
Does the Transactional–Transformational Leadership Paradigm Transcend Organizational and National Boundaries?

Bernard M. Bass
State University of New York at Binghamton

There is universality in the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm. That is, the same conception of phenomena and relationships can be observed in a wide range of organizations and cultures. Exceptions can be understood as a consequence of unusual attributes of the organizations or cultures. Three corollaries are discussed. Supportive evidence has been gathered in studies conducted in organizations in business, education, the military, the government, and the independent sector. Likewise, supportive evidence has been accumulated from all but 1 continent to document the applicability of the paradigm.

Evidence supporting the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm has been gathered from all continents except Antarctica—even offshore in the North Sea. The transactional–transformational paradigm views leadership as either a matter of contingent reinforcement of followers by a transactional leader or the moving of followers beyond their self-interests for the good of the group, organization, or society by a transformational leader. The paradigm is sufficiently broad to provide a basis for measurement and understanding that is as universal as the concept of leadership itself. Here, universal does not imply constancy of means, variances, and correlations across all situations but rather explanatory constructs good for all situations. Numerous investigations (field studies, case histories, management games, interviews, and laboratory studies) point to the robustness of the effects of transformational and charismatic leadership (Dorfman, 1996).

Although I focus here on the transactional–transformational conceptualization derived from Burns (1978) and elaborated by Bass (1985), it is one among a number of neocharismatic conceptualizations built around similar leader behaviors and perceptions with slight variations in emphases (House, 1995). Referred to as the “New Leadership” (Bryman, 1992), these conceptualizations include the 1976 theory of charisma (House, 1977), the attributional theory of charisma (Conger & Kanungo, 1987), the leadership challenge (Kouzes & Posner, 1987), and visionary leadership (Sashkin, 1988). This new leadership does not replace the conceptions of leadership as exchanges

of reinforcements by the leader that are contingent on followers’ performance. Rather, the new leadership adds the role of the transformational leader in enlarging and elevating followers’ motivation, understanding, maturity, and sense of self-worth. Graen and Uhl-Bien (1991) found that although leader–member exchange may begin with a simple transactional relationship, for effectiveness, it needs to become transformational.

Numerous reasons bolster the universality argument. First, leadership, as such, is a universal phenomenon. No society has been found where it is completely absent (Murdock, 1967). Still, the leadership that occurs is affected by the organizations and cultures in which it appears. To export participative management from the United States to more authoritarian countries involves preaching Jeffersonian democracy to managers who believe in the Divine Right of Kings (Haire, Ghiselli, & Porter, 1966). Nonetheless, the globalization of industry and the media has made the task easier to spread systematic approaches to leadership.

Second, laypeople repeatedly ask, “Are leaders born or made?” and usually argue about how much they are made. However, recent findings about heritability (Rose, 1995) may suggest otherwise. In a study of 100 sets of monozygotic and dizygotic twins, T. Vernon (personal communication, March 31, 1995) reported that monozygotic twins were much more alike than dizygotic twins in their self-perceived transformational leadership behaviors as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X; Bass & Avolio, 1995). As much as 40% of the variance could be attributed

Editor’s note. William Bevan served as action editor for this article.

Author’s note. This article was delivered as the Distinguished Scientific Contributions Award Address at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL, May 1995.

I am indebted to P. W. Dorfman for the liberal view of the meaning of *universality*. The full-range model and much of the relevant research emerged from collaboration with B. J. Avolio, F. J. Yammarino, and many others at the Center for Leadership Studies. I also thank W. F. Ulmer for comments on an earlier version of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Bernard M. Bass, Center for Leadership Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton, P.O. Box 6015, Binghamton, NY 13902-6015.



Bernard M. Bass

to heritability. Transactional managing by exception and laissez-faire leadership were similarly affected by heritability. Only transactional contingent reward failed to register a significant effect of inheritance. To the degree that heritability is culture free, it means that a universal constraint is placed on how much contingencies of training, culture, and organization vitiate possible transformational leadership effects.

Third, knowledge work will dominate the 21st century. It requires more envisioning, enabling, and empowering leadership, all of which are central to transformational leadership as defined by Kouzes and Posner (1987). The leadership must go beyond the transactional reward-punishment exchange relationship.

Fourth, the socially oriented transformational leader engages in moral uplifting of followers. Moral absolutes may be involved. It is absolutely true that crying "fire!" in a crowded theater is absolutely wrong. It is absolutely good to help the many without harming any.

Fifth, the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm can be extended to describe teams and group effects as well as how whole organizations differ (Avolio & Bass, 1994). People jockey for positions in a transactional group, whereas they share common goals in a transformational group. Rules and regulations dominate the transactional organization; adaptability is a characteristic of the transformational organization. The team MLQ has been developed to assess teams, as teams, in terms of the components of transformational and transactional team mores (Avolio & Bass, 1995). Correspondingly, raters have been able to complete reliable and valid descriptions of their organizations using the Organizational Description Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1993a). The paradigm can even be extended to the international behavior of nations. Kissinger (1994) repeatedly described the international diplomacy of nations as justified

by either self-interest (transactional) or moral principles (transformational). Britain was transactional in maintaining its "splendid isolation" and the European balance of powers by taking sides with whichever side was weaker. It was transformational when it outlawed and fought the slave trade as a matter of moral principle.

Sixth, pop culture and its fads sweep across the world. Worldwide webs of communication, trade, and travel and the international transfer of technology contribute to the convergence of requirements and role models for leadership. Most business and industrial managers everywhere are more pragmatic and less idealistic than most leaders of social movements (England, 1976). Organizations are continually seeking benchmarks to see what they can do to become closer in practice to the best of their counterparts. They learn, change, and become more alike. So do cultures. It may not be politically correct to say so, but less developed cultures change as a consequence of the diffusion of ideas and practices from more developed cultures.

Seventh, the United States provides important sources of communalities in the postindustrialized world. English has become the world's language of business, and much of American management practices and management education have been adopted universally. The United States dominates the worldwide entertainment industry. The master of business administration program has gone global. Recently, the British Ministry adopted American-style "publish or perish" rules for supporting higher education.

Five Universals

Lonner (1980) listed four kinds of universals or regularities in leader-follower relations that transcend cultures and organizations: simple, variform, functional, and systematic. I add a fifth—variform functional. A *simple universal* about leadership is demonstrated by General Norman Schwarzkoff's (1994) statement that anytime a group of human beings come together, there is always a leader. Furthermore, he did not see any difference in the characteristics required for successful leadership of Macedonia by Alexander the Great and successful leadership at IBM by Lou Gerstner. A *variform universal* is a simple regularity influenced to some extent by cultures or organizations. Ordinarily, business organizations almost everywhere are headed by a single executive officer or managing director, but in Germany, a technical and a commercial director may share authority and responsibilities. A *functional universal* is a relation that is universal between variables. Such a functional universal is the correlation between laissez-faire leadership and perceived ineffectiveness. Everywhere, the assigned leader who frequently avoids responsibilities and shirks duties is perceived as ineffective and dissatisfying by followers. A more dynamic rubric is a *variform functional universal*. Almost everywhere, a positive, sizable correlation is found between attributed charisma and satisfaction with it. But a slightly negative correlation emerged in one large sample of government economists rating their supervisors

(Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1996). A *systematic behavioral universal* is a theory about relationships that explain if-then outcomes across cultures and organizations. The full-range model of transformational and transactional leadership provides the measurable relationships for such a theory. The model and the theory underlying it are systematically universal, although they include variform and variform functional universals. When exceptions to the generalizations occur, they usually are circumstances explained by the peculiarities of the culture or organization.

In sum, universal means a universally applicable conceptualization. At the individual level of measurement, each individual leader has a profile of transactional and transformational scores that can be reliably and validly discriminated from the norms for his or her group, organization, or culture. The means will vary in understandable ways, as will the variances, as one moves from one context to another. Considerable functional uniformities in correlations with outcomes will be observed, with understandable exceptions (Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979).

Variation occurs because the same concepts may contain specific thought processes, beliefs, implicit understandings, or behaviors in one culture but not another. Misumi's (1985) performance-maintenance distinctions transfer for electronics plant supervisors across Britain, the United States, Japan, and Hong Kong, but the specific behaviors reflecting the two styles differ markedly (Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Peterson, & Bond, 1989). The linkages among concepts may strengthen or weaken as one moves from one culture to another. For example, Indonesian inspirational leaders need to persuade their followers about the leaders' own competence, a behavior that would appear unseemly in Japan. Contingent rewarding is more implicit in Japan than in the United States (Yokochi, 1989). Nevertheless, the concepts of inspiration and contingent reward appear to be as universal as the concept of leadership itself. In the same way, the contribution to the extra effort of followers of a leader's inspiration and a leader's promises of reward will vary to some degree. Nevertheless, inspirational leadership is more strongly correlated with extra effort of followers in most organizations and cultures than is contingent reward leadership (*viz.*, Druskat, 1994; Salter, 1989).

Dorfman and Ronen (1991) accounted for people's favoring of differences over similarities of leadership across cultures. The differences intrigue people; the sameness bores them. Differences give people more to say. Significant differences are a matter of having large enough samples. It is effect sizes that need to be large for people to dwell on the differences. Some suggest that because much of the theories and methods of the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm originated in the culturally individualistic United States, the paradigm is likely to have little relevance in countries with collectivistic cultures. The opposite appears to be more likely. Transformational leadership emerges more readily in the collectivistic societies of East Asia (Jung,

Bass, & Sosik, 1995). Currently, House (1995) is heading a 60-nation study in which measures of charismatic leadership have been developed indigenously in the same three industries in each of the nations. So far, preliminarily, he has concluded that the similarities of findings outweigh the differences.

At first, it appeared implicitly to me that transformational leadership was limited to leaders in the upper echelons of organizations. So, when I collected the first interview and survey data in 1980, they were data from and about senior executives and U.S. Army colonels describing their leaders (Bass, 1985). But by 1985, it had been discovered that transformational leadership was much more universal in that it could be displayed by middle managers, Army noncommissioned officers and lieutenants, first-level supervisors, and team leaders with no formal rank in their organizations. By 1992, it was clear from empirical evidence that transformational leadership could be exhibited by samples ranging from housewives active in the community (Avolio & Bass, 1994) and students (Avolio, Waldman, & Einstein, 1988) to Japanese CEOs (Bass & Yokochi, 1991), world-class leaders of movements, and presidents of the United States (Bass, Avolio, & Goodheim, 1987). Also, as people began to work toward transformational teams, it became clear that members of a team could learn how to make a team more transformational (Avolio & Bass, 1995).

A variety of contingency theories of leadership have been advanced, with varying research support. Little empirical evidence supports Hersey-Blanchard's (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969) model of situational leadership contingent on the followers' maturity. After more than 400 publications, controversy remains about Fiedler's (1983) saw-toothed theory that task-oriented leaders are most effective when they are faced with situations that are highly favorable or highly unfavorable to them and relations-oriented leaders do best when they are faced with situations that are in-between in favorableness. Equally researched is House's (1971) path-goal theory, which states that the effective leader clarifies the transactional exchange and the path the subordinate needs to follow for goal attainment. Contingencies include the motivation of the subordinate and the structure of the situation. But supporting evidence is mixed. Although contingencies do have some validity, overall, better leaders integrate a task-oriented and a relations-oriented approach (Blake & Mouton, 1964) as well as demonstrate their ability to clarify the path to the goals (Bass, 1960, 1990).

Since 1980, general findings have been assembled that the best of leaders are both transactional and transformational. Again, for many situations, the circumstances may not make that much difference. In fact, the leadership behavior may affect the contingent condition more than the reverse. Thus, the transactional leader works within the constraints of the organization; the transformational leader changes the organization (Bass, 1985). Transformational leadership and transactional leadership may be affected by contingencies, but most contingencies may be relatively small in effect.

Conceptualization

Leaders and followers enter into an exchange beginning with a process of negotiation to establish what is being exchanged and whether it is satisfactory (Hollander, 1986). This transactional leadership depends on the leader's power to reinforce subordinates for their successful completion of the bargain. Reinforcement can be materialistic or symbolic, immediate or delayed, partial or whole, implicit or explicit, and in terms of rewards or resources. Nevertheless, Levinson (1980) suggested that if you limit yourself to transactional leadership of a follower with rewards of carrots for compliance, or punishments with a stick for failure to comply with agreed-on work to be done by the follower, the follower will continue to feel like a jackass. Among other things, the follower's sense of self-worth must be addressed to engage and commit the follower (Shamir, 1991). And that is one of the strongest motivators that transformational leadership adds to the transactional exchange.

Authentic transformational leaders motivate followers to work for transcendental goals that go beyond immediate self-interests. What is right and good to do becomes important. Transformational leaders move followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the group, organization, or country. Transformational leaders motivate followers and other constituencies to do more than they originally expected to do as they strive for higher order outcomes (Burns, 1978). Self-interested pseudotransformational leaders may impress their followers in the same way, but their own purposes are clearly different and are likely to be exploitative rather than uplifting.

Until 1980, experimental and survey leadership research was limited mainly to the effects of leadership on lower order changes with leaders and followers at lower levels of organizations or in temporary groups—a reason that made more appealing explanations in terms of simple cost-benefit exchanges. The new paradigm of transformational and transactional leadership paralleled completion of more leadership research at the higher levels of organizations and intrinsic motivation. The old paradigms of task-oriented or relations-oriented leadership, directive or participative leadership, and autocratic or democratic leadership and related exchange theories of leadership ignored effects on leader-follower relations of the sharing of vision, symbolism, imaging, and sacrifice.

Empirical Support for Universality

Development of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

In 1980, 70 South African senior executives were asked if they could identify someone in their lives who had raised their consciousness; elevated their motivation on Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs; or moved them to go beyond their self-interests for the good of their group, organization, or society. (These effects were Burns's [1978] definition of the transforming leader.) All were able to do so. After identifying such an individual, the

executives reported that the leader motivated them to extend themselves, to develop themselves, and to become more innovative. The executives were motivated to emulate their transformational leader. They became committed to the organization as a consequence of belief in the leader. They exerted extra effort for their leader (Bass, 1985).

The original MLQ (Bass, 1985) began with the executives' statements and those from the literature on charisma and contingent reinforcement. The 141 statements were sorted by 11 trained judges into transformational and transactional leadership. Then, they were administered as MLQ Form 1 to senior U.S. Army officers to rate how much each statement described their superior officers on magnitude estimation scales of frequency ranging from 0 (the behavior is observed *not at all*) to 4 (the behavior is observed *frequently, if not always*). Numerous factor analyses of the frequencies of the behaviors rated by subordinates in this and subsequent studies of business executives, agency administrators, and U.S. Army colonels were completed (for summaries, see Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1993b). The factor studies suggested that the transformational statements could be assigned to four interrelated components: Idealized Influence (or Charisma), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration. The transformational components are intercorrelated. Nevertheless, they are assessed separately because they are conceptually distinct and important for diagnostic purposes. Analogously, anxiety and depression correlate highly but need to be treated differently. The transformational components are as follows:

Idealized Influence (Charisma)—leaders display conviction; emphasize trust; take stands on difficult issues; present their most important values; and emphasize the importance of purpose, commitment, and the ethical consequences of decisions. Such leaders are admired as role models generating pride, loyalty, confidence, and alignment around a shared purpose. A subjective component of attributed charisma may spin off from idealized influence, a behavioral component, for a fifth transformational component. (Components better describe the conceptually but not empirically distinct constructs. The same leaders tend to be high or low in each, but the behaviors involved are different and require different remediations.)

Inspirational Motivation—leaders articulate an appealing vision of the future, challenge followers with high standards, talk optimistically with enthusiasm, and provide encouragement and meaning for what needs to be done.

Intellectual Stimulation—leaders question old assumptions, traditions, and beliefs; stimulate in others new perspectives and ways of doing things; and encourage the expression of ideas and reasons.

Individualized Consideration—leaders deal with others as individuals; consider their individual needs, abilities, and aspirations; listen attentively; further their development; advise; teach; and coach.

Transactional leadership, using a carrot or a stick, contains three components usually characterized as instrumental in followers' goal attainment.

Contingent Reward—leaders engage in a constructive path-goal transaction of reward for performance. They clarify expectations, exchange promises and resources for support of the leaders, arrange mutually satisfactory agreements, negotiate for resources, exchange assistance for effort, and provide commendations for successful follower performance.

Active Management by Exception—leaders monitor followers' performance and take corrective action if deviations from standards occur. They enforce rules to avoid mistakes.

Passive Management by Exception—leaders fail to intervene until problems become serious. They wait to take action until mistakes are brought to their attention.

Laissez-Faire Leadership, a nonleadership component, also emerges—leaders avoid accepting their responsibilities, are absent when needed, fail to follow up requests for assistance, and resist expressing their views on important issues. Before the MLQ Form 5 was revised, an unpublished factor analysis of 4 of the 10 items such as "avoids interfering with the way I do my job" could be seen as empowering subordinates rather than as laissez-faire leadership (Bass, 1996).

According to a higher order factor analysis, the factors can be ordered from highest to lowest in activity as follows: Transformational Leadership, Contingent Reward, Active Management by Exception, Passive Management by Exception, and Laissez-Faire Leadership (Bass, 1985). Correspondingly, confirmed subsequently in an array of empirical studies, as noted in the first corollary that is presented, the components can also be ordered on a second dimension—effectiveness. Transformational Leadership tends to be most effective, followed in order of effectiveness by Contingent Reward, Active Management by Exception, Passive Management by Exception, and Laissez-Faire Leadership (Avolio & Bass, 1990).

In the numerous factor analyses that have been reported, consistent with the original research (Bass, 1985; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995), Charismatic and Inspirational Leadership form a single factor. Sometimes a transformational factor appears. The boundaries between Contingent Reward and Individualized Consideration also may blur. Although both involve helping fulfill the needs of followers, Individualized Consideration focuses more attention on personal growth and recognition, whereas Contingent Reward attends more to promising or providing material rewards and resources.

A survey of empirical analyses and three meta-analyses (Gaspar, 1992; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Patterson, Fuller, Kester, & Stringer, 1995) suggested that, generally, the MLQ components of Transformational Leadership correlate highly (.50 to .80) with each other but less so with Contingent Reward (.30 to .50). They correlate near zero with Management by Exception and moderately to highly negative with Laissez-Faire Leadership.

Howell and Avolio (1993) used partial least squares regression analysis with data collected on MLQ Form 10 from a sample of 250 executives rated by their direct reports, which supported the discriminant and convergent validity of a complex transactional–transformational fac-

tor structure. These results have been replicated with a total of 3,786 cases from 14 samples using MLQ-5X (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1996).

Many factor analyses have been completed for data from the United States and abroad. Koh (1990) found a similar factor structure for Singaporean school principals. Included were Charisma–Inspiration, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Reward, Active and Passive Management by Exception, and Laissez-Faire Leadership. Garcia (1995) produced similar results with U.S. salespeople, and Druskat (1994) did so with Roman Catholic clergy. Nonetheless, particularly when abbreviated scales were used, as at the U.S. Air Force Academy (Curphy, 1990) and in a Dutch study (Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1994), fewer factors could emerge as factor solutions. Minimally, a composite transformational factor and active and passive transactional factors were likely to appear in these diverse studies. Nonetheless, LISREL analyses involving 3,786 cases indicated that a more complex model of seven factors including Charisma–Inspiration, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Reward, Active and Passive Management by Exception, and Laissez-Faire Leadership best fit the data in contrast to factor solutions with fewer factors (Avolio et al., 1996).

The Universality of Three Propositions

Three corollaries for the theory underlying the model were presented by Bass and Avolio (1993b). With each corollary, some of the supporting empirical work is noted, which was completed in different countries and types of organizations to suggest that variform, functional, and systematic universals are involved.

The first corollary is that there is a hierarchy of correlations among the various leadership styles and outcomes in effectiveness, effort, and satisfaction. Transformational leaders are more effective than those leaders practicing contingent reward; contingent reward is somewhat more effective than active management by exception, which in turn is more effective than passive management by exception. Laissez-faire leadership is least effective. The patterns are similar for extra effort and for satisfaction with the leadership. The hierarchy remains, but is less steep, when objective, independent outcome criteria of effectiveness are used.

The corollary, first verified in the United States (Waldman, Bass, & Einstein, 1986), is applicable to results from India, Spain, Singapore, Japan, China, Austria, and a number of other countries. In Bombay, Dennyson Pereira (1986) found general support for the correlational hierarchy for managers in a large manufacturing organization, as did Roberto Pascual in Bilbao, Spain; Jaime Filella in Barcelona, Spain; Roger Gill in Singapore; Nokko Yokochi in Japan (Yokochi, 1989); Steyrer and Mende (1994) in Austria in diverse sectors of business and industrial management; and Davis, Guan, Luo, and Maahs (1996) in a Chinese state enterprise.

To illustrate, 120 Austrian branch bank managers and their subordinates who described them completed

the MLQ in German. Significant correlations were found between the extent to which the managers were perceived as transformational rather than transactional and the extent to which their banks increased subsequently in customer market share and several other criteria of customer business.

The same kind of results were reported for Federal Express managers in the United States (Hater & Bass, 1988) and for financial executives in Canada (Howell & Avolio, 1993). A similar hierarchy of correlations emerged for New Zealand professionals and administrators (Bass, 1985), U.S. nursing administrators (Arnold, 1990), and U.S. religious ministers (Onnen, 1987). Similar hierarchical results have been reported in the profit and nonprofit sectors for middle managers in the United States, Canada, Belgium, Japan, and elsewhere (Bass & Avolio, 1993b) and for the military in the United States, Canada, and Germany (Boyd, 1988).

Between 1989 and 1993, in Italy, Avolio and I systematically collected immediate subordinates' MLQ ratings of Fiat's senior managers (Bass & Avolio, 1990, 1991, 1994). For almost 200 of the senior executives described by their 1,032 immediate subordinates, the hierarchy of correlations held up. The same was true for 30 senior managers of Swedish multinationals described by their subordinates and for 500 participants in training in the Binghamton, New York, area coming from 10 different types of organizations such as business, education, health care, government, law enforcement, and social services.

Lowe et al. (1996) completed a meta-analysis involving from 1,295 to 5,475 cases. The hierarchy of correlations emerged for results based on subordinates' ratings as well as for those based on organizational outcomes—*independent performance appraisals, career advancement, performance of the units led, and so forth.* Results were the same for both published and unpublished reports.

I do not wish to imply that one has here a functional universal that is invariant. On the contrary, it is a variform functional universal when samples can be compared where everything but nationality is controlled (Boyd, 1988). Although the overall order of effects generally remained, variations appeared in the size of the differential correlations. Boyd compared 700 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) field grade officers. Although transformational leadership did remain more highly correlated with effective outcomes than did transactional leadership, with these military data, contingent reward was less effective and management by exception was more effective than usually obtained with civilian samples. The pattern for Canadian officers was particularly divergent from U.S. and German results in that Canadian transactional leadership correlated close to zero with effectiveness. Although passive and active management by exception were not separated in Boyd's scoring of the data, active management by exception undoubtedly would have been more highly correlated with effectiveness and passive management by exception would have

been less so, judging from a meta-analysis by Gaspar (1992) that compared military and civilian MLQ results.

Gaspar's (1992) meta-analysis of MLQ findings involved 957 military respondents with 577 to 2,141 civilian counterparts describing their superiors. Overall, the hierarchy of correlations with objective outcomes and perceived effectiveness was elevated in the military respondents as compared with civilians. For the military respondents, the mean correlation of the MLQ transformational factor scores with objective performance ranged from .46 to .57. The comparable results for the civilians ranged from .26 to .29. For the military personnel, objective performance correlated .46 with contingent reward; the comparable result was .20 for the civilians. Objective performance correlated .26 with active management by exception for the military respondents and $-.27$ for the civilians. The correlation was .32 with passive management by exception for the military respondents and $-.07$ for the civilians. When perceived effectiveness was the criterion outcome, the correlations were elevated (partly because of the bias of same-source variance). Military transformational leadership components correlated from .51 to .75 with perceived effectiveness. For the civilians, the correlations were from .47 to .57. The military-civilian differences in mean size of correlations with outcomes and the reverse direction with management by exception pointed to a variform, not a simple, universal in the leadership-outcome correlations.

The second corollary is that there is a one-way augmentation effect. When stepwise regression is used, measures of transformational leadership add to measures of transactional leadership in predicting outcomes, but not vice versa. Definitive analyses supporting the augmentation effect were completed with a representative sample of U.S. Navy officers using retrospective outcomes (Yammarino & Bass, 1990) and Canadian managers using outcomes collected a year after the measurements of leadership (Howell & Avolio, 1993). Comparable results were obtained in India (Pereira, 1986) and the Dominican Republic (Davis, 1994). In Singapore, Koh (1990) found the augmentation effect generalized for 90 secondary school principals when the criteria predicted by transformational leadership added to transactional leadership were commitment and satisfaction. However, it failed to do so when the criteria involved turnover or academic performance. The augmentation effect appears to be a variform functional universal.

The third corollary is that in whatever the country, when people think about leadership, their prototypes and ideals are transformational. Supportive evidence comes from a variety of sources: (a) Bass and Avolio (1989) showed that Lord's prototype leader was correlated with transformational, not transactional, leadership in an American sample. (b) In training efforts in various types of organizations and participants from the United States, Canada, South Africa, Spain, Austria, Sweden, Italy, Israel, and elsewhere, an exercise has been conducted routinely in the Full Range of Leadership Development Program with several thousand participants (Avolio & Bass,

1990). Participants are asked to describe an ideal leader who has been of consequence to them in their own lives. The traits and behaviors that are mentioned to describe the leader are almost invariably transformational, not transactional. (c) Using the MLQ items as a preference survey, Chinese police and Taiwanese company employees chose transformational rather than transactional leadership (Singer & Singer, 1990). (d) When U.S. undergraduates were asked to list up to 25 traits of leadership, the MLQ-like transformational factors emerged. Their implicit traits of leadership included charismatic, dedicated, intelligent, and sensitive (Offerman, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994).

Although the three corollaries appear to be universal, this does not mean the levels of perceived leadership in self and others will be invariant among the different nationalities. For instance, among Boyd's (1988) NATO officers, contingent reward was less effective for Canadian officers than for German or American officers. Self-ratings in Japan were not as inflated as they are in the United States or Europe (Yokochi, 1989). The size of the means, variances, and correlations will vary to some degree, yet the overall patterns of results generally remain the same everywhere. For instance, in Sri Lanka, the leader stereotype is a Ceylonese John Wayne, a hard task master, or a benevolent dictator. Nevertheless, when Weathersby (1993) asked 44 Sri Lankan managers to reflect individually and collectively about their experiences, over time they ended up espousing transformational approaches.

The three corollaries were found to hold when the MLQ was presented in translation in various European and Asian languages. One unpublished Chinese version of MLQ Form 5 suitably backtranslated was used in an unpublished study of managerial motivation in the People's Republic of China by Wang Ming Xhou. Another independently translated, unpublished version of Form 5 by Singer and Singer (1990) and an unpublished Chinese version of Form 5X by Li Baiqing were modified and used by Davis et al. (1996) in a Chinese state enterprise. Translations have been made of the MLQ in Spanish (Molero Alonso, 1994; replicated in Venezuela, Mexico, the Dominican Republic [Davis, 1994], and Puerto Rico), French (duplicated in Quebec, Canada, and France), Italian (Aparo, 1993), German (Steyrer & Mende, 1994), and Dutch (Den Hartog et al., 1994), as well as other languages more distant from English, such as Hebrew, Arabic (Al-Anazi, 1993), and Japanese (Yokochi, 1989). Nonetheless, although the concepts and components of transformational and transactional leadership transfer, the specific behaviors involved may be different, particularly as one crosses into the non-Western world.

Cultural Contingencies

Variform universals and variform functional universals still leave room for contingency analyses to assess how much situational context affects the general means, variances, and correlations. Dorfman (1994) cautioned about applying U.S.-developed leadership models to other cul-

tures and agreed with Adler (1984) that the devil is in the details. Thus, the impact of charismatic leadership on employee satisfaction was greater on the American employees for whom correlations of .50 and .70 were found, as compared with correlations of .29 and .57 for the Mexican employees (Dorfman & Howell, 1988). (Some of the darker history of charismatic Mexican political leaders may have lowered the Mexican results.) U.S. employees also generated higher correlations between contingent reward and the measures of satisfaction with work and with supervision (.48 and .73, respectively) in contrast to the Mexican employees (.19 and .58, respectively).

In Indonesia, inspirational leaders boast about their own competence to create pride and respect in themselves. In so doing, such transformational leaders aim to reduce subordinates' feelings of fear and shame. But, it would be unseemly for leaders to be so boastful in Japan.

There are cultural contingencies in manifesting individualized consideration. According to interviews by Yokochi (1989) with 17 Japanese CEOs of some of the largest Japanese firms and MLQ questionnaire surveys of 135 Japanese managers at levels below them, effective Japanese executives tended to be much more transformational than transactional. The three corollaries held up. Nonetheless, although the concepts and components of transformational and transactional leadership transfer, the specific behaviors involved may be different, particularly as one crosses into the non-Western world. In Yokochi's study, the transformational factor of Individualized Consideration emerged from a different set of items in Japan because such consideration is expected from one's supervisor as a matter of course, although it remains unspoken. The mutual obligation between the leaders and the followers in collectivistic cultures facilitates the transformational leaders' individualized consideration. Leaders in collectivistic cultures likewise already have a moral responsibility to take care of their subordinates, to help them prepare a career development plan, to attend their funeral ceremonies and birthday parties, and to counsel followers about personal problems. In turn, subordinates have a moral obligation to reciprocate with unquestioning loyalty and obedience. Indeed, transformational leadership may be far more pervasive in collectivistic societies than in the individualistic societies of the West (Jung, Bass, & Sosik, 1995).

Transformational leadership may be autocratic and directive or democratic and participative. Leaders can be intellectually stimulating to their followers when they authoritatively direct the followers' attention to a hidden assumption in their thinking. Leaders could also be intellectually stimulating when they ask whether their group would be ready to look together for hidden assumptions. In the individualistic societies of North America, more participative leadership would be expected of its transformational leaders. In the collectivistic societies of Asia, more directiveness would be expected of its transformational leaders. How participative or directive the transformational leaders will be—how much they will depend

on authority—would also depend on the issue involved. One would expect to see more authoritative transformational leadership when policy decisions rather than workplace decisions are being made.

Contingent reward may be the least universal component in concepts, behaviors, and effects. As noted earlier, there was no heritability effect in the display of contingent reward (T. Vernon, personal communication, March 31, 1995). Also, it seems to be particularly contingent on the way superior-subordinate relations are organized in different countries and on the idiosyncrasies of national history. Japan, India, Britain, and Egypt provide illustrations of the divergences. In the West, performing better than other members of one's team is ordinarily commendable. Contingent reward may be expected as a matter of equity. In Japan, it may be a cause for disharmony and loss of face. Pay differentials are small and along with promotions are not by one's immediate superior but by the amorphous company, consistent with its standards, values, history, and traditions. In India, implicit is the preference of many subordinates for a dependent personal relationship rather than a contractual one with their leader (Sinha, 1984). Earley (1988) noted that English workers do not value praise, criticism, and general conversation with their superiors as much as do workers in the United States and Ghana. English workers, therefore, are likely to be less responsive to contingent rewards. In particular, those in heavy industry distrust feedback from their supervisors. Perhaps contingent reward needs to be sought in the English workers' interactions with their shop stewards. Egypt is dominated by large public organizations. These are highly structured and centralized bureaucracies with little room for supervisors to practice contingent rewarding (Badran & Hinings, 1981).

Organizational Contingencies

Mechanistic organizations were expected to reveal more individual transactional leaders and organic organizations more individual transformational leaders (Bass, 1985). However, Singer and Singer (1990) failed to find such differences when results for members of police organizations were compared with those in business firms in New Zealand and Taiwan. But, the three corollaries tend to hold up across organizations, with a few exceptions. Organizational outliers have appeared on occasion when multiple samples of data have been collected in different units or organizations. Thus, in all but 1 of the 14 samples mentioned earlier, analyzed by Avolio et al. (1996), the usual expected strong correlation emerged between the leader's inspirational motivation and satisfaction with the leader. Thirteen samples generated correlations greater than .60. In 1 sample, an unexpected correlation of $-.21$ appeared! There is a possible explanation. The outlier sample consisted of professional economists working in a federal agency. Either their supervisors were irrelevant in that setting or the respondents subscribed to Williamson's (1975) theory that organizations are internal competitive marketplaces.

Kennedy (1994) found an outlier within the sample of offshore oil platform supervisors when he obtained onshore bosses' ratings of the offshore supervisors, platform by platform. Generally, the expected positive correlations were obtained between boss-rated performance of the supervisors on a platform and the supervisors' transformational leadership according to their subordinates, but the correlation was $-.57$ for the boss-rated performance and the transformational supervisors' behavior according to subordinates on one of the platforms. The result may have been due to a distant, tough, non-nonsense onshore boss rating the supervisors on the basis of his view of appropriate management. In the same way, Kennedy found that the mean for management by exception for offshore North Sea oil platform supervisors was much higher than for civilian norms in general. Kennedy's finding is understandable if one appreciates how, as in the military, a premium is placed on safety and effective reaction to emergencies.

Universality or Specificity?

Many situational contingencies may be posed as variform functional universals that raise or lower the means, variances, and correlations with outcomes. But the issue remains as to whether the portion of the accountable variance due to a contingent situation remains small, although interesting, or becomes so large as to call into question the argument endorsing the universality of transactional-transformational behaviors and their effects.

The cultural as well as organizational influences on leadership and interpersonal behavior are well-documented (Bass, 1990). Differences in cultural beliefs, values, and norms moderate leader-follower relations. Nonetheless, certain generalizations appear warranted. Transformational leadership tends to be more effective and satisfying than contingent rewarding, contingent rewarding is more effective and satisfying than managing by exception, and managing by exception is more effective and satisfying than laissez-faire leadership. Transformational leadership tends to add to the effects of transactional leadership, not substitute for the latter. The ideals and implicit theories of leadership tend to be transformational rather than transactional. Borrowing from Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) and Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993), to refute the transactional-transformational distinction will require finding conditions, cultures, and organizations in which trust between the leader and the led is unimportant and the led have no concern for self-esteem, intrinsic motivation, consistency in self-concept, actions taken for the leader, or meaningfulness in their work and lives. Such contexts are likely to prove to be the exception rather than the rule.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N. J. (1984). Understanding ways of understanding: Cross-cultural management methodology reviewed. *Advances in International Comparative Management*, 1, 31-67.

- Al-Anazi, F. B. (1993). *The relationship between new leadership styles and organization: An empirical investigation of transformational and transactional leadership*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, England.
- Aparo, A. (1993). Multidimensional management. *Isvor Notizie*, VII(17), 6–8.
- Arnold, J. W. (1990). *A comparison of home care nursing supervisors' self-described leadership styles and staff nurses' descriptions of the supervisors' leadership styles*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Akron.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). *The Full Range of Leadership Development: Basic/advanced manuals*. Binghamton, NY: Bass/Avolio and Associates.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1994). *Evaluate the impact of the Full Range of Leadership Training: Final report to the Kellogg Foundation*. Binghamton: State University of New York at Binghamton, Center for Leadership Studies.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). *Team leadership, team development and effectiveness: Final report to the Eisenhower Fund*. Binghamton: State University of New York at Binghamton, Center for Leadership Studies.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1996). *Replicated confirmatory factor analyses of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X; Rev.; CLS Tech. Rep. No. 96-1)*. Binghamton: State University of New York at Binghamton, Center for Leadership Studies.
- Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., & Einstein, W. O. (1988). Transformational leadership in a management game simulation. *Group and Organization Studies*, 13, 59–80.
- Badran M., & Hinings, B. (1981). Strategies of administrative control and contextual constraints in a less-developed country: The case of Egyptian public enterprise. *Group and Organization Studies*, 2, 3–21.
- Bass, B. M. (1960). *Leadership, psychology and organizational behavior*. New York: Harper.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and management applications* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1996). *A new paradigm of leadership: An inquiry into transformational leadership*. Washington, DC: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1989). Potential biases in leadership measures: How prototypes, leniency, and general satisfaction relate to ratings and rankings of transformational and transactional leadership constructs. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 49, 509–527.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Training and development of transformational leadership: Looking to 1992 and beyond. *European Journal of Industrial Training*, 14, 21–27.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1991). *The diffusion of transformational leadership in organizational settings*. Turin, Italy: ISVOR-Fiat.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993a). Transformational leadership and organizational structure. *International Journal of Public Administration Quarterly*, 17, 112–121.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993b). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 49–80). New York: Academic Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Goodheim, L. (1987). Biography and the assessment of transformational leadership at the world-class level. *Journal of Management*, 13, 7–19.
- Bass, B. M., Burger, P. C., Doktor, R., & Barrett, G. (1979). *Assessment of managers: An international comparison*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B., & Yokochi, N. (1991, Winter/Spring). Charisma among senior executives and the special case of Japanese CEO's. *Consulting Psychology Bulletin*, 1, 31–38.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Boyd, J. T., Jr. (1988). *Leadership extraordinary: A cross national military perspective on transactional versus transformational leadership*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova University.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 468–478.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637–647.
- Curphy, G. I. (1990). *An empirical study of Bass's (1985) theory of transformational and transactional leadership*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Campus.
- Davis, D. D. (1994, July). *A test of Bass's model of transformational leadership in the Dominican Republic*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Congress of Applied Psychology, Madrid, Spain.
- Davis, D. D., Guan, P. L., Luo, J. J., & Maahs, C. J. (1996). *Need for continuous improvement, organizational citizenship, transformational leadership and service climate in a Chinese enterprise*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Den Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J., & Koopman, P. (1994, July). *Transactional vs. transformational leadership*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Congress of Applied Psychology, Madrid, Spain.
- Dorfman, P. W. (1994, April). *Cross-cultural research: Issues and assumptions*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Nashville, TN.
- Dorfman, P. W. (1996). International and cross-cultural leadership. In J. Punnett & O. Shanker (Eds.), *Handbook for international management research* (pp. 267–349). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P. (1988). Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns. *Advances in International Comparative Management*, 3, 127–150.
- Dorfman, P. W., & Ronen, S. (1991, August). *The universality of leadership theories: Challenges and paradoxes*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Miami Beach, FL.
- Druskat, V. U. (1994). Gender and leadership style: Transformational and transactional leadership in the Roman Catholic Church. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 99–119.
- Earley, P. C. (1988, April). *Contributions of intercultural research to the understanding of performance feedback*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, TX.
- England, G. W. (1976). *The manager and his values: An international perspective*. Cambridge, MA: Balinger.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1983). The contingency model—A reply to Ashour. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 9, 356–368.
- Garcia, J. L. (1995). *Transformational leadership processes and salesperson performance effectiveness*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Gaspar, S. (1992). *Transformational leadership: An integrative review of the literature*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University.
- Graen, G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1991). The transformation of professionals into self-managing and partially self-designing contributors: Toward a theory of leadership making. *Journal of Management Systems*, X, 25–39.
- Haire, M., Ghiselli, E., & Porter, L. (1966). *Managerial thinking: An international study*. New York: Wiley.
- Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Supervisors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 695–702.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). *Management of organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hollander, E. P. (1986). On the central role of leadership processes. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 35, 39–52.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321–338.

- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 199–272). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R. J. (1995). Leadership in the twenty-first century: A speculative inquiry. In A. Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work* (pp. 411–450). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 891–902.
- Jung, D. I., Bass, B. M., & Sosik, J. (1995). Collectivism and transformational leadership. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 2*, 3–18.
- Kennedy, D. A. (1994, July). *Effective workplace leadership skills of an offshore first-line supervisor*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Congress of Applied Psychology, Madrid, Spain.
- Kissinger, H. (1994). *Diplomacy*. New York: Random House.
- Koh, W. (1990). *An empirical validation of the theory of transformational leadership in secondary schools in Singapore*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Concordia.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levinson, H. (1980). Power, leadership, and the management of stress. *Professional Psychology, 11*, 497–508.
- Lonner, W. J. (1980). The search for psychological universals. In H. C. Triandis & W. W. Lambert (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 143–204). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*, 385–391.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.
- Misumi, J. (1985). *The behavioral science of leadership: An interdisciplinary research program*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Molero Alonso, F. (1994). *Carisma y liderazgo carismático: Una aproximación empírica desde las perspectivas de Bass y Friedman* [Charisma and leadership: An empirical bringing together of the perspectives of Bass and Friedman]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Madrid, Spain.
- Murdock, G. (1967). *Ethnographic atlas*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Offerman, L. R., Kennedy, J. K., & Wirtz, P. W. (1994). Implicit theories: Content, structure and generalizability. *Leadership Quarterly, 5*, 43–58.
- Onnen, M. K. (1987). *The relationship of clergy and leadership characteristics to growing or declining churches*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville.
- Patterson, C., Fuller, J. B., Kester, K., & Stringer, D. Y. (1995, May). *A meta-analytic examination of leadership style and selected follower compliance outcomes*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.
- Pereira, D. (1986, July). *Transactional and transformational leadership scores of executives in a large Indian engineering firm*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Congress of Applied Psychology, Jerusalem.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*, 107–142.
- Rose, R. (1995). Genes and human behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology, 46*, 625–654.
- Salter, D. J. (1989). *Leadership styles in the United States Marine Corps transport helicopter squadrons*. Unpublished master's thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA.
- Sashkin, M. (1988). The visionary leader. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 122–160). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schwarzkopf, N. A. (1994, July 21). *Hitler and Stalin: Legacy of hate* [Interview by C. Kuralt]. New York: CBS Television.
- Shamir, B. (1991). Meaning, self and motivation in organizations. *Organization Studies, 12*, 405–424.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science, 4*, 577–594.
- Singer, M. S., & Singer, A. E. (1990). Situational constraints on transformational versus transactional leadership behavior, subordinates' leadership preference, and satisfaction. *Journal of Social Psychology, 130*, 385–396.
- Sinha, J. (1984). A model of effective leadership styles in India. *International Studies of Management and Organization, 14*, 86–98.
- Smith, P. B., Misumi, J. J., Tayeb, M., Peterson, M., & Bond, M. (1989). On the generality of leadership style measures across cultures. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 62*, 97–109.
- Steyrer, J., & Mende, M. (1994, July). *Transformational leadership: The local market success of Austrian branch bank managers and training applications*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Congress of Applied Psychology, Madrid, Spain.
- Waldman, D., Bass, B. M., & Einstein, W. O. (1986). *Effort, performance and transformational leadership in industrial and military settings* (Working Paper 84-78). Binghamton: State University of New York.
- Weathersby, R. (1993). Sri Lankan managers' leadership conceptualizations as a function of ego development. In J. Demick & P. M. Miller (Eds.), *Development in the workplace* (pp. 67–89). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Williamson, O. E. (1975). *Markets and hierarchies*. New York: Free Press.
- Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers: Some preliminary findings. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measure of leadership* (pp. 151–169). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Yokochi, N. (1989). *Leadership styles of Japanese business executives and managers: Transformational and transactional*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, United States International University, San Diego, CA.