations often requires social interactions among coworkers and managers, therefore individuals’ emotional and psychological features may play a role in this social process. A greater understanding of the personality traits associated with leaders may help in the identification and development of leaders within the counseling profession.

The Big Five Factors also known as the Five Factor Model was developed by Costa and McCrae (1992) as a model to help understand the five dimensions of personality that describe human behavior. The Big Five is one of the most widely accepted and dominant models of personality used in applied research (Orzer, 1994). Due to its focus on the broader domains rather than individual facets of personality, other personality models such as 16 Personality Factor (16PF) and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) are represented within the Big 5 Model (Orzer, 1994). The Big Five Factors (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness to Experience and Neuroticism) represent the basic dimensions of underlying personality traits in individuals. Descriptions of people who score high on each of these factors are provided (Costa and McCrae, 2010) as follows:

(a) Openness to Experience: unconventional, curious and open to new ways of thinking. High scores indicate nonconformity, autonomy, and someone who is imaginative.
(b) Conscientiousness: strong willed, determined, self-disciplined, thorough, punctual, and achievement-oriented.

(c) Extraversion: enthusiastic, action-oriented, energetic, and stronger tendencies toward social behaviors

(d) Agreeableness: compassionate, optimistic, tolerant, and cooperative. They place value in getting along with others and compromising their interests for the benefit of others.

(e) Neuroticism: low emotional stability. Individuals tend to be more emotionally reactive and easily stressed (Costa and McCrae, 2010).

**Personality and leadership.** Literature has suggested a relationship between personality attributes and leadership styles (Church & Waclawski, 1998; Frey, Snow, & Curlette, 2009; Gentry & Sparks, 2012). According to a study using the Basic Adlerian Scales for Interpersonal Success -Adult Form (BASIS-A), personality characteristics such as Softness in which individuals present a more favorable picture of their childhood experiences compared to others with a similar family experience, and Striving for Perfection, which describes a person who is confident and has developed valuable stress coping strategies to deal with life's stressors, were related to the leadership styles of business graduate students (Frey et al., 2009). In a study on the Big Five Factors of personality with leaders in the military, specific personality attributes were found to be predictors of transformational leadership (Johnson & Hill, 2009). These researchers found an inverse relationship between transformational leadership and Neuroticism. Based on the Neuroticism scale which rates emotional stability and the ability to cope
with stressors, leaders who rated low on the Neuroticism scale, thus more emotionally stable, were viewed as more effective transformational leaders (Johnson & Hill). Effective transformational leaders were rated significantly higher in personality attributes such as Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (Johnson & Hill).

**Personality attributes in the helping profession.** Personality attributes such as Openness to Experience and Conscientiousness have been found to be related to successful work performance of those in the helping profession including, nurses, psychologists and counselors (Grehan, 2011; Riggio 2000; Thompson, 2002). Counselors who were more open to different experiences were more comfortable working with a wider variety of populations (Thompson, 2002). Specific personal attributes such as Conscientiousness were strongly correlated to successful internship performance among school psychology students (Grehan, 2011). Similar to counselors, psychologists and nurses often deal with the emotional and psychological needs of clients and patients, coordinate with treatment teams, and are empathetic to the needs of the clients. The majority of counseling theories emphasize the importance of the counselor-client relationship (Glauser, 2001). The counseling relationship is embedded in respect for clients, genuineness of the counselor and an empathetic stand that promotes the counseling relationship (Glauser, 2001). Given that specific personality attributes are related to work performance in helping professions such as counseling, and in leaders in other professions, further examination of the personality attributes that differentiate leaders within the counselor education profession is warranted.
Statement of the Problem

Prior research on the relationship between personality attributes and leadership styles has focused mainly on the business (Gentry & Sparks, 2012; Church & Waclawski, 1998; Frey, et al., 2009) and military sectors (Johnson & Hill, 2009). However there is limited information on the personality characteristics related to the transformational leadership styles of counselor educators. Moreover, gender and racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes is limited within the current literature on the counseling profession.

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare personality attributes of counselor educators to further the understanding of characteristics most likely related to transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style. This study extended previous research on the personality attributes of leaders by focusing on gender and race. The specific purpose of this study was whether there are gender and racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes of counselor educators who are characterized as transformational leaders and transactional leaders.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed to explore the relationship between the personality attributes and leadership styles of counselor educators. This relationship was further analyzed to understand gender and racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes and leadership style of counselor educators. Several questions were presented in this study looking at the personality attributes that contribute to transformational leadership style in counselor educators. The purpose of the questions
was to add to the body of literature that seeks to understand the relationship between gender and culture as it relates to the personality attributes of transformational leaders.

The questions are as follows:

1. Are there personality attributes that discriminate between individuals showing High Transformational Leadership (HTL) or Low Transformational Leadership (HTL)?

2. Are there personality attributes that discriminate between individuals showing High Transactional Leadership or Low Transactional Leadership?

3. Are there gender differences in personality attributes depending on whether individuals are high or low in transformational leadership style?

4. Are there gender differences in personality attributes depending on whether individuals are high or low in transactional leadership style?

5. Are there differences between women who identify as White and women who identify as persons of color in personality attributes depending on whether they exhibit high or low transformational leadership style?

6. Are there differences between women who identify as White and women who identify as persons of color in personality attributes depending on whether they exhibit high or low transactional leadership style?

**Significance**

The significance of this study is that it will augment the body of research on the relationship between personality and leadership, and expand on current literature on leadership in counselor education. Further, the study will add to current theories on
transformational and transactional leadership theory and the Big Five Model of personality development, by extending prior research on the relationships between gender and race and personality attributes of transformational and transactional leaders. Although leadership styles and personality attributes have been researched extensively, increasing attention to diverse leadership groups in organizations has emphasized the need to explore how gender and ethnicity can influence personality and leadership behavior.

As academia looks toward increasing the number of women and ethnically diverse populations entering leadership positions within the faculty ranks, information on gender and ethnic differences in the personality attributes of leaders may prove beneficial. Within the field of counseling, CACREP standards (2009) require an effort to recruit and retain program faculty members that are representative of the population. Furthermore, personality assessments have often been used to provide individuals with a deeper understanding of self, to match individuals with careers, and used in job placement decisions (Neukrug & Fawcett, 2010). The results of this study will help in understanding the relationship between personality and leadership and aid counseling programs and counselor educators in developing culturally responsive counseling departments and educational programs in order to identify, encourage, and develop transformational leadership characteristics in racially and ethnically diverse female counselor educators and counseling students.
Limitations and Delimitations of Study

Limitations. There are two identified limitations to this study. First, assessments are all self-report and therefore there may result in a social desirability bias. Second, there are currently no statistics on the number of racially and ethnically diverse faculty in counselor education. Therefore it will be difficult to determine if the sample is representative of the population. Current statistics on the race/ethnicity of academic institutions from the National Center for Educational Statistics were used.

Delimitations. Based on current literature, the study included gender, race and personality attributes as correlates and examined the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and these correlates. Other variables that might relate such as tenure status, professor rank and previous leadership experience were not included. Finally, participation in this study was delimited to faculty from CACREP accredited Counselor Education programs who identified as Counselor Educators. Racially and ethnically diverse faculty was delimited to faculty who identify as persons of color.

Definition of Terms

Biological sex. The APA Guidelines state that sex refers to a person’s biological status and is typically categorized as male, female, or intersex (APA, 2011).

Counselor educator. Calley and Hawley (2008) define a counselor educator as having had doctoral training in counselor education or a counseling-related field. A counselor educator’s primary identity revolves around the activity of teaching,
scholarship and service. Counselor educators are responsible for shaping the professional identity of counselors in training.

**Culture.** Sue and Sue (2009) define culture as a pattern of learned behavior pattern such a language, values and traditions that are shared by members of a particular society.

**Ethnicity.** Ethnicity is described as a group of people who are identified by a group of socio-cultural characteristics, values and traditions that have developed from where they live or from their ancestors (Sue & Sue, 2009).

**High transactional leadership style.** High transactional leadership style describes individuals with a mean score greater than 2.9 on the transformational leadership variable as measured by the Multifactorial Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). The transactional leadership variable is an individual’s mean score of the three scales that make up transactional leadership style (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009).

**High transformational leadership style.** High transformational leadership style describes individuals with a mean score greater than 2.9 on the transformational leadership variable as measured by the Multifactorial Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). The transformational leadership variable is an individual’s mean score of the five scales that make up transformational leadership style (Blackburn, 2001; Frey, 2009).

**Low transactional leadership style.** Low transactional leadership style describes individuals with mean scores equal to or less than 2.9 (Blackburn, 2001; Frey,
The transactional leadership variable is an individual’s mean score of the three scales that make up transformational leadership style as measured by the Multifactorial Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) (Blackburn, 2001; Frey, 2009).

**Low transformational leadership style.** Low transformational leadership style describes individuals with mean scores equal to or less than 2.9 (Blackburn, 2001; Frey, 2009). The transformational leadership variable is an individual’s mean score of the five scales that make up transformational leadership style as measured by the Multifactorial Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) (Blackburn, 2001; Frey, 2009).

**Personality.** Beck (1999) defines personality as “those emotional and psychological features of our immaterial selves that influence and indeed govern how we relate to others” (p. 18).

**Person of Color.** For the purpose of this dissertation, a person of color is a member of racial and ethnic minority population defined by the U.S. Census as Asian American, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, American Indian and Alaska Native (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).

**Race.** Hays and McCleod (2010) have defined race as the “socially constructed classification of individuals often based on physical distinctions such as skin color, hair texture, face form, and eye shape” (p.7).

**American Indian or Alaska Native.** American Indian or Alaska Native as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau refers to a person having origins in any of the original peoples of North, Central and South America and who maintain tribal affiliation or community attachment (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).
Asian. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the term Asian refers to a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).

Black or African American. Black or African American refers to a person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).

Latino. Latino is described by the U.S. Census Bureau as a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture origin regardless of race (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).

White. White refers to a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).

Transactional leadership. Transactional leadership refers to the exchange of relationship between leader and follower to meet one’s own self-interest (Bass, 1999).

Transformational leadership. According to Burns (1978) transformational leadership occurs “when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p. 20).

Summary

This chapter presents background information, a description of current issues and importance of the research study. The problem statement and research questions proposed for this study were presented. Limitations and delimitations of the study were discussed. The subsequent chapter will review existing literature related to theoretical
assumptions and current research findings of transformational leadership and personality and gender differences in leadership styles.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

This chapter will present a critical review of the literature on transformational leadership theory and outcomes related to transformational leadership style. A method for the identification of transformational leadership components will be described. Research examining how gender and cultural values may influence how individuals choose to lead will be discussed. The concept of personality development will be presented and the Big Five personality model will be defined. The influence of gender and culture on personality development will also be explored. Finally, a critical review of research on the relationship between personality attributes and transformational leadership is described.

Leadership

A wide variety of theoretical approaches have attempted to explain leadership (Bass, 1990; Gardner, 1990; Mumford, 2006; Rost, 1991). Northouse (2007) defines leadership as “a process in which an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (p. 3).” Many of these theoretical approaches have conceptualized leadership as a trait or a behavior while others have examined it from a relational perspective and yet others from an information processing view (Northouse). The trait perspective suggests that leaders are individuals with innate leadership qualities and limits who can be viewed as leaders, however a process definition suggest that leadership is based on interactions and can be developed through learned behaviors (Northouse). Leadership has also been defined based on a power relationship that exists between a leader and follower while other theories have described leadership from a
skills perspective in which individuals possess a particular set of knowledge and skills that made them effective leaders (Northouse). Lastly, leadership has been viewed as a transformational process in which followers are motivated by leaders to go above what is expected of them (Northouse). This transformational process is commonly termed transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1999).

**Transformational leadership theory.** Greater interest in transforming organizations has led to increased attention toward identifying leadership qualities that promote the development of individuals, groups and organizations. “Leaders who are concerned about organizational renewal will seek to foster cultures that are hospitable and conducive to creativity, problem solving, risk taking and experimentation” (Bass, 1999, p. 17). According to del Castillo (as cited in Bass, 1999):

“…it would be transformational leaders who would be better prepared to adapt to and value diversity among their followers. The transformational leader was expected to envision a culturally competent organization, to inspire confidence in its achievement, to use Intellectual Stimulation to encourage new ways of dealing with increasing diversity of their followers and to be empathetic with their followers’ different needs as individually considerate leaders” (p.18).

These qualities are critical in leaders of the counseling profession if they are to contribute to the 20/20 Vision for the Future of Counseling initiative developed by the American Counseling Association (Kaplan & Gladding, 2011). This vision delineates seven principles that provide a foundation for unity and advancing the counseling profession. The 20/20: A Vision for the Future of Counseling principles include:
“Sharing a common professional identity is critical for counselors. Presenting ourselves as a unified profession has multiple benefits. Working together to improve the public perception of counseling and to advocate for professional issues will strengthen the profession. Creating a portability system for licensure will benefit counselors and strengthen the counseling profession. Expanding and promoting our research base is essential to the efficacy of professional counselors and to the public perception of the profession. Focusing on students and prospective students is necessary to ensure the ongoing health of the counseling profession. Promoting client welfare and advocating for the populations we serve is a primary focus of the counseling profession” (Kaplan & Gladding, 2011, p. 372).

Bass and Avolio (2004) suggested that research is often focused on the process rather than the outcomes of leadership. Minor changes in individuals, groups or organizations result when a singular area of focus is given to specific work processes such as maintenance of quality or quality of performance. Major changes in organizational outcomes arise when leaders motivate and inspire individuals to work toward meaningful outcomes (Bass & Avolio). The particular leadership qualities that create these dramatic outcomes, influence followers to perform at higher levels, and motivate them to work for a greater cause have been identified through transformational leadership theory (Bass & Avolio). Theorists have closely examined major changes in organizations and businesses in attempts to identify the major leadership practices that
contribute to such change. One of the most well-known theories that describe these leadership practices is transformational leadership theory.

Transformational leadership theory, first introduced by James Burns, assumes that people who exhibit particular leadership behaviors can inspire followers to higher levels of performance and dedication (Burns, 1978). According to Burns, transformational leadership occurs “when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p. 20). According to Bass (1999) transformational leadership moves followers beyond immediate self-interests, elevates followers’ maturity, and increases concerns for achievement, self-actualization and the well-being of others. Leaders who exhibit this style, help followers envision a desirable future and articulate how it can be reached, set high standards of performance, encourage followers to become innovative and creative, and pay attention to the individual developmental needs of followers (Bass, 1999).

The elements of transformational leadership have been narrowed down into four components (Bass, 1998). These components include Charismatic Leadership (CL; also known as Idealized Influence), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS) and Individualized Consideration (IC) (Bass, 1998). Under Charismatic Leadership (CL), leaders following this component serve as role models to followers. As leaders, they set an example of expected performance and often demonstrate high moral and ethical conduct. Leaders who follow the component of Inspirational Motivation (IM) are able to articulate a clear vision of the future and provide meaning and context to the work of followers. The component Intellectual Stimulation (IS) describes leaders who model
and encourage innovative thinking and problem solving. In this manner, the leader is able to create excitement about new perspectives and ways of doing things. Lastly, the element Individualized Consideration (IC) describes leaders who recognize and respond to the unique needs, abilities, and aspirations of followers. Although leaders can simultaneously exhibit both transformational and transactional leadership behaviors, each style is characterized by unique differences and outcomes (Bass, 1999). Unlike transformational leadership which focuses on future-oriented change, transactional leadership places emphasis on processes.

Transactional leadership style, although helpful in achieving a required task, has limited influence in creating major improvements. Unlike transformational leadership which moves followers beyond immediate self-interests, transactional leadership refers to the exchange of relationship between leader and follower to meet one’s own self-interest (Bass, 1999). Focus under this style of leadership is on maintenance. Minimum task performance is rewarded and leaders often engage with followers only when they fail to meet minimum standards. Transactional leadership components are comprised of Management-by-Exception and Contingent Reward. Under the component Contingent Reward, directions are provided and rewards are given for carrying out an assignment. Although effective for adequate task completion, it does not encourage followers to perform and achieve at higher levels. Management-by-exception (MBE) can either be active (MBE-A) or passive (MBE-P). In active MBE-A, the leader actively monitors performance and takes corrective action when followers deviate from expected levels of
MBE-P is defined as passively waiting for sub-par performance, or mistakes and errors to occur, and then taking corrective action after problems have arisen.

Bass and Avolio (2004) argue that transformational leadership enhances transactional leadership in effecting productive outcomes. Because of its emphasis on maintaining the status quo, transactional leadership often results in minor improvements (Bass & Avolio). Effective leadership therefore requires that leaders exhibit both transformational and transactional components (Bass & Avolio). Effective leaders benefit from using transactional leadership to accomplish lower level goals and practicing transformational leadership to influence higher order future-oriented goals.

Transformational leadership is highly correlated with outcomes in effectiveness and satisfaction of subordinates than Contingent Reward (Bass, 1999). Managers perceive transactional leadership as less important than a transformational leadership for organizational effectiveness (Rukmani & Jayakrishnan, 2010). Furthermore, current research on leadership has supported the effectiveness of these transformational practices.

**Transformational leadership outcomes.** Several studies have provided support for the use of transformational leadership on various work and performance outcomes including organizational success (Jandaghi et al., 2009), ethical climate (Sagnak, 2011), job satisfaction (Yang, 2012), and increased productivity (Gellis, 2001). Jandaghi, Matin, and Farjami (2009) compared transformational leadership in successful and unsuccessful companies in various countries. Results indicated that successful organizations possessed more transformational leadership traits than unsuccessful companies (Jandaghi et al.). All four transformational leadership components were
significantly higher in successful companies, however leaders were found to be highly active in the area of Inspirational Motivation. In their study, Jandaghi et al. (2009) found that leaders in successful organizations paid special attention to motivational issues in personnel and were able to respond with appropriate motivational techniques (Jandaghi et al.).

Sagnak (2011) found that school transformational leadership was a significant predictor of ethical climate. In an examination of the perceived leadership behaviors of school principal, all dimensions of transformational leadership were positively related to caring, law and code, and ethical climate. Transformational leadership factors of inspirational motivation, idealized influence, and individual consideration were important components that predicted job satisfaction (Sagnak). Leaders who are rated high in Idealized Influence serve as role models to followers. As leaders, they set an example of expected performance and often demonstrate high ethical standards. Under the component Inspirational Motivation, these leaders articulated a clear vision of the future and provided meaning and context to the work of followers. Rating high in Individualized Consideration, these leaders were able to recognize and respond to the unique needs, abilities and aspirations of followers.

Such practices have also been found to influence job satisfaction. Yang (2012) examined the effects of transformational leadership on the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of public relations practitioners in Taiwan. Findings revealed that when personnel “perceived a higher degree of inspirational motivation and idealized influence from their supervisors, their levels of extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction
rose” (Yang, p.38). In turn, organizational commitment was determined by intrinsic job satisfaction (Yang).

Within the helping profession, transformational leadership has been associated with perceptions of leader effectiveness, satisfaction with leader, and increased productivity (Gellis, 2001). A study of social workers examined the degree to which social work managers practiced transformational and transactional leadership and the extent to which these leadership styles predicted leader effectiveness, satisfaction with leader, and extra effort produced by social workers (Gellis). Results indicated that transformational leadership behaviors in social work managers significantly affected subordinates’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness and satisfaction with leaders. As the counseling profession works toward the 20/20 Vision, academic institutions and counselor education programs would benefit from the development and identification of transformational leaders.

**Leadership in academia.** Findings from both the White House Project (2009) and AAUP Faculty Gender Equity Indicators (West & Curtis, 2006) highlight the current shortage of women in leadership positions in higher education. Over the past few decades women have shown a dramatic increase in participation as students (NCES, 2012). However the same cannot be said for the number of women represented in the faculty ranks of academic institutions. Female faculty members continue to lag behind male peers in a variety of ways including underrepresentation at the highest faculty ranks and lower salaries beyond entry level (West & Curtis, 2006). The number of women in academic positions decreases as faculty rank increases with women making up 57% of
lecturers and instructors, 46% of assistant professors, 38% of associate professors, 24% of full professors and 23% of college presidents (2006). According to the AAUP’s faculty gender equity indicators, in 2006 women had lower percentages of tenured positions than men at doctoral, masters, and bachelor’s institutions (2006). Additionally, “women occupied more non-tenure track positions than tenure track positions, and men overwhelmingly comprised the majority of tenured faculty” (2006, p. 6). On average, female faculty members earn 81 percent of what male faculty members earn across all ranks and all institutional types (2006). The absence of female leaders is more apparent among the top ranks of academia where according to the White House Project (2009), women comprise 57% of all college students nationwide but only 26% of full professors, 23% of university presidents, and 14% of presidencies at the doctoral degree–granting institutions. Findings also indicated that women account for only 30% of board members on college and university boards.

Women in academia have been found to experience a unique set of challenges as they navigate through the academic pipeline. Airini et al. (2011) found five themes that focus on what helps or hinders the advancement of women in university settings. These included work relationships, university environment, invisible rules, proactivity, and personal circumstance. Ballenger (2011) argues that attitudinal and organizational biases against women often exclude women from upper-level and leadership positions. Findings from her study of women serving as president or other upper administrative positions (i.e., dean, chancellors, directors, provosts) indicated that lack of mentors, the good old boy network, gender inequalities, and slower career paths served as invisible
barriers for female faculty (2011). These women reported that positive and supportive mentors, affirmative action laws, and university’s awareness and actions related to increasing gender and racial diversity in the workforce contributed to their professional advancement (2011).

According to Cropsey et al. (2008), women and minority faculty leave academic positions at the same or higher rate than White or male counterparts which can significantly impact an already narrow pool of minority and female faculty at institutions. Chairperson/departmental leadership issues and professional advancement were among the primary reasons for leaving academic positions for both women and minority faculty (Cropsey et al., 2008). Madsen (2012) argues that “leadership development programs for women continue to be a critical element in teaching and supporting women in higher education to prepare for, attain, and maintain positions of influence within their institutions” (p. 5).

**Identifying transformational leaders.** The identification and development of a diverse leadership group requires knowledge of how to differentiate highly effective from ineffective leaders. According to Burns (1998) organizations that are concerned about organizational renewal will foster cultures that are hospitable to creativity, problem solving, risk taking and experimentation. Transformational leaders are better prepared to adapt to and value diversity among their followers, can envision a culturally competent organization, inspire confidence in its achievement, encourage new ways of dealing with increasing diversity of their followers, and be empathetic with their followers’ different needs (Burns, 1998).
One of the most frequently used tools for research in the area of transformational and transactional leadership is the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), developed by Avolio and Bass (2004). As a research tool, the MLQ has also been used to increase understanding of the developmental factors and experiences that contribute to leadership styles (Burns & Avolio, 2004). Furthermore, the MLQ has been used at all levels of organizations for examining leadership behaviors of personnel (Burns & Avolio, 2004). Organizations have used the results from the MLQ for identifying individuals for selection to training programs, transfer to leadership positions and promotions to supervisory positions. The MLQ has also been used as a tool for providing individualized and group feedback to managers and leaders concerning their leadership style (Burns & Avolio, 2004). Although this instrument has been used extensively to research leadership styles, increasingly, attention to diverse leadership groups has emphasized the need to explore how factors such as gender can influence leadership behavior.

**Gender and transformational leadership.** As increasing numbers of women enter the workforce and assume leadership roles, attention has been placed on the leadership attributes of women and how they might differ from men. Several studies have examined gender differences in leadership styles (Bass, Avolio, & Atwater, 1996; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) have suggested that gender roles may contribute to leadership style differences observed among men and women. Gender roles are
described as shared beliefs that are applied to individuals based on their socially identified sex (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt).

An investigation of transformational, transactional and laissez faire styles of male and female leaders in a large sample of managers revealed gender differences in leadership styles (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt). Women were found to exceed men in the areas of Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation and Individualized Consideration. They also exceeded men on the transactional scale of Contingent Reward. Female leaders rated high in Idealized Influence were more likely than men who rated low, to serve as role models to followers. As leaders, they set an example of expected performance and often demonstrate high ethical standards. Inspirational Motivation scales indicated that women were more likely to articulate a clear vision of the future and provide meaning and context to the work of followers. Women rating high in Individualized Consideration are able to recognize and respond to the unique needs, abilities and aspirations of followers. Higher ratings on Contingent Reward indicated that women were more likely to use Contingent Reward in which directions are provided and rewards are given for carrying out an assignment. Men were found to surpass women on the transactional scales of Management by Exception and on Laissez-faire leadership. Men who engaged in management by exception were more likely take corrective actions only when followers deviated from expected levels of performance. Men were more likely than women to engage in laissez-faire leadership which is characterized by the absence of leadership. Women also scored significantly higher than men on a measure of perceived effectiveness.
Bass et al. (1996) studied a diverse sample of managers from business, industry, non-profit, government, health care and manufacturing organizations and revealed that female leaders rated higher on transformational leadership styles and less on passive leadership styles. A meta-analysis of 45 studies examining male and female leadership styles reported similar findings from business, education and governmental organizations revealing that female leaders were more transformational in their leadership style than males (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). Again women were found to score higher on transformational subscales of Charisma, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration. Additionally women scored higher than male leaders on Contingent Reward.

Gender roles and work environments have been suggested as possible influencing factors in leadership style differences among men and women. Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) suggested that gender roles prescribed by others on the individual and self-prescribed gender roles may influence a person’s leadership style. Traditional leadership components attributed to organizational success are often rooted in masculine characteristics of assertiveness, competition and problem solving. Female gender roles including such as nurturance, empathy and sensitivity often conflict with these expectations of leadership behavior. Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) suggest that differences in expected gender and leadership roles may make it more difficult for women to display these masculine-oriented leadership styles. Women who depart from expected gender roles and exhibit more assertive leadership styles have been perceived more negatively (Eagly & Chin, 2010).
Dunnigan (2010) suggested that work environments may influence leadership styles. A study examining gender role internalization and leadership styles found that women who were trained by other women tended to exhibit more gender role internalization and transformational leadership styles (Young et al.). Research indicating gender differences in transformational leadership and the influence of gender role expectations on leadership behavior suggest that the influence of identities such as race and ethnicity should be considered.

**Race and transformational leadership.** The influence of gender identity on leadership style has increasingly gained the attention of researchers; however limited information exists on how group identities such as race and ethnicity can influence leadership behavior (Ayman & Korabik, 2010). Eagly and Chin (2010) suggest that like women, leaders from racially diverse groups face a similar pressure to conform to the leadership expectations established by the majority group. As women attempt to balance gender roles and leadership expectations, individuals from racially diverse backgrounds face the challenge of balancing racial and ethnic identity and leadership styles.

Qualities associated with certain ethnic or cultural groups may be in conflict with the direct, task-oriented leadership styles typically observed in the United States. For example, Asian cultures are often described as being more group-oriented and emphasize harmony and politeness (Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010). Latino cultures also tend to be highly group-oriented; emphasizing respect for those in positions of authority and focusing on developing relationships (Sue & Sue, 1999). These qualities may be denigrated or viewed as a lack of leadership if viewed through the lens of the majority
culture. As women of color assume leadership positions, they are faced with the challenge of navigating through the multiple identities of gender and race and the leadership styles of the majority group.

Multiple identities and the social interactions that result from these identities may influence leadership styles of women of color. Ayman (1993) argued that because an individual’s schema is influenced by gender and culture, leaders and their followers may be influenced by such schemas in their day-to-day work transactions. Sanchez-Hucles and Davis (2010) suggest that women of color face additional forms of discrimination and stereotyping based on race that is not experienced by White women. Racial stereotypes that are often seen in society make it difficult for women of color to be seen as effective leaders (Sanchez-Hucles & Davis). These stereotypes can influence how individuals from both similar and different background relate to one another. Despite the fact that most organizations value assertiveness and individualism in emerging leaders, women of color are often caught in a dilemma between meeting these leadership expectations while not deviating from expected stereotypical behaviors. When women of color assume traditional leadership behaviors of assertiveness and self-promotion this may be seen as less favorable by the majority group because it deviates from expected stereotypical behaviors (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Social expectations that occur in the work place may therefore influence leadership behavior.

Sanchez-Hucles and Davis (2010) argue that leadership in itself is a social process that involves both the followers’ and leaders’ perceptions and expectations of and reactions toward leadership behaviors. Identity and leadership may continually interact
to shape one another during this process. This intersection of multiple identities must be examined to explore how these identities influence one another. Multiple identities may interact in different ways to influence leadership styles or may mask aspects of a single influencing identity (Sanchez-Hucles & Davis).

In summary, current research findings suggest that transformational leadership components can positively influence ethical climate, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Research using the MLQ to identify leadership behaviors has indicated that men and women exhibit differences in the degree to which they practice the four elements of transformational leadership. Research has indicated that women tend to display higher levels of transformational leadership styles compared to men. The influence of racial and ethnic identities on the leadership styles of women of color has increasingly gained the attention of researchers. In the following section, current research on personality development are also reviewed and discussed.

**Personality**

**Personality development.** Individual personality may potentially account for the differences observed in leadership styles among individuals. Beck (1999) defines personality as the “emotional and psychological features of our immaterial selves that influence and indeed govern how we relate to others” (p. 18). Given that leadership in organizations requires social interactions among coworkers and managers, individuals’ emotional and psychological features may play a role in this social process. Kluckhohn and Murray (1953) state that some of the factors that influence personality are common features found in the genetic makeup of all people, while others’ personality features are
the results of social grouping such as culture, race and ethnicity. Universal determinants are found in the genetic make-up of all people; however, other characteristics are the result of unique social group and individual experiences. The personality framework of Kluckhohn and Murray (1953) describes three dimensions of personality: all people share some characteristics based on biological makeup, all persons are like some other persons given that members of a group share commonalities, and lastly all persons are like no other person based on the unique individual experiences of each person. This model of personality formation suggests that both similarities and differences in personality traits may influence the way people relate to others. The identification and development of a diverse group of leaders therefore may require a deeper understanding of the personality traits associated with leadership behaviors.

**Big Five Model of Personality.** The Big Five factors also known as the Five Factor Model was developed by Costa and McCrae (1992) as a model for understanding the five dimensions of personality that describe human behavior. Prior to the development of the Big five, a variety of competing systems from Guilford, Cattell, and Eysenck claimed to offer the best representation of personality systems (Costa & McCrae, 2004). Through their research, Costa and McCrae determined there was agreement among the competing systems on five broader domains of traits rather than the specific traits. This led to the development of the Big Five Inventory (BFI) a psychological personality inventory that measures personality along the five dimensions which include Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness to Experience and Neuroticism (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991).
The Big Five is one of the most widely accepted and dominant models of personality used in applied research (Orzer, 1994). Due to its focus on the broader domains rather than individual facets of personality, other personality models such as 16 Personality Factor (16PF) and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) are represented within the Big 5 Model (Orzer, 1994). The Big Five Inventory, a personality instrument, measures the relationship between the Big Five traits and a wide number of variables (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). The Big Five factors (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness to Experience and Neuroticism) represent the basic dimensions of underlying personality traits in individuals.

Openness is described as unconventional, curious and open to new ways of thinking. The opposite end of this dimension would describe behavior that is more conventional and conservative in views. Individuals at this end of the continuum prefer familiar routines and have a narrow range of interests. An emotional response in these individuals is more reserved. Conscientiousness is described as strong willed, determined, punctual and achievement-oriented. Traits contrary to this factor can be described as more apathetic when working toward goals. Extraversion can be described as enthusiastic, action-oriented and energetic. Individuals with this trait typically enjoy being around other people. Individuals who are not extroverts, also known as introverts, tend to be more low-key, less socially involved. They may be energetic and active, however may not require as much social stimulation as Extraverts. Agreeableness describes those who are compassionate, optimistic and cooperative. They place value in getting along with others and compromising their interests for the benefit of others.
Individuals on the other end of this dimension put self-interest above the interests of others. They are generally less concerned with the welfare of others. Whereas Agreeableness describes a more optimistic view, individuals with traits contrary to this may be described as more of a skeptic. Neuroticism describes low emotional stability. Individuals tend to be more emotionally reactive and easily stressed.

**Gender and personality.** The relationship between gender and personality attributes has been explored in order to gain a deeper understanding of the dimensions of personality that describe human behavior. Biological and psychosocial theories have attempted to explain gender differences in personality by attributing differences to the biological make-up of men and women and to the different gender roles established within society. For example, the social constructs of masculinity and femininity have been found to predict personality attributes. An examination of men and women in China found that masculinity was a strong predictor of Extraversion and Conscientiousness and a moderate predictor of Agreeableness across gender (Zheng & Zheng, 2011).

Feingold (1994) conducted several meta-analyses to examine gender differences in personality and in normative data for well-known personality inventories. Inventories examined included assessments such as the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), the Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory (MMPI/MMPI-2), the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) and the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R). These findings indicted that men were more assertive and had slightly higher self-esteem than women (Feingold, 1994). Additionally, women were found to have higher levels of Extraversion, anxiety, trust, and nurturance. These gender differences in personality
traits were found to be constant across ages, years of data collection, educational levels, and nations (Feingold, 1994).

Similar findings were found in studies exploring the relationship between gender and the Big Five personality model. Saarnio (2010) investigated whether gender differences occur in Big Five personality traits or interpersonal functioning among substance abuse therapists in Finland. Findings revealed that female therapist scored significantly higher in friendliness and Openness to Experience. Women also scored higher on interpersonal functioning. Data on gender differences in the Finnish population indicated that greater gender differences were found among therapists than the general population. These findings differed from international comparisons that indicated women score significantly higher than men on four factors: Neuroticism, Extroversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (Saarnio, 2010).

Gender differences in personality traits were found to be consistent across cultures (Costa, Terraciano & McCrae, 2001; Saarnio, 2010; Zheng & Zheng, 2011). For example, an examination of gender differences across cultures in the Big Five personality model was conducted using the NEO-PI-R instrument. Costa et al. (2001) found modest gender differences in the NEO-PI-R across cultures. These differences were consistent with gender stereotypes related to masculinity and femininity namely, women tended to score higher on negative effect, submissiveness, nurturing, and orientation toward feelings (Costa et al., 2001). Women consistently scored higher on facets of Neuroticism and Agreeableness. Higher scores on Neuroticism may indicate women are more emotionally reactive and easily stressed compared to men. Higher scores on
Agreeableness suggest that women placed emphasis on the nurturance facet while men tended to be more assertive (Costa et al., 2001). The magnitude of gender differences varied across cultures with the largest differences in European and American cultures (Costa et al., 2001).

**Culture and personality development.** As an increasing number of organizations have begun to use personality instruments in the selection and development of personnel and research on racial and ethnic differences in personality instruments have been explored (Foldes, Duehr, & Ones, 2008; Ployhart & Holtz, 2008; Zheng & Zheng, 2011). Given that personality consists of a combination of an individual’s emotions, attitudes and behaviors, the interpersonal relationships and communication styles of different racial and ethnic groups can vary greatly from one group to another (Sue & Sue, 2009). McCrae (2001) has suggested that personality and culture interact to create the emotions, attitudes and behaviors of individuals and social groups. Much of the literature in this area has focused on the use of personality instruments in the hiring and selection procedures of organizations (Foldes, Duehr, & Ones, 2008; Ployhart & Holtz, 2008; Zheng & Zheng, 2011).

A meta-analysis conducted by Foldes et al. (2008) examined racial differences across the Big Five personality factors and facets. Findings suggested that racial group differences were relatively small (Foldes et al., 2008). However, moderate findings revealed that White respondents generally scored higher on sociability, lower on Extraversion and lower on anxiety compared to Black respondents. Additionally Black respondents scored higher on self-esteem, Conscientiousness and cautiousness. Among
Asian-White comparisons, mean effect sizes were quite small. Whites scored slightly higher when all measures of emotional stability were analyzed together. Asians scored higher than Whites for the trait Agreeableness, however the implications of these findings are limited due to the small number of Asian (White participants, N= 104,257 and Asian participants N= 3,454) participants. Negligible differences in personality were found among Whites and Latinos. Among Whites and Latinos, mean differences were not found for emotional stability, however, small differences were found in the facets of self-esteem and low anxiety. Among comparisons between Whites and American Indians, Whites scored higher on Extraversion, emotional stability and Agreeableness. American Indians scored higher in Conscientiousness. Due to the limited number of American Indians in the sample (White participants N= 22,097 and American Indian participants N= 743), differences between White and American Indians should be interpreted with caution.

Similar findings in racial and ethnic differences in personality were found in a study on masculine and feminine personality traits (Zheng & Zheng, 2011). Results from a study conducted in China found that masculinity contributed very positively not only to Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and intellect but also contributed slightly to Agreeableness. These findings were in contrast to results in western cultures where masculinity contributed negatively to Agreeableness. Results suggest that unlike in the United States where masculinity is related to assertiveness and competition, masculine traits in Asia reflect the cultural emphasis on harmony.
In summary, personality development has been described as the emotional and psychological factors that influence how individuals relate to one another. Bio-psychosocial factors have all been suggested as interacting factors in the development of personality. As a result, both similarities and differences in personality may explain the differences in how individuals relate to one another. The Big Five factors also known as the Five Factor Model was developed in an attempt to describe the dimensions of personality that describe human behavior. However, current research on personality attributes has suggested that the social constructs of gender and race and ethnicity may explain differences in personality attributes among individuals and groups.

The Relationship Between Personality and Leadership Behaviors

The influence of personality on behavior has led researchers to examine the relationship between personality attributes and leadership style. Findings from several studies have indicated a significant relationship between specific personality attributes and leadership behaviors (Blackburn, 2001; Frey, Snow, & Curlette, 2009; Hautala, 2006). Although there have been various studies exploring this relationship, many were conducted using different personality and leadership measurements. Furthermore, research on transformational leaders’ personalities has been conducted from either the perspective of the leader, the follower, or both.

Hautala (2006) examined the relationship between personality attributes and transformational leadership behavior based on the perceptions of leaders and their subordinates. Using the Myers Briggs type indicator and the Leadership Practices inventory, data from both leaders and their subordinates’ findings revealed that a
relationship exists between personality and transformational leadership (Hautala, 2006). However, results revealed that subordinates’ and leaders’ ratings did not align. According to leaders’ self-ratings, extraverted, intuitive and perceiving preferences correlated with transformational leadership. Conversely, subordinates’ ratings indicated that leaders with sensing preference, those who make decisions based on data and facts, were associated with transformational leadership.

A meta-analysis conducted by Bono and Judge (2004) supported the relationship between personality traits and leadership styles. A meta-analysis was conducted of studies that measured observer ratings of leadership behavior and examined personality traits measured in the Big Five model. Findings from this study indicated that among the five personality traits, Extraversion was the strongest correlate with transformational leadership behavior. Additional Individuals who were more emotionally stable based on personality assessments engaged in higher levels of transformational leadership.

Frey et al. (2009) reported similar findings regarding the relationship between personality attributes and transformational leadership behaviors. The relationship between personality attributes, demographic variables and leadership styles among business graduate students was examined. Findings indicated a statistically significant relationship between Scales in the BASIS-A inventory and leadership scales of MLQ-5X. Significant differences in personality attributes were found in those who exhibited a high transformational leadership style and those who did not. The Softness scale that describes a leader who will promote a positive and encouraging attitude and the Striving for Perfection scale that describes individuals who have the necessary coping skills to
solve problems and handle stress in an organizational setting were both identified as attributes predictive of high transformational leaders. These scales are similar to the Big Five traits Extraversion and Neuroticism. Furthermore, Striving for Perfection and Wanting Recognition accounted for the largest amount of variance in individuals with elevated transformational leadership scores. Consistent with the literature on transformational leadership, female participants were higher on all transformational scales.

Additional findings from the transformational scales revealed that means for all scales were higher in African American participants than White participants, and significant mean differences existed between groups on the Idealized-Influence Attributed scale. Under this scale, leaders serve as role models to followers. As leaders they set an example of expected performance and often demonstrate high ethical standards. Although results suggest racial and ethnic differences in leadership behaviors, the majority of African Americans participants were female. Given that women in general tend to score higher on transformational scales, these findings do not account for gender as an influencing variable. In conclusion, results from this study suggest individuals who practice higher levels of transformational leadership behavior exhibit unique personality traits such as being achievement-oriented and wanting attention. However, this study along with those previously discussed do not account for the role that gender and race may play in the personality attributes of transformational leaders.
Summary and Conclusion

This chapter has described the concepts of transformational leadership and personality based on relevant literature. Outcomes related to transformational leadership style have been identified. Additionally, the influence of gender and race and ethnicity on leadership style has been discussed. Personality attributes have been described as influential factors in the way individuals relate to one another. The manner in which race and gender contribute to the personality development of individuals and social groups has been explored. Finally, a critical review of literature examining the relationship between personality attributes and leadership styles have been discussed.

Although there is growing literature on the relationship between personality attributes and transformational leadership styles, studies that address the influence of multiple identities on the personality traits of leaders is limited. The literature on leadership has limited information regarding cross-cultural applicability of transformational leadership theory. Additionally, the manner in which multiple identities such as gender and race and ethnicity influence leader behaviors should be explored.

Research has suggested a relationship between personality attributes and leadership style; however lack of inclusion of gender and culture limits the scope of knowledge in this area.

As leadership within the counseling profession becomes increasingly diverse, emerging leaders and individuals who train these leaders must understand their individual leadership style and behaviors and how it may contrast from styles preferred by others (Ayman & Korabik, 2010). Lacking within the field of counseling is information on the
personality characteristics related to the transformational leadership styles of counselor educators. Furthermore, gender and racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes are absent within the current literature on the counseling profession. A lack of understanding of how gender and culture influence leadership behaviors can impede the development of the next generation of diverse leaders (Ayman & Korabik, 2010). The identification and development of a diverse group requires a greater understanding of the traits associated with transformational leaders. Given the influence that gender and work environment can have on transformational leadership styles, an examination of the influence of gender in leadership qualities in counselor education should be explored.

Based on an examination of research on personality attributes and transformational leadership, the current research study is offered. The present study is an exploratory study of the relationship between gender, race and ethnicity and personality attributes and leadership styles. This study explores the relationships between these variables and leadership theory among counselor educators in order to gain a richer understanding of the influence of multiple identities on the personality traits of female counselor educators of color who exhibit high transformational leadership styles.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare personality attributes of counselor educators to further the understanding of characteristics most likely related to transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style. In addition to examining the relationship between personality attributes and leadership, this study extended previous research by focusing on gender and culture as it relates to personality attributes of leaders. The main research question in this study was whether there were significant gender and racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes of counselor educators who are characterized as transformational leaders. By conducting an exploratory study, this study focused on gender and race/ethnicity as it relates to personality attributes of leaders. This chapter describes the methodology employed to test the research questions. A description of operational definitions of the variables, sampling plan, and instrumentation utilized in this research design are provided, followed by a discussion of issues in reliability and validity. Finally data collection and data analysis will be described in this chapter.

Procedures

This study examined the relationship between race, gender, personality attributes, and leadership styles. Participants were asked to self-report on established measures of personality and leadership style as well as complete a demographic questionnaire. The data gathered from these measures and from the questionnaire were analyzed. Prior to the collection of data, the researcher submitted and gained approval for the current study from the Ohio University Institutional Review Board (IRB).
Operational Definition of Variables

1. Are there personality attributes that accurately discriminate between individuals showing High Transformational Leadership (HTL) or Low Transformational Leadership (HTL)?

   The dependent variable for the first research question was the leadership style scores on the MLQ-5X which was dichotomized into a high transformational leadership style and low transformational leadership style (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). The independent variables were the five scores from the measure of personality, The Big Five Inventory-(BFI).

2. Are there personality attributes that accurately discriminate between individuals showing High Transactional Leadership or Low Transactional Leadership?

   The dependent variable for the second research question was leadership style scores on the MLQ-5x which was dichotomized into high transactional leadership and low transactional leadership style. The independent variables were the five scores from the measure of personality, The Big Five Inventory-3 (BFI).

3. Are there gender differences in personality attributes depending on whether individuals are high or low in transformational leadership style?

   The independent variables for question three were the response to demographic questionnaire on gender (male or female) and leadership style scores on the MLQ-5x which was dichotomized into high transformational leadership and low transformational leadership style. The dependent variables were the five scores from the measure of personality, The Big Five Inventory-3 (BFI).
4. Are there gender differences in personality attributes depending on whether individuals are high or low in transactional leadership style?

The independent variables for question four were the response to demographic questionnaire on gender (male or female) and leadership style scores on the MLQ-5x which was further dichotomized into high transactional leadership and low transactional leadership style. The dependent variables were the five scores from the measure of personality, The Big Five Inventory-3 (BFI).

5. Are there differences between women who identify as White and women who identify as non-White in personality attributes depending on whether they exhibit high or low transformational leadership style?

The independent variables for question five were the response to demographic questionnaire on race (White or Person of Color) and leadership style scores on the MLQ-5x which was further dichotomized into high transformational leadership and low transformational leadership style. The dependent variables were the five scores from the measure of personality, The Big Five Inventory-3 (BFI).

6. Are there differences between women who identify as White and women who identify as non-White in personality attributes depending on whether they exhibit high or low transactional leadership style?

The independent variables for question six were the response to demographic questionnaire on race (White or Person of Color) and leadership style scores on the MLQ-5x which was further dichotomized into high transactional leadership and low
transactional leadership style. The dependent variables were the five scores from the measure of personality, The Big Five Inventory-3 (BFI).

Population

Participants were faculty members of graduate level counseling programs from CACREP Accredited Institutions who identified as Counselor Educators. The rationale for obtaining participants from the CACREP directory is it allowed for the study of counselor educators from differing geographical locations. Additionally, as opposed to surveying counselor educators holding only elected leadership positions, this sampling method allowed for the inclusion of counselor educators who held nonelected leadership positions. Participants included counselor educators at various rank levels (Instructor, Associate, Assistant, and Full Professor).

Sampling Plan

Due to the nature of the study, stratified random sampling was employed to ensure that each of the five strata for geography, North Atlantic, North Central, Southern, Rocky Mountain and Western, were represented. The target population for this study was accessible faculty members from counselor education programs. The sample was obtained from the CACREP directory of 263 full time accredited institutions with graduate level counseling programs. Using the CACREP website (2012), 107 institutions from each of the five ACES geographical regions, North Atlantic, North Central, Southern, Rocky Mountain and Western, were randomly selected. Using a cluster sample approach, the researcher located the email addresses of all current counselor education faculty members from the selected counselor education programs. Every counselor
educator from each of the selected counselor education programs was sent a questionnaire for a total of 864 counselor educators. Two weekly follow up reminders were sent participants who had not responded. Due to low response rates, another random sample of 108 institutions were selected from the remaining list of CACREP accredited programs for an additional sample of 713 faculty members. Appropriate for a multivariate analysis, and based on a moderate effect size, a total sample size of 200 participants was determined (Stevens, 2002).

Instrumentation

Multifactorial leadership questionnaire. The Multifactorial Leadership Questionnaire, (MLQ) (5X-Short) is a 45 item self-report survey used to measure participants’ perceptions of leadership behavior. The MLQ was designed to expand on the dimensions of leadership measured by previous leadership instruments. The MLQ can measure a participant’s leadership behavior based on effective and ineffective leadership behaviors that have been linked to individual and organizational success (Avolio & Bass, 2004). These behaviors were based on the major leadership constructs: Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, and Laissez-Faire Leadership.

The MLQ contains 36 questions which assessed nine leadership styles and the remaining nine questions assessed three leadership outcomes. Each of the nine leadership styles was measured by four items. The nine leadership outcomes include: Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behaviors, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception: Active, Management-by-Exception: Passive and Laissez-Faire. These items
measured key leadership and effectiveness behaviors that as a result of prior research have been found to be related to individual and organizational success. A five point scale for rating the frequency of observed leadership behaviors was used (0 = Not at all, 1 = Once in a while, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Fairly often and 4 = Frequently, if not always). Examples of items included “I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts” and “I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.” From the nine scales, this study focused on the five scales that described transformational leadership style and the three scales that described transactional leadership style. The transformational scales are Idealized Attributes (IA), Idealized Behaviors, (IB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS) and Individual Consideration (IC).

Following the methods employed by Blackburn (2001) and Frey et al. (2009) each participant’s mean score of the five scales that make up transformational leadership style were examined. The maximum mean score was four. A mean score of 2.9 or above determined High Transformational Leadership (HTL) and a mean score equal to or less than 2.9 determined Low Transformational Leadership (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). The transactional scales are Contingent Reward (CR) and Management-by-Exception: Active (MEA). Each participant’s mean score of the three scales that make up transactional leadership style were examined (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). The maximum mean score was four. A mean score of 2.9 or above determined High Transactional Leadership (HTXL) and a mean score equal to or less than 2.9 determined Low Transactional Leadership (LTXL) (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009).
The MLQ-5x was developed in response to criticism over the previous version, MLQ-5R. The criticism was due to high correlations among the transformational scales. The reliabilities for the total items in the MLQ-5X and for each leadership factor scale ranged from .63 to .92 (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Reliability scores for each scale were: Charisma = .92, Intellectural Stimulation = .83, Individualized Consideration = .79, Contingent Reward = .80, Active Management-by-Exception = .63, and Passive/Avoidant = .84 (Avolio & Bass). All scales’ reliabilities exceeded standard cut offs for internal consistency (Avolio & Bass). Additionally the construct validation process has been described by Avolio and Bass (2004). Since the development of the MLQ-5x, fourteen samples have been used to both validate and cross validate the instrument (Avolio & Bass). These studies have been conducted in a variety of cultures and organizational settings.

The Big Five inventory. The Big Five Inventory (BFI) is a 44-item self-report inventory (Appendix A). It was designed to provide a comprehensive measure of the five domains of personality based on the Big Five Personality Model (John, 1991). The BFI was intended to measure differences in personality among a general population. The BFI was created to allow for an efficient assessment of the five dimensions without the need to measure individual facets (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). It used short phrases based on trait adjectives recognized as identifiers of Big Five traits (John, 1991). The five major domains of personality were Neuroticism (N), Extraversion (E), Openness to Experience (O), Agreeableness (A), and Conscientiousness (C). Neuroticism and Extraversion scales each contained eight items, the Agreeableness and Conscientiousness
scales each contained nine items and the Openness to Experience scale contained 10 items. Sample items included “I see myself as someone who is reserved” and “I see myself as someone who prefers work that is routine.” Participants were asked to respond along a five-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Traits were measured in comparison to a normal bell-shaped distribution. Individuals represented a degree of the personality trait, ranging from extremely high scorers to extremely low, although most typically fell in the mid-range displaying some of the characteristics of that trait. Following the bell-shaped distribution; very few would exhibit all characteristics of a trait or no characteristics of a trait.

The BFI described the degree to which individuals represented a personality trait, ranging from high scorers to low scorers. Individuals who scored low on Openness tended to be more conventional in behavior and conservative in views. These individuals preferred familiar routines and had a narrow range of interests. An emotional response in these individuals is more reserved. Individuals who scored high on Openness can be described as unconventional, curious and open to new ways of thinking. Conscientious individuals can be described as strong willed, determined, punctual and achievement-oriented. Low scoring individuals can be described as more apathetic when working toward goals. Individuals who score high on Extraversion can be described as enthusiastic, action-oriented and energetic. They typically enjoy being around other people. Individuals who score low on Extraversion tend to be more low-key and less socially involved. Low scoring Extraverts may be energetic and active, however may not require as much social stimulation as high scoring Extraverts. Agreeableness describes
those who are compassionate, optimistic and cooperative. They place value in getting along with others and compromising their interests for the benefit of others. Individuals who scored low on Agreeableness generally put self-interest above the interests of others. They are generally less concerned with the welfare of others. Whereas high scoring individuals hold an optimistic view, the low scorer would be described as more of a skeptic. Neuroticism has also been described as low emotional stability. Individuals who scored high on Neuroticism tend to be more emotionally reactive and easily stressed. Low scoring individuals can be described as calm, emotionally stable, and free from persistent negative feelings. As mentioned previously, traits are described along a range and there is no single cutoff point that determines whether an individual possesses a trait or not.

The BFI was based on the Big Five theory, one of the most widely used and dominant models of personality in applied research (Orzer, 1994). Alpha coefficients on the BFI range from .75 to .90 and average above .80 (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). Furthermore, three month test retest reliabilities range from .8 to .9 with a mean of .85. The BFI correlates highly with the Costa and McCrae’s scales on the NEO-PI-R (rs = .75). Validity evidence has been established through substantial convergent and divergent relations with other Big Five instruments and with peer ratings (John, Naumann & Soto, 2008).

**Demographic questionnaire.** A demographic questionnaire was used to gather demographic information from participants. Information obtained in this questionnaire included gender, age, race/ethnicity, marital status, family status, tenure status, rank
(instructor, assistant, associate, full), type of institution employed (public or private), type of counseling program (masters only or master and doctoral program) and years of experience (Appendix C).

**Data Collection Procedures**

This study utilized quantitative methodology for data collection and analysis. After the proposed study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ohio University, questionnaires were distributed via e-mail to faculty members who met the criteria for participation in this study. The online survey contained an introduction about the purpose and significance of the study, the estimated time for completion of questionnaires, a statement concerning anonymity and invitation for participation in the study. The survey also addressed informed consent and stated that no compensation would be provided for participation in this study.

The online survey was made available to participants through the use of Qualtrics Survey Software. This online survey software was provided through the Patton College of Education at Ohio University. Survey questions were presented to participants after the description of the study, the estimated completion time of 25 minutes, the invitation to participate in the study, and the statement of confidentiality. The survey included a demographic questionnaire, the MLQ-5X and the BFI. Follow up reminders were sent to participants who had not completed the survey every week over a three-week period informing them that the survey was open for completion. In order to ensure appropriate sample size, the survey was re-opened. A second sample was obtained and the survey was sent to this second group following the same procedures. Consistent with the first
sample group, follow up reminders were sent to participants of the second sample group who had not completed the survey every week over a three-week period informing them that the survey was open for completion.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

After response from participants had been collected, data was checked, scored and results were analyzed using SPSS. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS and the types of analysis employed were based on the research questions and hypotheses. The following describes the procedures the statistical analysis that were used to test the research hypotheses.

First, descriptive statistics and Cronbach Alpha coefficients were computed for each scale used in the study and factorial analysis were used for validity of the MLQ-5X. Next, a Transformational Leadership Variable (TL) and Transactional Leadership Variable (TXL) were created using leadership scales from the MLQ-5X.

**Transformational leadership variable.** A transformational leadership (TL) variable was created by adding the following scales on the MLQ-5X to determine each participant’s mean score: Idealized Attributes (IA), Idealized Behaviors, (IB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS) and Individual Consideration (IC). The creation of this variable was based on methods employed in previous studies examining the relationship between leadership styles and personality attributes (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). The TL variable was created by finding each participant’s mean score of the five scales that make up Transformational Leadership Style (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). Avolio and Bass (1990) recommend that
ratings for all transformational styles should be greater than 3.0. However, consistent with previous studies such as Blackburn (2001) and Frey et al. (2009), a cut-off score of 2.9 determined High Transformational Leadership (HTL) and Low Transformational Leadership (LTL). The High Transformational Leadership group consisted of individuals with a score greater than 2.9 and the Low Transformational Leadership group consisted of individuals with scores equal to or less than 2.9.

**Transactional leadership variable.** A transactional leadership (TXL) variable was created by averaging the following scales on the MLQ-5X to determine each participant’s mean score: Contingent Reward (CR), Management-by-Exception: Active (MEA), Management-by-Exception: Passive (MEP). The creation of this variable was based on methods employed in previous studies examining the relationship between leadership styles and personality attributes (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). The TXL variable was created by finding each participant’s mean score of the three scales that make up Transactional Leadership Style (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). Avolio and Bass (1990) recommend that ratings for all transformational leadership styles should be greater than 3.0. However, consistent with previous studies such as Blackburn (2001) and Frey et al. (2009), a cut-off score of 2.9 was used to determine High Transactional Leadership (HTXL) and Low Transactional Leadership (LTXL). The High Transactional Leadership group consisted of individuals with a score greater than 2.9 and the Low Transactional Leadership group consisted of individuals with scores equal to or less than 2.9.
Analysis of research questions. In order to determine the relationship between leadership style and personality attributes and gender and race the following null hypotheses were tested.

1. Are there personality attributes that accurately discriminate between individuals showing High Transformational Leadership (HTL) or Low Transformational Leadership (HTL)?

   Null Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between personality attributes and high or low transformational leadership styles.

   Appropriate assumptions were tested using Levene’s test to examine homogeneity of variance and the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality. Reliability and factorial validity for measures were checked. A discriminant analysis and a one-way MANOVA were utilized to compare the mean scores of the HTL group and the LTL group on the scales of personality attributes. This determined if there were statistically significant differences in personality attributes between the HTL group and the LTL group.

2. Are there personality attributes that accurately discriminate between individuals showing High Transactional Leadership or Low Transactional Leadership?

   Null Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between personality attributes and high or low transactional leadership styles.

   Appropriate assumptions were tested using Levene’s test to examine homogeneity of variance and the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality. Reliability and factorial validity for measures were checked. A discriminant analysis and a one-way MANOVA were utilized to compare the mean scores of the HTXL group and the LTXL group on the scales of
personality attributes. This determined if there were statistically significant differences in personality attributes between the HTXL group and the LTXL group.

3. Are there gender differences in personality attributes depending on whether individuals are high or low in transformational leadership style?

Null Hypothesis 3: There are no significant gender differences in personality attributes of high or low transformational leadership styles.

Appropriate assumptions were tested using Levene’s test to examine homogeneity of variance and the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality. A 2x2 MANOVA was utilized to determine whether there were gender differences in the personality attributes of high and low transformational leadership styles. Results from this analysis determined whether there were gender differences in personality attributes depending on high or low leadership style. Simple main effects for gender were not tested as part of this analysis because there was no interaction.

4. Are there gender differences in personality attributes depending on whether individuals are high or low in transactional leadership style?

Null Hypothesis 4: There are no significant gender differences in personality attributes of high or low transactional leadership styles.

Appropriate assumptions were tested using Levene’s test to examine homogeneity of variance and the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality. A 2x2 MANOVA was utilized to determine whether there are gender differences in the personality attributes of high and low transactional leadership styles. Results from this analysis determined whether there were gender differences in personality attributes depending on high or low leadership
style. Simple main effects for gender were tested as part of this analysis because there was no interaction.

5. Are there differences between women who identify as White and women who identify as non-White in personality attributes depending on whether they exhibit high or low transformational leadership style?

Null Hypothesis 5: There are no significant differences between women who identify as White and women who identify as non-White in personality attributes of high or low transformational leadership styles.

Appropriate assumptions were tested using Levene’s test to examine homogeneity of variance and the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality. A 2x2 MANOVA was employed to determine whether there were racial/ethnic differences in the personality attributes of high and low transformational leadership styles. Results from this analysis determined whether there were racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes based on high or low leadership style. Simple main effects for race/ethnicity were not investigated as part of this analysis because there was no interaction.

6. Are there differences between women who identify as White and women who identify as non-White in personality attributes depending on whether they exhibit high or low transactional leadership style?

Null Hypothesis 6: There are no significant differences between women who identify as White and women who identify as non-White in personality attributes of high or low transactional leadership styles.
This question was answered using only data from female participants. Appropriate assumptions were tested using Levene’s test to examine homogeneity of variance and the Shapiro-Wilk test for normality. A 2x2 MANOVA was employed to determine whether there were racial differences in the personality attributes of high and low transactional leadership styles. Results from this analysis determined whether there were racial differences in personality attributes based on high or low leadership style in females. Simple main effects for race/ethnicity were not investigated as part of this analysis because there was no interaction.

**Summary**

This chapter described the methodology employed to test the research questions. A description of procedures, operational definitions of the variables, population, sampling plan, and instrumentation utilized in this research design were provided, followed by a discussion of issues in reliability and validity. Finally data collection and data analysis were described in this chapter. The subsequent chapter will discuss the results of the study.
Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare personality attributes of counselor educators to further the understanding of characteristics most likely related to transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style. The focus of this study was whether there were significant gender and racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes of counselor educators who are characterized as transformational leaders. By conducting an exploratory study, this study focused on gender and race/ethnicity as it relates to personality attributes of leaders. This chapter describes the results and the supplementary analyses described in the previous chapter.

This chapter first presents preliminary analysis including the reliability and factor analysis of the MLQ-X instrument and the Big Five Inventory and additional descriptive data. Then it presents the demographic description of the research participants. Lastly it presents the results of null hypothesis tests and supplemental analyses.

Preliminary Analysis

In the preliminary analyses, the data-cleaning procedures to examine and deal with invalid or missing data were conducted. Also, the evaluation of assumptions for MANOVA and discriminant analysis were conducted and examined including reliability and a factorial analysis of the MLQ-X and Big Five instruments.

Data-cleaning procedures. Participants for this study were current faculty teaching in CACREP accredited counseling programs. Email requests were sent to 1577 subjects. After the data was collected, data cleaning procedures were conducted to screen for invalid or missing data from the sample. A total of 187 participants responded to the
email message. Four surveys were discarded due to missing data on Likert scale items from the Big Five Inventory. Additionally one response was eliminated as the responder taught in a Counseling Psychology program. As a result, responses from 182 participants of the 1577 (11.5%) invited to participate were included for statistical analysis in this study.

**Leadership variable procedures.** A transformational leadership (TL) variable was created by adding the following scales on the MLQ-5X to determine each participant’s mean score: Idealized Attributes (IA), Idealized Behaviors, (IB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS) and Individual Consideration (IC). The creation of this variable was based on methods employed in previous studies examining the relationship between leadership styles and personality attributes (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). The TL variable was created by finding each participant’s mean score of the five scales that make up Transformational Leadership Style (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). Avolio and Bass (1990) recommend that ratings for all transformational styles should be greater than 3.0. However, consistent with previous studies such as Blackburn (2001) and Frey et al. (2009), a cut-off score of 2.9 determined High Transformational Leadership (HTL) and Low Transformational Leadership (LTL). The High Transformational Leadership group consisted of individuals with a score greater than 2.9 and the Low Transformational Leadership group consisted of individuals with scores equal to or less than 2.9.

A transactional leadership (TXL) variable was created by averaging the following scales on the MLQ-5X to determine each participant’s mean score: Contingent Reward
The creation of this variable was based on methods employed in previous studies examining the relationship between leadership styles and personality attributes (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). The TXL variable was created by finding each participant’s mean score of the three scales that make up Transactional Leadership Style (Blackburn, 2001; Frey et al., 2009). Avolio and Bass (1990) recommend that ratings for all transformational leadership styles should be greater than 3.0. However, consistent with previous studies such as Blackburn (2001) and Frey et al. (2009), a cut-off score of 2.9 was used to determine High Transactional Leadership (HTXL) and Low Transactional Leadership (LTXL). The High Transactional Leadership group consisted of individuals with a score greater than 2.9 and the Low Transactional Leadership group consisted of individuals with scores equal to or less than 2.9.

**Reliability.** The reliability of the Big Five Inventory was tested for each of the BFI scales, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism. Cronbach Alpha coefficients above .8 suggest good reliability (Warner, 2007). Cronbach Alpha coefficients ranged from .73 to .88.

The scale Openness to Experience had a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of .80 indicating good reliability. The Agreeableness scale had a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of .73. When examining the mean, all participants were scoring high on this scale and there was not a lot of variation between standard deviations. The Conscientiousness scale had a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of .80 and the Extraversion scale was reported at .88
indicating good reliability for these two scales. Lastly, the Neuroticism scale had a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of .83.

The reliability of the seven outcome scales in the MLQ-5X were tested. Cronbach Alpha coefficients ranged from .54 to .76. The Idealized Attributes and Idealized Behaviors scales had Cronbach Alpha coefficients of .59 and .54 respectively indicating low reliability. Inspirational Motivation had a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of .76. Intellectual Stimulation had a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of .64 and Individual Consideration had .72. Lastly, Contingent Reward had a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of .59 and Management by Exception-Active had Cronbach Alpha coefficient of .75. Low levels of reliability on these scales may be low due to the fact that each scale consisted of only four items.

Table 1: Reliability of Instrument Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFI</td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealized Attribute</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealized Behavior</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management by Exception-Active</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Analysis.** Factor validity of the Big Five Inventory was tested. To test to see if it was an identity matrix, Bartlett’s test of Sphericity was analyzed and a significant p value was found (p < .000). This correlation matrix is not an identity matrix and
therefore variables are correlated with themselves and other items in that factor. The number of components to retain was determined by parallel analysis. Five components were retained, Extraversion, Neuroticism, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness and Openness to Experience.

Factor validity of each of the five subscales was tested. Each scale was verified to be uni-dimensional. Analysis of each scale indicated that there was a sufficient sample size to run the analysis. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) was .762 for Extraversion, .821 for Agreeableness, .838 for Conscientiousness, .841 for Neuroticism, and .782 for Openness to Experience. Each of these was greater than .6. To test to see if it was an identity matrix, Bartlett’s test of Sphericity was analyzed and a significant $p$ value was found for each of the five subscales ($p < .000$). Therefore these correlation matrices were not identity matrices and correlated with themselves and other items in that factor. The number of components to retain was determined by parallel analysis. Based on the following eigenvalues, each of the five subscales was working as a subscale to measure Extraversion (4.290), Agreeableness (3.082), Conscientiousness (3.725), Neuroticism (3.708), and Openness to Experience (4.057).

Factor validity of the MLQ-5X was tested. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy indicated that there was a sufficient sample size to run the analysis with a KMO of .811. Measures vary between 0 and 1. To test to see if it was an identity matrix, Bartlett’s test of Sphericity was analyzed and a significant $p$ value was found. Therefore this correlation matrix is not an identity matrix. The number of components to retain was determined by parallel analysis. Two components were retained at
eigenvalues of 6.751 and 2.692. Based on the rotated component matrix, the scales for
the characteristic Transformational Leadership (Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behaviors,
Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration) loaded
strongly on component one. Additionally, the scale Management by Exception-Active
for the characteristic Transactional Leadership loaded strongly on component two.

Factor validity of each of the seven subscales was tested. Analysis of each scale
indicated that there was a sufficient sample size to run the analysis. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin
Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) was .663 for Idealized Attributes, .650 for
Idealized Behaviors, .750 for Inspirational Motivation, .676 for Intellectual Stimulation,
.698 for Individual Consideration, and .748 for Management by Exception (Active).
Each of these was greater than .6. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy
(KMO) for Contingent Reward was .595, just slightly lower than the minimum .6. To
test to see if it was an identity matrix, Bartlett test of Sphericity was analyzed and a
significant $p$ value was found for each of the seven subscales. Therefore these correlation
matrices were not identity matrices. The number of components to retain was determined
by parallel analysis. It was determined that all four items for each of the seven subscales
were working as a subscale to measure Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behaviors,
Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individual Consideration, Contingent
Reward and Management by Exception (Active).

**Demographic Characteristics**

**Personal characteristics.** The demographic questionnaire included questions
about gender, age, race/ethnicity, and marital status. All participants responded to the
question regarding gender. As shown in Table 1, of the respondents, 60.4% were female and 39.6% were male. All participants responded to the question regarding age.

Regarding the question on race/ethnicity, 84.4% of respondents identified as White and 15.5% identified as a Person of Color. Two respondents did not answer this question.

Although the percentage of respondents who identified as a Person of Color is low, it is close to the current rates (18.4%) of racial/ethnically diverse faculty across the United States (NCES, 2012). According to table 4.1, participants in the age range of 55-63 made up approximately 30% of the participants, followed by 25% in the 45-54 age group and 23% in the 35-44 age group. Approximately 69% of the respondents reported being married or in a civil union.

Table 2: Personal characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-63</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64+</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person of Color</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or in a civil union</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried, living with a partner</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced, separated or widowed</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Institutional characteristics.** Additional questions included information on institutional demographics including type of institution employed (public or private), rank (instructor, assistant, associate, full), tenure status, ACES geographical region, type of counseling program (masters only or master and doctoral program) and years of experience. Of the 181 respondents who answered the question, 76.8% (N= 139) were employed at public universities. Additionally, all respondents answered the question regarding rank. The majority of participants 36.3% were at the rank of Assistant Professor, followed by 29.1% at the rank of Associate Professor and 27.5% at the rank of Full Professor. ACES geographical representation was as follows: North Atlantic (23.6%), North Central (18.7%), Southern (39%), Rocky Mountain (7.7%) and Western (11%). The majority of respondents came from Masters only programs (69.9%).
Table 3: Institutional demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure track, part time</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure track, full time</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure track</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACES region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Atlantic</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Programs</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters only</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters and Doctoral</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership characteristics.** Lastly, the demographic questionnaire gathered information on the leadership characteristics of counselor educators. This information included participation in leadership training within the institution (program, college and university) and within professional organizations (local, state, regional, and national).

According to table 4, within the academic institutions, participation in leadership training offered by the university was greatest with 41% of respondents participating. The lowest rate of participation was leadership training offered by counselor education programs with 36.1% of respondents participating. Within professional organizations, the largest participation was at the national level, with 57% of respondents participating in
leadership training provided by national organizations. The lowest rate of participation was within local organizations at 35.8%. Information on counselor educators’ service in leadership positions was also gathered. According to table 4.3, within the institutions, service in leadership positions was greatest within counselor education programs (81.7%). Within professional organizations, service in leadership positions was greatest in state professional organizations (53.1%).

Table 4: Leadership Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Leadership Program</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Leadership Local</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training within Professional Regional</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served in a Leadership Position College</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served a Leadership Position Local</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within Professional Organizations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testing the Research Questions and Null Hypotheses

In this section the results of the testing of each of the six research questions and associated null hypotheses outlined in Chapter One are presented.

Research question 1. *Are there personality attributes that discriminate between individuals showing High Transformational Leadership (HTL) or Low Transformational*
Leadership (HTL)? Question 1 examined if there were statistically significant differences in personality attributes between the HTL group and the LTL group. A discriminant analysis using both high and low transformational leadership groups (HTL & LTL) with personality attributes as the predictors and transformational leadership groups as the outcome determined whether personality attributes (Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Extraversion, and Neuroticism) predict high or low transformational leadership groups. Of the 182 total participants, 128 participants were identified as HTL and 54 were identified as LTL. As a result of uneven group sizes, the option of prior probabilities being from group size not equal size was selected for the analysis. As noted in Table 4.4, significant mean differences were observed for all predictors on the dependent variable. While the log determinants were quite similar, Box’s M indicated that the assumption of equality of covariance matrices was not violated. Box’s M is 29.588 with F =1.898 which is not significant at p < .019. All five personality attributes were significant predictors when considered individually. The discriminant analysis revealed an association between groups and all predictors, accounting for 30.3% of between group variability. Closer analysis of the structure matrix revealed that Agreeableness score (.682), Openness score (.586) and Extraversion score (.458) were more important predictors than Neuroticism and Conscientiousness. The cross validated classification showed that overall 77.5% were correctly classified. Canonical coefficient weights were 1.591 for Agreeableness, 1.077 for Openness, .479 for Extraversion, .303 for Conscientiousness, and .186 for Neuroticism.
Table 5: Test of Equality of Group Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>36.339</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>26.780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>16.375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>6.432</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>6.405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way MANOVA was utilized to compare the mean scores of the HTL group (N=128) and the LTL group (N=54) on the scales of personality attributes. The independent variable for this first research question was leadership style which was dichotomized into high transformational leadership (HTL) and low transformational leadership style (LTL). The dependent variables were the five scores from the measure of personality, The Big Five Inventory-(BFI). A one-way MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate main effect for leadership style, Wilks’ λ = .697, F (5, 176) = 15.268, p < .000. Box’s M indicated that the assumption of equality of covariance matrices was not violated. Box’s M is 29.588 with F = 1.898 which is not significant at p < .019. Given the significance of the overall test, the univariate main effects were examined. Significant univariate main effects for leadership style were obtained for each of the five personality variables, Extraversion scale score, F (1, 180) = 16.375, p < .000, Agreeableness scale score, F (1, 180) = 36.339, p < .000, Neuroticism scale score, F (1, 180) = 6.432, p < .012, Openness scale score, F (1, 180) = 26.780, p < .000, and Conscientiousness scale score, F (1, 180) = 6.405, p < .012. The Levene’s statistics for
the five dependent variables that had significant univariate ANOVAs indicated assumptions of equality of variance were not met for Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Extraversion, Neuroticism and Openness were all non-significant, meaning that the group variances were equal. Cohen’s effect size values suggest large effect size for Agreeableness (.978) and Openness (.840), moderate effect size for Extraversion (.655) and small to moderate effect size for Conscientiousness (.411) and Neuroticism (.411).

Table 6: Question 1: Descriptive Statistics of the Big Five Factor scores for Transformational Leadership Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Low TL</td>
<td>3.3472</td>
<td>.74355</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High TL</td>
<td>3.8511</td>
<td>.77717</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.7016</td>
<td>.79935</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Low TL</td>
<td>4.0229</td>
<td>.52627</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High TL</td>
<td>4.4462</td>
<td>.41324</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.3321</td>
<td>.49140</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Low TL</td>
<td>2.475</td>
<td>.74344</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High TL</td>
<td>2.1807</td>
<td>.70148</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.2679</td>
<td>.72473</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Low TL</td>
<td>3.7829</td>
<td>.59326</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High TL</td>
<td>4.2295</td>
<td>.50398</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.0970</td>
<td>.56844</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conscientiousness Scale</th>
<th>Low TL</th>
<th>.62544</th>
<th>54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High TL</td>
<td>4.3059</td>
<td>.49143</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.2408</td>
<td>.54231</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research question 2. Are there personality attributes that discriminate between individuals showing High Transactional Leadership or Low Transactional Leadership?**

Question 3 examined if there were statistically significant differences in personality attributes between the HTXL group and the LTXL group. A discriminant analysis using both high and low transactional leadership groups (HTXL & LTXL) with personality attributes as the predictors and transactional leadership groups as the outcome was used to determine whether personality attributes (Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Extraversion, and Neuroticism) predict high or low transactional leadership groups. Of the 182 total participants, 12 participants were identified as HTXL and 170 were identified as LTXL. As a result of uneven group sizes, the option of prior probabilities being from group size not equal size was selected for the analysis. As noted in Table 6, significant mean differences were observed for Openness to Experience and Extraversion as predictors on the dependent variable. The log determinants were similar and Box’s M indicated that the assumption of equality of covariance matrices was not violated. Box’s M is 22.34 with F = 1.232 which is not significant at $p < .240$. The discriminant function revealed a significant association between groups and all predictors, accounting for 10.4% of between group variability, although closer analysis of the structure matrix revealed Extraversion score (.677) and Openness to Experience score
(.577) were more important predictors than Neuroticism, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness. The cross validated classification showed that overall 93.4% were correctly classified. Canonical coefficient weights were for .923 for Extraversion, .899 for Openness, .612 for Neuroticism, .556 for Conscientiousness, and -.553 for Agreeableness.

Table 7: Question 2: Test of Equality of Group Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>6.948</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>9.547</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way MANOVA was utilized to compare the mean scores of the HTXL group (N = 12) and the LTXL group (N = 170) on the scales of personality attributes. The independent variable for the second research question was leadership style which was dichotomized into high transactional leadership (HTXL) and low transactional leadership style (LTXL). The dependent variables were the five scores from the measure of personality, The Big Five Inventory-(BFI). A one-way MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate main effect for leadership style, Wilks’ $\lambda = .896$, $F (5, 176) = 4.078, p < .002$. Box’s M indicated that the assumption of equality of covariance matrices was met. Box’s M is 22.340 with $F = 1.232$ which is not significant at $p < .240$. 
Given the significance of the overall test, the univariate main effects were examined.

Significant univariate main effects for leadership style were obtained for Extraversion and Openness personality variables, Extraversion scale score, $F(1, 180) = 9.547, p < .002$ and Openness scale score, $F(1, 180) = 6.948, p < .009$. The Levene’s statistics for the five dependent variables were all non-significant, meaning that the group variances were equal and assumptions were met. Cohen’s effect size values suggest large effect size for Extraversion (.923), moderate to large effect size for Openness (.785), and small to moderate effect size for Agreeableness (.280), Conscientiousness (.292), and Neuroticism (.312).

Table 8: Question 2: Descriptive Statistics of the Big Five Factor scores for Transactional Leadership Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Low TXL</td>
<td>3.6541</td>
<td>.79692</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High TXL</td>
<td>4.3750</td>
<td>.47673</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.7016</td>
<td>.79935</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Low TXL</td>
<td>4.3412</td>
<td>.49020</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High TXL</td>
<td>4.2037</td>
<td>.51211</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.3321</td>
<td>.49140</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Low TXL</td>
<td>2.2529</td>
<td>.72352</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High TXL</td>
<td>2.4792</td>
<td>.74015</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.2679</td>
<td>.72473</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Low TXL</th>
<th>High TXL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low TXL</td>
<td>4.0680</td>
<td>.56862</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High TXL</td>
<td>4.5083</td>
<td>.38954</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.0970</td>
<td>.56844</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conscientiousness Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low TXL</td>
<td>4.2303</td>
<td>.54794</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High TXL</td>
<td>4.3889</td>
<td>.44822</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.2408</td>
<td>.54231</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: TXL= Transactional Leadership*

**Research question 3.** *Are there gender differences in personality attributes depending on whether individuals are high or low in transformational leadership style?*

Question three examined whether there were gender differences in personality attributes depending on high or low leadership style. A factorial 2x2 MANOVA was utilized to determine whether there were gender differences in the personality attributes of high and low transformational leadership styles. Simple main effects for gender were not tested as part of this analysis because there was no interaction. The independent variables for question three were gender and leadership style which were dichotomized into high transformational leadership and low transformational leadership style. The dependent variables were the five scores from the measure of personality, The Big Five Inventory-3 (BFI). A one-way MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate main effect for transformational leadership style, Wilks’ $\lambda = .715$, $F (5, 174) = 13.896$, $p < .000$. However there was no significant main effect for gender Wilks’ $\lambda = .942$, $F (5, 174) = 2.138$, $p < .063$. Box’s M indicated that the assumption of equality of covariance...
matrices was violated. Box’s M is 71.510 with F = 1.486 which is significant at \( p < .019 \).
The Levene’s statistics for the five dependent variables were all non-significant, meaning that the group variances were equal and assumptions were met.

Table 9: Question 3: Descriptive Statistics of the Big Five Factor scores for Male and Female Transformational Leadership Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion Scale</td>
<td>Male Low TL</td>
<td>3.4844</td>
<td>.80784</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Low TL</td>
<td>3.2375</td>
<td>.68177</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.3472</td>
<td>.74355</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male High TL</td>
<td>3.6786</td>
<td>.77322</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female High TL</td>
<td>3.9547</td>
<td>.76572</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.8511</td>
<td>.77717</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness Scale</td>
<td>Male Low TL</td>
<td>3.9728</td>
<td>.50803</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Low TL</td>
<td>4.0630</td>
<td>.54565</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.0229</td>
<td>.52627</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male High TL</td>
<td>4.3927</td>
<td>.38292</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female High TL</td>
<td>4.5045</td>
<td>.42724</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.4626</td>
<td>.41324</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism Scale</td>
<td>Male Low TL</td>
<td>2.3594</td>
<td>.75390</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Low TL</td>
<td>2.5667</td>
<td>.73456</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.4745</td>
<td>.74344</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male High TL</td>
<td>2.2578</td>
<td>.72218</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female High TL</td>
<td>2.1344</td>
<td>.68920</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.1807</td>
<td>.70148</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Male Low TL</th>
<th>Female Low TL</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male High TL</th>
<th>Female High TL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness Scale</td>
<td>3.9681</td>
<td>3.6348</td>
<td>3.7829</td>
<td>4.2245</td>
<td>4.2325</td>
<td>4.2295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.53310</td>
<td>.60563</td>
<td>.59326</td>
<td>.50907</td>
<td>.50410</td>
<td>.50398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness Scale</td>
<td>3.9676</td>
<td>4.1815</td>
<td>4.0864</td>
<td>4.2222</td>
<td>4.3561</td>
<td>4.3059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.64413</td>
<td>.60400</td>
<td>.62544</td>
<td>.51914</td>
<td>.47021</td>
<td>.49143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* TL = Transformational Leadership

**Research question 4.** *Are there gender differences in personality attributes depending on whether individuals are high or low in transactional leadership style?*

Question four examined whether there were gender differences in personality attributes depending on high or low transactional leadership style. A factorial 2x2 MANOVA was utilized to determine whether there were gender differences in the personality attributes of high and low transactional leadership styles. Simple main effects for gender were not tested as part of this analysis because there was no interaction. The independent variables for question four were gender and leadership style which were dichotomized into high transactional leadership and low transactional leadership style. The dependent
variables were the five scores from the measure of personality, The Big Five Inventory-3 (BFI). A one-way MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate main effect for transactional leadership style, Wilks’ $\lambda = .917$, $F (5, 174) = 3.154$, $p < .009$. However there was no significant main effect for gender Wilks’ $\lambda = .975$, $F (5, 174) = .896$, $p < .485$. Box’s M indicated that the assumption of equality of covariance matrices was met. Box’s M is 38.599 with $F = 1.068$ which is not significant at $p < .368$. The Levene’s statistics for the five dependent variables were all non-significant, meaning that the group variances were equal and assumptions were met.

Table 10: Question 4: Descriptive Statistics of the Big Five Factor scores for Male and Female Transactional Leadership Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Male Low TXL</td>
<td>3.5783</td>
<td>.79111</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Low TXL</td>
<td>3.7047</td>
<td>.80064</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.6541</td>
<td>.79692</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male High TXL</td>
<td>4.2188</td>
<td>.27717</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female High TXL</td>
<td>4.4531</td>
<td>.55072</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.3750</td>
<td>.47673</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Male Low TXL</td>
<td>4.2512</td>
<td>.45798</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Low TXL</td>
<td>4.4011</td>
<td>.50386</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.3412</td>
<td>.49020</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male High TXL</td>
<td>4.2778</td>
<td>.72860</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female High TXL</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
<td>.42414</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.2037</td>
<td>.51211</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Male Low TXL</th>
<th>Female Low TXL</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male High TXL</th>
<th>Female High TXL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism Scale</td>
<td>2.2941</td>
<td>2.2255</td>
<td>2.2529</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>2.5938</td>
<td>2.4792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.73738</td>
<td>.71646</td>
<td>.72352</td>
<td>.66144</td>
<td>.79268</td>
<td>.74015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness Scale</td>
<td>4.1134</td>
<td>4.0377</td>
<td>4.0680</td>
<td>4.5750</td>
<td>4.4750</td>
<td>4.5083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.52854</td>
<td>.59447</td>
<td>.56862</td>
<td>.28723</td>
<td>.44641</td>
<td>.38954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness Scale</td>
<td>4.1356</td>
<td>4.2934</td>
<td>4.2303</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>4.3889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.58191</td>
<td>.51739</td>
<td>.54794</td>
<td>.43033</td>
<td>.44046</td>
<td>.44822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TXL = Transactional Leadership

**Research question 5. Are there differences between women who identify as White and women who identify as persons of color in personality attributes depending on whether they exhibit high or low transformational leadership style?**

Question five examined whether there were racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes depending
on high or low transformational leadership style. A factorial 2x2 MANOVA was utilized to determine whether there were racial/ethnic differences in the personality attributes of high and low transformational leadership styles. Simple main effects for gender were not tested as part of this analysis because there was no interaction. The independent variables for question six were race and leadership style which were dichotomized into high transformational leadership and low transformational leadership style. The dependent variables were the five scores from the measure of personality, The Big Five Inventory-3 (BFI). A one-way MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate main effect for transformational leadership style, Wilks’ $\lambda = .709$, $F (5, 100) = 8.222$, $p < .000$. However there was no significant main effect for race Wilks’ $\lambda = .940$, $F (5, 100) = 1.276$, $p < .280$. Box’s M indicated that the assumption of equality of covariance matrices was met. Box’s M is 41.216 with F = 1.246 which is not significant at $p < .167$. The Levene’s statistics for the five dependent variables were all non-significant, meaning that the group variances were equal and assumptions were met.

Table 11: Question 5: Descriptive Statistics of the Big Five Factor scores for White and Persons of Color Transformational Leadership Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion Scale</td>
<td>White Low TL</td>
<td>3.2731</td>
<td>.68293</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC Low TL</td>
<td>2.9167</td>
<td>.71078</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.2375</td>
<td>.68177</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White High TL</td>
<td>3.9873</td>
<td>.77428</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>White Low TL</th>
<th>.75585</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC Low TL</td>
<td>.14434</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.73456</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White High TL</td>
<td>.66906</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC High TL</td>
<td>.62485</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.65457</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness Scale</td>
<td>White Low TL</td>
<td>.58018</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC Low TL</td>
<td>.72342</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.60563</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White High TL</td>
<td>.52983</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC High TL</td>
<td>.42150</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.50409</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness Scale</td>
<td>White Low TL</td>
<td>.63030</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC Low TL</td>
<td>.33945</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.60400</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>POC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White High TL</td>
<td>4.3792</td>
<td>.42787</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC High TL</td>
<td>4.3158</td>
<td>.60322</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.3638</strong></td>
<td><strong>.47298</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* TL = Transformational Leadership  
POC = Person of Color

**Research question 6.** *Are there differences between women who identify as White and women who identify as persons of color in personality attributes depending on whether they exhibit high or low transactional leadership style?*

Question six examined whether there were racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes depending on high or low transactional leadership style. A factorial 2x2 MANOVA was utilized to determine whether there were racial/ethnic differences in the personality attributes of high and low transactional leadership styles. Simple main effects for gender were not tested as part of this analysis because there was no interaction. The independent variables for question six were race and leadership style which were dichotomized into high transactional leadership and low transactional leadership style. The dependent variables were the five scores from the measure of personality, The Big Five Inventory-3 (BFI). A one-way MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate main effect for transformational leadership style, Wilks’ $\lambda = .861$, $F(5, 100) = 3.233$, $p < .010$.

However there was no significant main effect for race Wilks’ $\lambda = .965$, $F(5, 100) = .731$, $p < .602$. Box’s M indicated that the assumption of equality of covariance matrices was met. Box’s M is 6.364 with $F = .379$ which is not significant at $p < .984$. The Levene’s statistics for the five dependent variables were all non-significant, meaning that the group variances were equal and assumptions were met.
Table 12: Question 6: Descriptive Statistics of the Big Five Factor scores for White and Persons of Color Transformational Leadership Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>White Low TXL</td>
<td>3.733</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC Low TXL</td>
<td>3.553</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.699</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White High TXL</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC High TXL</td>
<td>4.792</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.453</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>White Low TXL</td>
<td>4.389</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC Low TXL</td>
<td>4.433</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.397</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White High TXL</td>
<td>4.111</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC High TXL</td>
<td>4.259</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>White Low TXL</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC Low TXL</td>
<td>2.283</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.206</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White High TXL</td>
<td>2.975</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC High TXL</td>
<td>1.958</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.594</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>White Low TXL</td>
<td>4.019</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POC Low TXL</td>
<td>4.089</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.032</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White High TXL</th>
<th>POC High TXL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5200</td>
<td>.55408</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4000</td>
<td>.26458</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4750</td>
<td>.44641</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Low TXL</th>
<th>POC Low TXL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness Scale</td>
<td>4.3146</td>
<td>.51308</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2281</td>
<td>.56227</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2982</td>
<td>.52093</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3111</td>
<td>.41126</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8148</td>
<td>.32075</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>.44046</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: TXL = Transactional Leadership  
POC = Person of Color

Summary

This chapter described the preliminary analysis including the reliability and factor analysis of the MLQ-X instrument and the Big Five Inventory and additional descriptive data. It also presented the demographic description of the research participants. Lastly it presented the results of null hypothesis tests and supplemental analyses. Results of the study indicated a significant relationship between personality attributes and transformational and transactional leadership styles. Results also indicated that a low score in Neuroticism and high scores in Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness distinguished Transformational leaders. Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Openness to Experience were the strongest predictors of a Transformational leadership Style. Extraversion and Openness to Experience were also predictive of a Transactional Leadership style. Additionally, findings indicated that
high scores in Extraversion and Openness to Experience distinguished Transactional leaders. Contrary to other studies, no gender differences were found in the personality attributes of Transformational or Transactional leaders. Lastly, no racial differences were found in the personality attributes of Transformational or Transactional leaders. The next chapter will present a discussion of these findings in addition to theoretical and practical implications.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

In the preceding chapter, the results of data analyses for the research questions were presented and reported. This chapter presents a summary of the study, discussion of the findings, theoretical and research implications, limitations and recommendations for future research, as well as conclusions. The concluding sections aim to expand on the findings in this study to provide a further understanding of gender and race/ethnicity as it relates to personality attributes of leaders. Theoretical and clinical implications, limitations of this study, as well as recommendations for future research on personality and leadership are presented and discussed.

Summary of the Study

This study examined and compared the personality attributes of counselor educators in an effort to further the understanding of characteristics most likely related to transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style. The purpose of this study was whether there were personality differences between high and low transformational and transactional leaders and if there were significant gender and racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes of counselor educators who are characterized as transformational and transactional leaders. By conducting an exploratory study, this study focused on gender and race/ethnicity as it relates to personality attributes of leaders.

Participants were asked to self-report on established measures of personality and leadership style as well as complete a demographic questionnaire. The demographic
questionnaire included information regarding gender, age, race/ethnicity, marital status, family status, tenure status, rank (instructor, assistant, associate, full), type of institution employed (public or private), type of counseling program (master’s only or master and doctoral program) and years of experience. The first instrument, the Multifactorial Leadership Questionnaire, (MLQ-5X), was used to measure participants’ perceptions of leadership behavior. This study focused on the behaviors based on the major leadership constructs of Transformational leadership and Transactional Leadership. This study examined seven of the nine leadership outcomes: Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behaviors, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Reward, and Management-by-Exception: Active. The second instrument, the Big Five Inventory (BFI), provided a comprehensive measure of the five domains of personality based on the Big Five Personality Model. The five major domains of personality were Neuroticism (N), Extraversion (E), Openness to Experience (O), Agreeableness (A), and Conscientiousness (C).

A stratified random sampling was employed to ensure that each of the five strata for geography, North Atlantic, North Central, Southern, Rocky Mountain and Western, were represented. The accessible population for this study was faculty members from CACREP accredited counselor education programs. A final sample of 182 counselor educators provided the data for this study.

In order to analyze the research questions, leadership variables were created. Based on prior methods employed by Frey et al. (2009) and Blackburn (2001), a transformational leadership (TL) variable was created by adding the following scales on
the MLQ-5X to determine each participant’s mean score: Idealized Attributes (IA), Idealized Behaviors, (IB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS) and Individual Consideration (IC). A transactional leadership (TXL) variable was created by averaging the following scales on the MLQ-5X to determine each participant’s mean score: Contingent Reward (CR), Management-by-Exception: Active (MEA), Management-by-Exception: Passive (MEP). A cut-off score of 2.9 was used to determine High Transformational Leadership (HTL) and Low Transformational Leadership (LTL), High Transactional Leadership (HTXL), and Low Transactional Leadership (LTXL).

Question one was answered using the results from discriminant analysis. Question 1 was tested using a discriminant function analysis to determine whether personality attributes predict high or low transformational leadership groups. Additionally, a one-way MANOVA was utilized to compare the mean scores of the HTL group and the LTL group on the scales of personality attributes to determine if there were statistically significant differences in personality attributes between the HTL group and the LTL group. Question 2 was also tested using a discriminant function analysis in order to determine whether personality attributes predict high or low transactional leadership groups. For question two, mean scores of the HTXL group and the LTXL group on the scales of personality attributes were compared to determine if there are statistically significant differences in personality attributes between the HTXL group and the LTXL group.

Question three and four examined whether there were gender differences in leadership styles. Question three used a 2x2 MANOVA to determine whether there were
gender differences in personality attributes depending on high or low transformational leadership styles. Question four utilized a 2x2 MANOVA to determine whether there are gender differences in the personality attributes of high and low transactional leadership styles.

Questions five and six examined whether there were racial differences in leadership styles. Question five used a 2x2 MANOVA to determine whether there were racial/ethnic differences in the personality attributes based on high and low transformational leadership styles. Question six employed a 2x2 MANOVA to determine whether there were racial differences in personality attributes based on high or low transactional leadership styles in counselor educators.

**Discussion of the Findings**

As mentioned previously, the purpose of this study was to examine and compare personality attributes of counselor educators to further the understanding of characteristics most likely related to transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style. This section discusses the implications of the findings for the six research questions.

**Research question 1. Are there personality attributes that accurately discriminate between individuals showing High Transformational Leadership (HTL) or Low Transformational Leadership (HTL)?** The first question examined the relationship between personality attributes and transformational leadership outcomes. A discriminant analysis indicated that all five personality attributes were predictors of transformational leadership and identified Extraversion, Agreeableness and Openness to Experience as
more important discriminators in classifying individuals into one of the two transformational leadership groups. Those individuals with elevated Extraversion, Agreeableness or Openness to Experience scores were more likely to be classified as having a Transformational Leadership Style and those with lower scores were more likely to be classified as not having a Transformational Leadership Style.

The relationship between personality and transformational leadership has been soundly established in prior studies in business and the military (Blackburn, 2001; Church & Waclawski, 1998; Frey, Snow, & Curlette, 2009; Gentry & Sparks, 2012; Hautala, 2006). Furthermore, the significant relationship between transformational leadership and the personality attributes Extraversion, Agreeableness and Openness to Experience, Neuroticism and Conscientiousness are consistent with the findings of a military study focusing on the Big Five Factors of personality. The study of military leaders found that transformational leaders rated significantly higher in personality attributes such as Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (Johnson & Hill, 2009). This current study, like Johnson and Hill (2009) found that Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience were predictors of Transformational Leadership. This consistency across studies suggests Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness may be personality attributes that are characteristic of transformational leaders across varying professions. Based on these findings, counselor educators who are characterized as transformational leaders have personality attributes that can be described as action oriented, imaginative, and cooperative.
Question one examined if there were statistically significant differences in personality attributes between the HTL group and the LTL group. Analysis indicated that there were significant main effects in the personality attributes of the HTL group and LTL group for all five of the personality dimensions. Individuals in the High Transformational Leadership group scored higher in the scales Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Agreeableness than individuals in the Low Transformational Leadership Group. Those in the HTL group were significantly lower on the Neuroticism scale score than individuals in the Low Transformational Leadership Group.

As noted previously, the study by Johnson and Hill (2009) examined military leaders and found an inverse relationship between transformational leadership and Neuroticism. Based on the Neuroticism scale which rates emotional stability and the ability to cope with stressors, transformational leaders rated low on the Neuroticism scale and were thus more emotionally stable. Transformational leaders also scored significantly higher in personality attributes such as Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (Johnson & Hill, 2009). Findings from this study appear to further support the results of Johnson and Hill (2009). These results suggest that high scores in Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness and Low scores on Neuroticism appear to characterize a Transformational Leadership style.

Transformational leaders have been described as open to diversity (Bass, 1999). They can “envision a culturally competent organization” and “use intellectual stimulation
to encourage new ways of dealing with increasing diversity of their followers and [are] empathetic with their followers’ different needs” (Bass, p.18). The fact that individuals who are high in transformational leadership style exhibit stronger qualities of Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness makes sense given this description. High ratings on the Extraversion scale indicate stronger tendencies toward social behaviors. These personal qualities may be beneficial to transformational leadership who according to transformational leadership theory are often described as moving followers beyond immediate self-interests, elevating followers’ maturity, and increasing concerns for achievement, self-actualization and the well-being of others (Bass, 1999). High scores on the Openness to Experience scale indicate nonconformity, autonomy and someone who is imaginative. These qualities are consistent with a transformational leader who is able to adapts to diversity, encourages intellectual stimulation, and encourage new ways of thinking (Bass, 1999). Agreeableness describes an individual who is cooperative and tolerant, and Conscientiousness can be described as self-disciplined, thorough, and having a need for achievement. Again, these qualities align with the behaviors of transformational leaders who inspire confidence in a vision and are sensitive to the needs of their followers.

**Research question 2.** *Are there personality attributes that accurately discriminate between individuals showing High Transactional Leadership or Low Transactional Leadership?* Question 2 examined the relationship between personality attributes and transactional leadership outcomes. A discriminant analysis identified Extraversion and Openness to Experience as important discriminators in classifying
individuals into one of the two groups. Those individuals with elevated Extraversion or Openness to Experience scores were more likely to be classified as having a Transactional Leadership Style and those with lower scores were more likely to be classified as not having a Transactional Leadership Style.

Although prior research has examined the relationship between personality and transformational leadership (Blackburn, 2001; Church & Waclawski, 1998; Frey, Snow, & Curlette, 2009; Gentry & Sparks, 2012; Hautala, 2006), little attention has been paid to the relationship between personality attributes and transactional leadership outcomes. The findings from this study indicate that similar to findings on Transformational Leadership style, Extraversion and Openness to Experience are qualities of individuals identified as having Transactional Leadership style.

Question 2 examined if there were statistically significant differences in personality attributes between the HTXL group and the LTXL group. Analysis indicated that there were significant main effects in the personality attributes of the HTL group and LTL group for two of the personality dimensions. Individuals in the High Transactional Leadership group scored higher than individuals in the Low Transactional Leadership on the Extraversion and Openness to Experience scale.

The results of question two extends current literature on the relationship between personality and leadership styles. As mentioned previously, current literature has focused on the relationship between personality attributes and transformational leadership styles. The findings from this study indicate that specific personality attributes, Extraversion and Openness to Experience distinguish a High Transactional Leadership style from a Low
Transactional Leadership style. Interestingly, the mean scores for Extraversion and Openness to Experience scales were actually higher for the High Transactional Leadership group (Extraversion, $M = 4.3$ and Openness to Experience, $M = 4.5$) than the mean score for the High Transformational Leadership group (Extraversion, $M = 3.8$ and Openness to Experience, $M = 4.2$). These findings should however be viewed with caution given the small sample size of High Transactional Leadership group ($N = 12$).

**Research question 3. Are there gender differences in personality attributes depending on whether individuals are high or low in transformational leadership style?**

Question three examined whether there were gender differences in personality attributes depending on high or low transformational leadership style. Analysis indicated that there were no gender differences in personality attributes of high or low transformational leadership styles.

These findings contradict the findings of previous studies on gender differences in personality (Feingold, 1994; Terraciano & McCrae, 2001; Saarnio, 2010; Zheng & Zheng, 2011). A meta-analysis conducted by Feingold (1994) indicted that men were more assertive and had slightly higher self-esteem than women. Additionally, women were found to have higher levels of Extraversion, anxiety, trust, and nurturance. Costa et al. (2001) found that women consistently scored higher on facets of Neuroticism and Agreeableness.

Results from this study are however similar to findings reported by Saarnio (2010). Saarnio (2010) investigated whether gender differences occur in Big Five personality traits or interpersonal functioning among substance abuse therapists in
Finland and compared this to findings of gender differences in the general population. An examination of substance abuse therapists found gender differences only for one personality attribute, Openness to Experience. Women scored significantly higher than men. These results differed greatly from results of the general population in which women scored higher on all personality attributes (Saarnio, 2010). Similar to Saarnio’s (2010) findings, this study found no gender differences in the personality attributes of counselor educators. Qualities such as empathy, support, a collaborative working alliance between counselor and client, and openness to diversity are recognized as critical for client outcomes and are strongly emphasized in the counseling profession. The majority of participants (79.5%) had been in counselor education for five or more years. The years of experience in counseling and counselor education and the specific personality attributes emphasized in the work performance of counselors may have contributed to a pool of participants with similar personal qualities due to the nature of their profession.

**Research question 4.** Are there gender differences in personality attributes depending on whether individuals are high or low in transactional leadership style?

Question four examined whether there were gender differences in personality attributes depending on high or low leadership style. Analysis indicated that there were no gender differences in personality attributes of high or low transactional leadership styles.

As highlighted in the findings of question four, counselor educators, given the nature of their profession and their training, may demonstrate less gender differences in personality attributes compared to other populations. As previously mentioned, qualities
such as empathy, support, a collaborative working alliance between counselor and client, and openness to diversity are recognized as critical for client outcomes and are strongly emphasized in the counseling profession. This may account for the lack of differences in personality attributes among counselor educators. Given their years of experience in the profession, these personal qualities may be strongly engrained in their methods for interacting with both students and clients. Additionally, these qualities are contradictory to the definition of transactional leadership which refers to the exchange of relationship between leader and follower to meet one’s own self-interest (Bass, 1999). This may account for the low numbers found in the High Transactional Leadership (N = 12) and the high numbers found in the Low Transactional Leadership group (N = 112).

**Research question 5.** *Are there racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes depending on whether individuals are high or low in transformational leadership style?*

Question five examined whether there were racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes depending on high or low leadership style. Analysis indicated that there were no racial differences in personality attributes of high or low transformational leadership styles.

These findings support the results of a meta-analysis conducted by Foldes et al. (2008) that examined racial differences across the Big Five personality factors and facets. Findings from the meta-analysis suggested that racial group differences were relatively small (Foldes et al., 2008). Given the relatively low number of racially diverse participants in this study (N = 28), the results from question five should be viewed with caution.
Research question 6. Are there racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes depending on whether individuals are high or low in transactional leadership style?

Question six examined whether there were racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes depending on high or low leadership style. Analysis indicated that there were no racial differences in personality attributes of high or low transactional leadership styles.

Once more, these findings support the results of a meta-analysis conducted by Foldes et al. (2008) which suggested that racial group differences were relatively small (Foldes et al., 2008). Again, given the relatively low number of racially diverse participants in this study (N=28), the results from question six should be viewed with caution.

Implications

Findings in this study can augment current literature on personality and leadership style. They can also provide important implications for theory and practice. The following section will discuss possible ways the current study clarifies or extends the theoretical understanding of the relationship between personality and leadership style.

Theoretical implications. The significant relationship between transformational leadership and the personality attributes Extraversion, Agreeableness and Openness to Experience were similar to the findings of a military study focusing on the Big Five Factors of personality. The study of military leaders found that transformational leaders rated significantly higher on personality attributes such as Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (Johnson & Hill, 2009). This
consistency across studies suggests that these personality attributes are critical for leaders across varying professions. Additionally, differences may suggest that slight differences in personality attributes may exist among leaders across professions. Future research may wish to explore how the personality attributes of individuals categorized as transformational leaders compare and contrast across different career fields.

Although the relationship between personality and transformational leadership has been studies in both the military and business sector (Blackburn, 2001; Church & Waclawski, 1998; Frey, Snow, & Curlette, 2009; Gentry & Sparks, 2012; Hautala, 2006), little attention has been paid to the relationship between personality attributes and transactional leadership outcomes. Results from this study indicate that similar to Transformational Leadership style, Extraversion and Openness to Experience are also qualities that distinguish Transactional Leadership style. Leadership development programs may wish to utilize programs that develop these characteristics in leaders. Due to the small sample size of high transactional leaders these findings must be viewed with caution. However this suggests that characteristics such as social behaviors and autonomy may be important to the mutual exchanges that occur between transactional leaders and their followers. Future research may wish to explore the personality attributes that differentiate a Transformational Leadership style from Transactional Leadership style.

Findings from this study indicated that individuals in the High Transformational Leadership group scored higher in the scales Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Agreeableness than individuals in the Low Transformational
Leadership group. Those in the HTL group scored significantly lower on the Neuroticism scale score than individuals in the Low Transformational Leadership Group. These findings support the findings of Johnson and Hill (2009). However, Extraversion and Openness to Experience were also qualities that distinguished a High Transactional Leadership style from a Low Transactional Leadership style. Mean scores for Extraversion and Openness to Experience scales were actually higher for the High Transactional Leadership group (Extraversion, $M = 4.3$ and Openness to Experience, $M = 4.5$) than the mean score for the High Transformational Leadership group (Extraversion, $M = 3.8$ and Openness to Experience, $M = 4.2$). Additional research in this area is needed to determine if these differences are consistent across Transformational and Transactional leaders.

This study did not find gender differences in the personality attributes of counselor educators characterized as transformational or transactional leaders. These findings are similar to Saarnio’s (2010) findings, which found only one significant difference related to scores on Extraversion. Saarnio’s examination of therapists differed greatly from results of the general population in which women scored higher in all personality attributes (2010). This suggests that those in the mental health profession may share similar personality attributes. Personality attributes such as Openness to Experience and Conscientiousness have been found to be related with successful work performance of those in the helping profession including, nurses, psychologists and counselors (Grehan, 2011; Riggio 2000; Thompson, 2002). Counselors who were more open to different experiences were more comfortable working with a wider variety of
populations (Thompson, 2002). Specific personal attributes such as Conscientiousness were strongly correlated to successful internship performance among school psychology students (Grehan, 2011). The majority of counseling theories emphasize the importance of the counselor-client relationship (Glauser, 2001). The counseling relationship is embedded in respect for clients, genuineness of the counselor and an empathetic stand that promotes the counseling relationship (Glauser, 2001). Given that specific personality attributes are related to work performance in helping professions such as counseling, these common personality attributes may have been observed in this current study. Additional research examining the personality attributes of counselor educators is needed to support this idea.

The current study indicated that there were no racial/ethnic differences in women who identified as White and women who identified as a Person of Color in personality attributes based on leadership style. These findings support the results of a meta-analysis conducted by Foldes et al. (2008) that examined racial differences across the Big Five personality factors and facets. Findings from the meta-analysis suggested that racial group differences were relatively small (Foldes et al., 2008). Given the relatively low number of racially diverse participants in this study (N = 28), the results from question six should be viewed with caution.

Personality development has been defined as the emotional and psychological factors that influence how individuals relate to one another. Bio-psychosocial factors have all been suggested as interacting factors in the development of personality. As a result, both similarities and differences in personality may explain the differences in how
individuals relate to one another. The Big Five Factors theory was developed in an attempt to describe the dimensions of personality that describe human behavior. However, current research on personality attributes has suggested that there may be relatively little difference among racial/ethnic groups. Most of these studies, this current study included, have had relatively low samples of racially/ethnically diverse participants. Additional research should focus on obtaining a significant sample size of racially and ethnically diverse leaders in order to determine if these comparisons are accurate.

**Practical implications.** Based on the aforementioned, findings in this study can further inform counselor education programs. These results may aid counselor educators in developing counseling departments and educational programs that can effectively identify, encourage, and develop transformational leadership characteristics in counselor education faculty and doctoral students. Given the relatively lower numbers of females and racially and ethnically diverse females in leadership positions among counselor educators and counseling students, special attention could be given to developing personality attributes linked to transformational leadership.

These findings suggest that counselor educators who are transformational share similar personality attributes. Counselor educators who are characterized as transformational leaders were identified as scoring higher in Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness to Experience and Extraversion and low in Neuroticism. Openness to Experience is described as unconventional, curious and open to new ways of thinking. Conscientiousness is described as determined, punctual and achievement-
oriented. Extraversion can be described as enthusiastic, action-oriented, energetic and social. Agreeableness describes those who are compassionate, optimistic and cooperative. They place value on getting along with others and compromising their interests for the benefit of others. Lastly, Neuroticism describes low emotional stability. Individuals who score high in this tend to be more emotionally stable and able to respond to daily stressors. Personality attributes such as Openness to Experience and Conscientiousness have been found to be related with successful work performance of those in the helping profession including, nurses, psychologists and counselors (Grehan, 2011; Riggio 2000; Thompson, 2002). Counselors who were more open to different experiences were more comfortable working with a wider variety of populations (Thompson, 2002).

The counseling relationship is embedded in respect for clients, genuineness of the counselor and an empathetic stand that promotes the counseling relationship (Glauser, 2001). Personal qualities such as empathy, support, a collaborative working alliance between counselor and client, and openness to diversity are often recognized as critical for positive client outcomes. These qualities are similar to the qualities described in the scales of Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness to Experience and Extraversion. Counselor educators who were identified as transformational leaders were also more emotionally stable, a quality critical for counselors dealing with the emotional and psychological needs of clients.

In order to promote and cultivate the next generation of transformational leaders, counselor education programs and counselor educators may benefit from nurturing the
very qualities that are critical to a successful therapeutic relationship. Assessments such as the Big Five Inventory can be used to measure the personality traits of counselor educators in order to provide them with a deeper understanding of self. Assessments such as this are a popular method to assess non-clinical populations and have been used in both business and industry to help employees understand why they as individuals respond the way they do and have also been used in job decisions and career counseling (Neukrug & Fawcett, 2010). In addition to helping both counselor educators and counselor educators in training gain insight into their personality traits through the use of assessments, programs might consider providing mentorship opportunities for potential leaders. Such types of activities could be easily incorporated into leadership courses at the doctoral level.

Martin, Oades and Caputi (2012) have found that Big Five personality traits can change in individuals in response to life experiences, as people move between different social settings and through coaching interventions. Female counselor educators and racially and ethnically diverse female counselor educators may therefore benefit from mentorship experiences that help them develop the Big Five personality traits that are predictive of transformational leaders. In developing such personality traits, mentors can choose to focus on the interactional style of their mentees. Lastly, counseling departments can nurture the personality traits of future Transformational leaders by providing leadership courses and workshops that provide experiential learning opportunities that promote personal development and awareness of impact on self on others.
The findings from this study suggest that there were no gender or racial differences in the personality attributes of counselor educators who are identified as transformational leaders. As a result, counselor education programs can focus on developing the previously identified Big Five personality qualities in all potential leaders, regardless of race or gender. If there are no differences, counselor education programs might want to examine why there are relatively few ethnically and racially diverse faculty in leadership positions. Universities, counselor education programs and counseling professional organizations may wish to evaluate how racially and ethnically diverse female counselor educators are recruited and whether there are systemic barriers in place that discourage these transformational leaders from assuming formal leadership roles. The personality attributes of transformational leaders in counselor education are similar to the qualities that are promoted as essential qualities in counselors for developing a good therapeutic alliance. Counselor educators may wish to actively recruit and mentor racially and ethnically diverse counseling students who show strong counseling skills early on, in pursuing an advanced degree in counselor education and ultimately moving into the role of a leader within the profession.

**Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research**

Findings from this study must be considered in light of limitations when interpreting the findings and applying implications to practice and future research. The first limitation was that all assessments were self-report and therefore respondents may have answered questions in a way that would be viewed favorably by others. Future researchers could consider having leadership attributes of doctoral students and faculty
rated by those they lead as well as those that supervise them. These types of 360 degree studies on leadership are conducted in the field of business. Secondly, the relatively lower number of racial and ethnically diverse respondents made meaningful comparisons difficult. Of the 182 participants only 28 (15.6%) were categorized as a Person of Color. This is less than current statistics on the race/ethnicity of academic institutions which stand at 18.4%. Given these low numbers, the results of questions regarding racial/ethnic differences should be viewed with caution. Future researchers could consider utilizing qualitative methodology to better focus on leadership and personality attributes in faculty and doctoral students of color. More purposeful sampling of faculty and doctoral students of color could be employed in future quantitative and qualitative research. The third limitation was a less than ideal sample size. The sample size determined necessary for adequate power was approximately 200 participants. This goal was not met due to low response rates (11.5%). A larger sample might have permitted sub-grouping of race and gender in questions three through six. Future researchers may wish to utilize methodology other than email surveys to study this topic.

As demographics in academia continue to change, particularly within the field of counselor education (American Counseling Association, 2012; Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, 2012; NCES, 2012), future researchers may wish to focus on female counselor educators and racially/ethnically diverse counselor educators. Researchers might also consider examining the personality and leadership attributes of counselor education students. A comparison of the personality and leadership attributes of doctoral and master’s students may provide insight into the characteristics of those
who choose to pursue a terminal degree. Researchers might also consider examining and comparing counselors who hold leadership positions and those who do not. This information may further help counseling departments in nurturing the attributes that move counselors into leadership positions.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare personality attributes of counselor educators to further the understanding of characteristics most likely related to transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style. The researcher aimed to understand this question at three levels – for counselor educators in general, for female counselor educators, and racially and ethnically diverse female counselor educators. The specific purpose of this study was to explore whether there were gender and racial/ethnic differences in personality attributes of counselor educators who are characterized as transformational leaders. Results of the study indicated a significant relationship between personality attributes and transformational and transactional leadership styles. Results also indicated that counselor educators who are as Transformational Leaders are characterized as individuals who have good emotional stability, are sociable, open to new experiences, and are achievement-oriented and considerate of others. Additionally, findings indicated that counselor educators who are characterized as Transactional leaders are can be distinguished by their social behavior and openness and flexibility to diverse experiences.

Contrary to other studies, no gender differences were found in the personality attributes of Transformational or Transactional leaders. The lack of gender differences
found in counselor educators may be influenced by the specific qualities that are 
encouraged in the counseling profession. This includes personal qualities such as 
empathy, support, a collaborative working alliance between counselor and client, and 
openness to diversity which is often recognized as critical for client outcomes. 

Furthermore, no racial differences were found in the personality attributes of 
Transformational or Transactional leaders. Regardless of race, counselor educators who 
are Transformational leaders appear to share similar qualities. Additionally, counselor 
educators who are Transactional leaders share similar qualities regardless of race. The 
information indicates that race and culture may not play as influential a role in the 
development of personality of leaders as theorized. Counseling departments and 
educational programs that are working toward identifying, encouraging, and developing 
transformational leadership characteristics in racially and ethnically diverse female 
counselor educators and counseling students can use this information in developing 
appropriate leadership training. 

Transformational leaders in counselor education have been identified has having 
qualities such as good emotional stability, nonconformity, autonomy and someone who is 
imaginative. These individuals can be described as cooperative, tolerant, self-disciplined 
and have a need for achievement. Given this information, leaders in counselor education 
can be developed by nurturing the very qualities that are essential to client-counselor 
alliances. By emphasizing qualities that are critical to positive client outcomes, such as 
empathy, support, a collaborative working alliance between counselor and client, and 
openness to diversity counselor education programs might simultaneously be nurturing
the personality attributes that are critical to the next generation of transformational leaders in the profession.
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Appendix A: Big Five Inventory

How I am in general

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am someone who...

1. _____ Is talkative
2. _____ Tends to find fault with others
3. _____ Does a thorough job
4. _____ Is depressed, blue
5. _____ Is original, comes up with new ideas
6. _____ Is reserved
7. _____ Is helpful and unselfish with others
8. _____ Can be somewhat careless
9. _____ Is relaxed, handles stress well.
10. _____ Is curious about many different things
11. _____ Is full of energy
12. _____ Starts quarrels with others
13. _____ Is a reliable worker
14. _____ Can be tense
15. _____ Is ingenious, a deep thinker
16. _____ Generates a lot of enthusiasm
17. _____ Has a forgiving nature
18. _____ Tends to be disorganized
19. _____ Worries a lot
20. _____ Has an active imagination
21. _____ Tends to be quiet
22. _____ Is generally trusting
23. _____ Tends to be lazy
24. _____ Is emotionally stable, not easily upset
25. _____ Is inventive
26. _____ Has an assertive personality
27. _____ Can be cold and aloof
28. _____ Perseveres until the task is finished
29. _____ Can be moody
30. _____ Values artistic, aesthetic experiences
31. _____ Is sometimes shy, inhibited
32. _____ Is considerate and kind to almost everyone
33. _____ Does things efficiently
34. _____ Remains calm in tense situations
35. _____ Prefers work that is routine
36. _____ Is outgoing, sociable
37. _____ Is sometimes rude to others
38. _____ Makes plans and follows through with them
39. _____ Gets nervous easily
40. _____ Likes to reflect, play with ideas
41. _____ Has few artistic interests
42. _____ Likes to cooperate with others
43. _____ Is easily distracted
44. _____ Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature
Appendix B: Demographic Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Your responses will remain anonymous.

1. Biological Sex: Male Female

2. Are you White or a person of color? __________

3. What is your ethnicity/race? ________________

4. Age:
   a. 20-29
   b. 30-34
   c. 35-44
   d. 45-54
   e. 55-63
   f. 64+

5. What is your marital status?
   a. Single
   b. Married or in a civil union
   c. Unmarried, living with partner
   d. Divorced, separated or widowed

6. What is your tenure status?
   a. Non-tenure track, part-time
   b. Non-tenure track, full-time
c. Tenure-track

d. Tenured

7. What is your rank?

a. Adjunct Professor

b. Assistant Professor

c. Associate Professor

d. Full Professor

8. What type of institution are you employed at?

a. Private

b. Public

9. What geographical Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) region do you represent?

a. North Atlantic

b. North Central

c. Southern

d. Rocky Mountain

e. Western

10. What types of programs are offered at your current employment?

a. Masters program only

b. Masters and Doctoral Program

11. How many years of experience do you have in Counselor Education?

a. Less than 1 year

b. 1-5 years
12. What program are you in?

13. What department are you in?

14. Other than Counseling how many other programs are there in your department?

15. Have you participated in professional leadership training within:

   a. your program? Yes No
   b. your college? Yes No
   c. your university? Yes No
   d. local professional organizations? Yes No
   e. state professional organizations Yes No
   f. regional professional organizations? Yes No
   g. national professional organizations? Yes No

16. In the past ten years have you served in leadership position within:

   a. your program? Yes No
   b. your college? Yes No
   c. your university? Yes No
   d. local professional organizations? Yes No
   e. state professional organizations Yes No
   f. regional professional organizations? Yes No
   g. national professional organizations? Yes No

17. Within the following areas what are your leadership aspirations?
a. In your program? _________________________________

b. In your college? _________________________________

c. In your university? _________________________________

d. In local professional organizations?
_______________________________

e. In state professional organizations?
_______________________________

f. In regional professional organizations?
_______________________________

g. In national professional organizations?
_______________________________
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