Followers' personality, transformational leadership and performance

Followers' Personality, Transformational Leadership and Performance

Emma Soane

Department of Management

London School of Economics and Political Science

Houghton Street

London WC2A 2AE

Phone: +44 (0) 20 7405 7686

Email: e.c.soane@lse.ac.uk

Christina Butler

Department of Leadership, HRM & Organisation

Faculty of Business and Law

Kingston University

Kingston Hill

Kingston-upon-Thames

Surrey KT2 7lB

Phone: +44 (0) 84175123

Email: Christina.butler@kingston.ac.uk

Dr Emma Stanton

South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust

Maudsley Hospital,

Denmark Hill,

London

SE5 8AZ

Phone: +44 (0) 7789 950 774

Email: dremmastanton@gmail.com

Abstract

Purpose

Effective leadership is important to performance in both organisational and sporting arenas. We theorised that follower personality would influence perceptions of leadership, and that perceived effective leadership would be associated with performance. We drew on Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), transformational leadership and personality theory to develop a research model designed to assess leadership effectiveness and performance. The current study tested the research model in a sporting context.

Design/methodology

The context of the research was a round the world sailing race, a 10 month competitive circumnavigation with ten identical boats. Quantitative data were gathered concerning participants' personality, their perceptions of transformational leadership, and boat performance. Qualitative data on transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness were gathered from a subsample of crew members.

Findings

Results showed that transformational leadership was associated with leadership effectiveness and performance. Personality influenced perceptions of leadership and, for moderate performing boats, there were associations between perceptions of leadership and performance.

Research implications/limitations

The data have implications for the extension of transformational leadership theory. Further consideration of follower personality could enhance leadership effectiveness. A limitation is the relatively small scale of the study.

Practical implications

The main implication is that leaders should take follower personality into account, and adapt their leadership style accordingly. Doing so has consequences for performance.

Originality/value

This novel study examined personality, leadership, and performance and has implications for enhancing leadership and performance in sports and business.

Key words: Transformational leadership; personality; leadership effectiveness; performance; sailing

Performance is a fundamental goal for business leaders and sports coaches. Psychology theory has a significant role in understanding how leaders and followers can work together yielding high performance. One recent development in leadership theory building is the focus on followership and how followers' perceptions of leadership influence performance (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Ehrhart & Klein, 2001; Judge & Bono, 2000). These models rest on the assumption that effective leadership is due to both leaders' behaviours and the impact these behaviours have on followers' information processing (Lord & Emrich, 2000). Social Identity Theory (SIT, Tajfel & Turner, 1986) provides a mechanism to explain this process since it concerns the perception of fit between leaders and followers. When a leader is considered to fit with a follower's prototypical view then the leader will be accepted and the follower is more likely to engage in high performance behaviours. However, follower perceptions show individual differences (Schyns & Sanders, 2007) that are not fully modelled in SIT alone, necessitating a supplementary approach.

Prior research has shown that personality is one source of individual differences that could add to explanations of perception (Schyns & Felfe, 2006). Recent work by Felfe and Schyns (2010) acknowledged that additional longitudinal research is required to examine further the causal relationship between follower personality and perceptions of leadership, and to examine the impact on performance, two issues addressed in the current research.

A second development is the application of models developed in the sporting arena (O'Broin & Palmer, 2006). For example, recent research has examined organisational commitment and performance of intercollegiate coaches (Turner & Chelladurai, 2005) and satisfaction and commitment of collegiate coaches (Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003). A study of intercollegiate athletes showed that

transformational leadership and the leader-member relationship were associated with organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). A general theme of this literature is that there are important parallels between business and sporting contexts. Business leaders can be considered as corporate athletes and sports coaches must demonstrate leadership (Burnes & O'Donnell, 2011). The sports context thus provides an opportunity to extend theory and to test a new model in an environment that enables assessment of perceptions of leadership as well as objective performance.

The current research examined performance in a competitive sporting context. We drew upon the transformational and transactional leadership model (Bass & Avolio, 1990, 2000) to explain how leaders' skills and behaviours influence performance; and Social Identity Theory (SIT, Tajfel & Turner, 1986) to explain how followers perceive leaders and how these perceptions influence followers' responses and their potential for performance. We also applied the five factor model of personality (Digman, 1990) to provide a robust framework for individual differences that could complement the SIT approach and provide additional understanding of the processes that influence followers' perceptions of, and responses to, leaders and how these factors influence performance. In doing so, we contribute to the literature by providing a novel approach to theorizing about performance. The model was tested in a ten-month round the world competitive sailing race where the participants are crew who are amateur sailors with business and management experience led by professional skippers. Performance could be assessed by placement of each boat in a series of races that were components of the circumnavigation. Performance is influenced by skipper decision making (e.g. coping with conditions) and crew management. We applied a mixed method approach, gathering quantitative and

qualitative data. Thus the research makes two empirical contributions to the literature by adding a qualitative perspective to the typically quantitative research into personality and leadership, and by gaining insights into the little-explored context of competitive sailing races with a long time frame that enables significant development of team working and leadership, similar to business and management contexts.

Leading for high performance requires an understanding of the relationship between leaders and followers (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999). A growing field of research examines how perceptions of leadership influence followers' responses to leaders and their performance. Within this field, there has been a focus on transformational leadership (e.g. Kent & Chelladurai, 2001) which has a substantial theoretical and empirical tradition. The transformational and transactional model of leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990, 2000) provides a taxonomy of leader behaviours that are associated with effectiveness and high performance. Transformational leadership comprises idealised influence, inspirational motivation, individualised consideration and intellectual stimulation. Bass and Avolio (1990, 2000) proposed that transformational leaders are effective because they raise the level of awareness of followers about the importance of achieving valued outcomes; provide a vision and strategy; encourage followers to transcend their own self-interest for the sake of the team, organisation or larger collective; and, they expand followers‟ portfolio of needs by raising their awareness to improve themselves and what they are attempting to accomplish. Transformational leaders also align individual and organisational goals (Judge & Bono, 2000). Transformational leadership is complemented by one positive form of transactional leadership: contingent reward involves giving followers rewards for fulfilling obligations

In contrast, less effective leadership is characterised by management-by-exception active (error monitoring) and management-by-exception passive (dealing with errors when brought to the leader's attention). Non-leadership, or a 'laissez faire' style, is withdrawal from leadership responsibilities. Empirical study has shown associations with high performance and positive outcomes for followers (Antonakis et al, 2003; Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). In the current study, the focus was on perceived transformational leadership because of the potential significance of the social identity process on perceived leadership, effectiveness and performance.

Personality is a significant source of individual variation in perception and behaviour that is relevant to the study of leadership. The five factor model (Digman, 1990) categorises personality into five sets of stable traits, each comprising six facets arranged along bipolar continua (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Neuroticism encompasses anxiety, pessimism and stress coping. Extraversion comprises sociability, dominance sensation seeking and positive emotions. Openness characterises tendencies for abstract thinking and interest in emotions. Agreeableness encompasses trust, altruism, and co-operation. Conscientiousness consists of preparedness, achievement striving and deliberation.

Personality is important for the study of effective leadership for three reasons. First, personality theory suggests that some traits are likely to be associated with both the motivation to be a leader, and ability to perform leadership behaviors (Judge & Bono, 2000). Judge et al's (2002) meta-analysis confirmed this. The personality profile of a typical effective leader was emotionally stable (low neuroticism), extravert, open, conscientious and agreeable (the weakest associate). Second, personality has relevance to the SIT process. Personality shapes a lens through which other people are perceived and which can determine preferences in interpersonal

relationships (Costa & McCrae, 1992). It is one source of individual variation that can influence the relationship between transformational leadership and outcomes of leadership (Walumba, Avolio & Zhu, 2008). Individuals are oriented to affirm their self-concept, and relationships characterised by similar personality traits fulfil this need (Keller, 1999; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Empirical studies have verified this proposition (Keller, 1999; Phillips & Bedeian, 1994). For example, Felfe and Schyns (2006) found that extravert followers rated transformational leadership highly and perceived this type of leadership as more positive than more introvert followers.

Furthermore, Felfe and Schynes (2010) propose that similarity is the main process through which SIT functions. We build upon this approach and propose that personality traits will influence perceptions of effective leadership. Specifically, we suggest that followers characterised by low scores in neuroticism, and high scores in extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness will have positive perceptions of leaders due to the fit between their characteristics and the typical profile of an effective leader (Judge et al, 2002) and in accordance with SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1986, 2001). Agreeableness did not show a strong directional association with leadership effectiveness in the Judge et al. (2002) study, however, we suggest that followers with high scores in neuroticism and low scores in agreeableness are likely to have less positive perceptions of leadership due to the nature of these traits (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Tamir, 2005).

Third, personality can influence performance. Moynihan and Peterson (2001) argued that the ideal configuration of personality traits in a team depends upon the requirements of the team, however they acknowledge that some traits contribute to performance in a range of situations. Following Moynihan and Peterson (2001), we propose that teams scoring high in agreeableness will be cohesive. This could be

relevant to performance in a competitive team context where working together is essential. We also suggest teams characterised by conscientiousness have a strong goal focus which can also contribute to performance. The relationships between the other traits and performance might not be so clear-cut due to the contingencies that influence the circumstances under which specific traits function to enhance performance.

Method

The research method was designed to gather information from two key sources (race participants and performance data) at different points in time (before, during and after the race) using two approaches (quantitative and qualitative). Although studies of personality are typically quantitative (Borman, et al., 2003), the addition of qualitative data enabled in-depth examination of *how*, rather than simply *what*, perceptions were experienced (Denzen & Lincoln, 2011; Miles & Huberman, 1994). The context for this research was the nine month competitive circumnavigation by ten identical boats. The race was divided into seven 'legs', each of which was approximately six weeks in duration. Each boat had a professional skipper and up to 17 amateur crew. Crew members represented a range of occupational backgrounds, ages, levels of seniority and each was a mix of men and women. Crew members self-selected into one of two categories: round the world crew who participated in the entire race and 'leggers' who participated in one or more 'legs' of the race. The race organisers allocated crews to each boat to ensure a mix of skills. Race performance was influenced by a range of leadership-related factors, such as decisions about

location of crew members to roles, routes, sail configurations and managing conditions e.g. rough seas.

Participants and procedure

There were 122 participants in the quantitative element of the study (34 women, 27.9%; 88 men, 72.1%; mean age = 41.03 years; range = 18-65 , sd = 11.17), a response rate of 33%. Of the 122 participants, 34 (28%) completed the organisational background section of the survey. Data showed that participants worked in a range of occupational groups and levels of seniority. Crew members' sailing experience varied (mean = 11.84 years, range = 0–49 years, sd = 12.71 years), as did experience of being a skipper in other contexts (mean = 9.79 years, range = 0–30, sd = 8.56 years). Qualitative data were gathered from 52 crew members (18 women and 34 men) at the end of the race, 40 of whom had also participated in the quantitative phase. Of the 52, 29 participated by email only, 16 by email and phone, 5 by phone only, and 2 face to face (due to proximity to the research team).

Prior to the race all crew members were sent a letter inviting them to participate in the research, a short demographic questionnaire and the NEO PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992). During the race, all crew on each leg were invited to complete the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire rating their skipper. To control for the effects of experience, responses used were from the first leg in which crew members raced. After the race, all crew members were invited to be interviewed either by phone, or to complete the same set of questions by email. Each qualitative phase participant’s response was coded for overall leadership effectiveness (low, moderate, high) and overall positioning on the transformational leadership continuum (low, moderate, high). Coding was carried out independently by each of the three authors of this study. Across the qualitative data set, agreement among the three raters

was greater than 90%. The initial qualitative data set therefore consisted of 52 data points for each of the two leadership constructs.

Measures

Personality was assessed using the NEO PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992). 240-items measure each of the five factors of personality. Each item was a statement rated by a five-point Likert scale with a response range of 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. Trait scores were the mean of relevant item sets (48 items per factor). Continuous trait variables were used in the correlation and regression analyses. Personality trait data were also used to categorise participants into one of three groups: high scoring (more than one standard deviation above the mean), moderate (within one standard deviation of the mean) or low scoring (more than one standard deviation below the mean). These categories were used in the qualitative analysis phase to examine associations between personality and perceived leadership.

Transformational leadership was assessed with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ, Bass & Avolio, 2000). Four items measured each of: idealised influence; intellectual stimulation; individualised consideration; inspirational motivation. Items were in the format of a statement rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'not at all' to 'frequently'. Scales were the mean scores of the relevant item sets.

Leadership effectiveness was also assessed in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2000). There were three components: extra effort as a result of leadership (3 items); leadership effectiveness (4 items); satisfaction with the leader‟s behaviour (2 items). Items had the same format and response range as above and scales were formed from mean scores of item sets. Following Schyns and Sanders (2007), we created two new scales. *Transformational leadership* was the mean of all

the transformational leadership scales. *Leadership effectiveness* was the mean of the effectiveness, extra effort and satisfaction scales.

Performance was measured by the position of each boat for the leg that each participant's data related to. 1 represents maximum performance (winning). For example, a participant in leg 3 rated their perceptions of leadership for leg 3, and that was related to the performance of their boat in leg 3. This process was to ensure appropriate matching of data.

Perceived leadership (qualitative) was assessed using interview questions. Questions were derived from MLQ transformational leadership items, with one question for each area.

Results

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics and correlations for the variables in the research model.

Insert Table 1 about here

The transformational leadership and leadership outcomes were associated significantly with each other ($r = .87$, $p < .001$), and transformational leadership was associated with extraversion ($r = .21$, $p < .05$). Performance was associated with agreeableness ($r = -.25$, $p < .05$; the relationship is negative since high scores in agreeableness were associated with winning where 1 = first place).

Next, we considered the homogeneity of perceived leadership and leadership outcomes for each of the skippers. Table 2 shows the single measures intraclass correlation coefficients which provide an index of the consistency of a group of raters for each boat. Boat performance is also shown.

Insert Table 2 about here

The intraclass correlation coefficient data show that there was variation among raters for transformational leadership and the outcomes of leadership for most skippers. However, when considered in the context of performance, agreement was strongest for the highest performing boat, and for the lower performing boats. These data indicated that team member personality could be a factor in ratings of leadership, particularly within the context of moderate to low performance.

Regression analyses were carried out to examine; the associations between follower personality and transformational leadership, leadership effectiveness; boat performance. The outcomes of leadership scale was omitted due to a strong, positive association with perceived transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness.

Insert Table 3 about here

The results show that the research model accounted for 9% of the variance in transformational leadership, 10% of the variance in leadership effectiveness, and 11% of the variance in performance. Perceived transformational leadership was associated positively with extraversion ($\beta = .27$, $p < .05$). Perceived leadership effectiveness was associated positively with extraversion ($\beta = .24$, $p < .05$) and negatively with openness ($\beta = -.26$, $p < 05$). Performance was associated high levels of agreeableness ($\beta = -.23$, $p < .05$).

The relationships were explored further using the qualitative data. Leading qualitative analysis protocols (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Miles & Huberman, 1994) were drawn upon. The meaning of each construct and degrees thereof (low, moderate, high) were discussed and agreed in advance by the three raters. Interview transcripts and email responses were carefully read and systematically reviewed for meaning and then coded for each leadership construct by each rater independently. Lastly ratings

were compared and discrepancies discussed among the three raters until agreement was reached. Coding for the two leadership constructs showed extremely high 'face' correlation. Where a skipper was evaluated by a participant as low on effort, satisfaction and effectiveness, that skipper was also evaluated as exhibiting less transformational behaviour. There were similar relationships between moderate and high effort, satisfaction and effectiveness and moderate and high transformational behavior. The two constructs were therefore collapsed into one single rating of leadership style effectiveness along a continuum from 'less effective' to 'moderately effective' to 'more effective'.

Results showed a strong relationship between the effectiveness of the skipper's leadership style and overall boat performance. Two patterns are evident. First, a more coarse grained analysis across the population as a whole reveals that the best performing boats had 'more effective' leaders and the worst performing boats had 'less effective' leaders. The top two boats, Boats 1 and 2, had skippers who were rated as exhibiting 'more effective' leadership styles; the bottom two boats, Boats 9 and 10, had skippers who were rated as exhibiting 'less effective' leadership styles; moderately performing boats, Boats 3-8, had skippers with a range of leadership effectiveness ratings. For moderate performing boats, followers' overall perceived effectiveness of leadership style seems to be key to overall performance.

To understand *how* followers' perception of leadership style effectiveness was related to end-of-race overall performance, participant evaluations from each boat were considered together to place each boat on a continuum of overall crew perception of leadership style effectiveness against overall end-of-race overall boat performance. Five skippers were rated by all participants on their boats as exhibiting a leadership style which was 'less effective'. One skipper was evaluated as exhibiting a

‘moderately effective’ leadership style and four skippers were evaluated as exhibiting moderately to highly effective leadership styles (‘most effective’ on our rating scale). Agreement among participants from each boat of this second set of five boats was moderately high, as reflected in the Table 2 data. For three boats, there was agreement among all but one participant. In the other two cases, participant agreement was split with approximately 50% of participants rating the skipper’s style as ‘moderately effective’ and 50% of the participants rating the skipper’s style as ‘more effective’.

Participants who rated their skippers as exhibiting a ‘less effective’ leadership style provided examples of their skipper criticizing/ignoring crew members. The leadership style of the skipper who was rated by members of his crew as ‘moderately effective’ was illustrated with examples that used a mixture of praise and criticism/indifference. One Boat 3 crew member commented that, while the skipper suggested ways to improve when the crew made a mistake, the skipper did not seem to notice when the crew worked hard. Participants who rated their skippers as ‘more effective’ illustrated the relevant skipper’s leadership style with many examples demonstrating the skipper’s ability to show individualized consideration. The skipper of Boat 1 was reported to have thanked a crew member regularly for that person’s contribution, discussing mistakes when they occurred, but never ‘having a go’. Boat crews reporting a ‘more effective’ leadership style also provided evidence for a mix of individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation. One Boat 6 crew member told us that when a crew member made a mistake the skipper clearly explained to the crew member what the mistake was as well as the consequences of the error. However, there were relatively few examples of inspirational motivation amongst the skippers and only one participant discussed idealized influence.

A more fine-grained analysis within performance categories high (Boats 1-4), moderate (Boats 5-8), and low (Boats 9-10) revealed that perceptions of leadership effectiveness made a difference to relative within-category performance. Of the high performing boats, Boat 1 and 2 had 'more effective' skippers, Boat 3 had a 'moderately effective' leader and Boat 4 had a 'less effective' leader. Of the moderate performing boats, Boats 6 and 7 had 'more effective' skippers and Boat 8 had a 'less effective' skipper. Boat 5, the one data point anomaly of this analysis, also had a 'less effective' skipper. This is also the boat from which we had the fewest participants overall and so it is possible that this particular result is not representative of the boat. Of the two low performing boats, both had skippers with 'less effective' leadership styles. Given similar overall team skill levels, differences in followers' perception of leadership style effectiveness seem to make a difference to relative performance (i.e., within performance categories). The more effective is the perception of leadership style, the better the performance. From this second pattern, we can tentatively conclude that individual follower personality as well as mix of personalities within the crew may make a difference to incremental performance.

An examination of interview data categorised by high, moderate and low personality trait scores showed some support for this argument. Low scores in neuroticism were associated with positive perceptions of transformational leadership:

"The skipper was good, positive, instilled confidence."

Conversely, high scores in neuroticism were associated with negative perceptions.

"I felt uncertainty and a lack of confidence. I needed more individual feedback."

Introvert crew members found it difficult to engage in discussions with their skipper.

"[The skipper] didn't really connect with individuals"

Extravert crew members were focused on the interactions with their skipper. Many of the extraverts commented on how they would have liked more communication and greater interpersonal skills from their skipper.

"In his own way he has taught me a lot about sailing and I hope I have taught him something about managing and motivating people."

Participants with low scores in openness had preferences for standardized approaches to decision making that could fit with their own practical style.

"I tried to introduce a more formalized method of decision making, based on that we use at work."

High scores in openness were associated with a more involved, discussion based preference for decision making, and an appreciation of this style from leaders. A crew member with a low score in agreeableness was very negative about the leadership on his boat.

"The challenge was with the skipper not the sailing."

In contrast, crew members with high scores in agreeableness commented on the role of the skipper in managing team cohesion.

> "I enjoyed the sailing…but I wish the skipper could have been fairer and more educational…The skipper should resolve issues."

Participants with high conscientiousness scores showed their willingness to work hard, and to be committed and focused.

> "I have a lot of respect for our skipper who was extremely inspirational and mature for his age. He worked hard on bringing everyone together and canvassing openly opinions on issues and options."

In summary, the patterns of associations between transformational leadership, leadership effectiveness, personality and performance showed some support for our propositions. Quantitative and qualitative data showed that positive views of transformational leadership were associated significantly with leadership effectiveness. Personality seemed to influence perceptions of transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness thus, potentially, also influencing performance.

Discussion

We proposed that Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) would underpin the process through which followers' personality would influence their perceptions of transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness, and that these factors would have a positive influence on performance. We discuss each of the five personality factors and their influence on perceived leadership and performance. We start with the factor that showed the strongest relationship, extraversion. Prior theory has proposed that extraversion gives a strong positive focus (Keller, 1999; Watson & Clark, 1997) and this might colour their evaluations of leadership. Extraversion is particularly relevant to leader-follower relations since they depend on interpersonal relationships (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Ehrhart & Klein, 2001; Felfe & Schyns,

2006). From an SIT perspective, extraversion fits typical leader profiles (Judge et al, 2002) and influences social interaction, thus providing opportunities for the expression of the leader-follower relationship and a positive view of it. Quantitative and qualitative data from the current study showed that extravert followers had more positive perceptions of their skippers.

Openness had a negative association with leadership effectiveness: people with low scores in openness rated their skipper as more effective. The qualitative data showed that people with high scores in openness appreciated a creative, intellectual approach to decision making, and they tended not to be satisfied with this aspect of leadership. While openness is typically associated with leadership effectiveness (Judge et al, 2002), our finding fits with the Social Identity Theory process. It is possible that the skippers tended not to have a participative, discussion-oriented style of leadership and this was appreciated by crew members with similarly low scores in openness, but not by those with high scores in this trait.

The quantitative neuroticism data showed no significant results. However, qualitative data showed that people with high scores in neuroticism were not satisfied with the leadership they received. The pattern of associations does not support Yukl‟s (1999) and Conger and Kanungo‟s (1998) suggestion that anxious people require charismatic leadership. It seems possible that charisma might be a necessary components of transformational leadership, but is insufficient for high performance, and that additional aspects of transformational leadership are required to satisfy more anxious followers' dislike of the uncertainty that could be associated with visionary, transformational leadership (Tamir, 2005). This finding supports our proposition that the nature of neuroticism influences perceptions of leadership such that similarity is not the most significant ingredient of effective leadership. Rather, to be effective, a

leader must counter the anxieties prevalent in followers with high scores in neuroticism thus enhancing empowerment rather than creating dependency (Kark, Shamir & Chen, 2003).

The qualitative agreeableness data suggested that this personality factor could influence perceptions of leadership in two ways. Low scorers in agreeableness could have a tough minded and challenging approach to any style of leadership (Costa & McCrae, 1992). High scorers could seek co-operation with their leaders (Ehrhart & Klein, 2001). Both of these approaches have some support from the qualitative data and, when considered together, could suggest why there are few clear directional associations between follower agreeableness and perceptions of leadership. However, agreeableness was related positively to performance suggesting that team cohesion was important to performance (Moynihan & Peterson, 2001).

The fifth personality factor, conscientiousness, has emerged in previous research to have some significance for leadership skills and effectiveness (Judge et al, 2002). Qualitative data from the current study showed that people with high scores in conscientiousness appreciate a similarly goal-focused leader.

The current study has practical implications for leaders. The data emphasise the relevance of followers' personality to perceptions of transformational leadership and thus the mechanism though which leaders' influence functions. The data also shed light onto the role of personality in performance as a consequence of leadership. The current study employed mixed methods and longitudinal data gathering. However, the sample size is small, numbers of participants varied between boats, and the context is relatively unusual. Similar research in different sporting and organisational contexts would be useful.

Summary

The current study showed that follower personality is relevant to perceptions of transformational leadership and leadership effectiveness. The qualitative data also demonstrated that followers' overall perceived effectiveness of leadership style seems to be key to overall performance. Furthermore, followers' agreeableness was significantly associated with performance, highlighting the relevance of a co-operative approach and an agreeable outlook on leadership.

For more moderate performing boats, individual follower personality as well as mix of personalities within the crew may make a difference to overall performance. Further, differences in followers' perception of leadership style effectiveness seem to make a difference to relative performance. Therefore, individual follower personality as well as mix of personalities within the crew may make a difference to incremental performance in terms of both overall and relative standing (i.e., within performance categories).

The data suggest that in both sporting and organisational arenas, enhanced consideration of follower personality and concurrent adaptability in leadership style could lead to more positive perceptions of transformational leadership, more effective leadership outcomes and performance.

References

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B.J. and Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003), "Context and leadership: an examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 14, pp. 261-295.

Bass, B. and Avolio, B. (1990), "The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development", *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Vol. 4, pp. 231-272.

Bass, B. and Avolio, B. (2000), "*MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Technical Report",* Mind Garden Inc., Redwood City, CA.

Borman, W., Ilgen, D., Klimoski, R., and Weiner, I. (2003). *"Handbook of Psychology, Volume 12, Industrial and Organizational Psychology",* John Wiley: Oxford.

Burnes, B. and O'Donnell, H. (2011). "What can business leaders learn from sport?", *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 1, pp. 12-27.

Chelladurai, P. and Ogasawara, E. (2001). "Satisfaction and commitment of American and Japanese collegiate coaches", *Journal of Sport Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 62-73.

Conger, J.A. and Kanungo, R.N. (1998), "*Charismatic leadership in organizations",* Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Costa, P.T. and McCrae, R.R. (1992), "*NEO PI-R and NEO-FFI Professional Manual",* Psychological Assessment Resources Inc, Odessa, FLA.

Denzin, N.K., and Lincoln, Y.S. (2011). "*The SAGE Handbook of qualitative research", (4th ed.),* Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Digman, J.M. (1990), "Personality structure - emergence of the 5-factor model", *Annual Review Of Psychology*, 41, pp. 417-440.

Ehrhart, M.G. and Klein, K.J. (2001), "Predicting followers' preferences for charismatic leadership: the influence of follower values and personality", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.12, pp. 153-179.

Felfe, J. and Schyns, B. (2006), "Personality and the perception of transformational leadership: The impact of extraversion, neuroticism, personal need for structure, and occupational self-efficacy", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol.36, pp. 708-739.

Felfe, J. and Schyns, B. (2010), "Followers' personality and the perception of transformational leadership: Further evidence for the similarity hypothesis", *British Journal of Management*, Vol.21, pp. 393-410.

Judge, T.A. and Bono, J.E. (2000), "Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 85, pp. 751-765.

Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Illies, R. and Gerhardt, M.W. (2002), "Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87, pp. 765-780.

Kark, R. Shamir, B. and Chen, G. (2003), "The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and Dependency", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88, pp. 246-255.

Keller, T. (1999), "Images of the familiar: Individual differences and implicit leadership theories", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.10, pp. 589-607.

Kent, A. and Chelladurai, P. (2001), "Perceived transformational leadership, organisational commitment, and citizenship behavior: A case study in intercollegiate athletics", *Journal of Sport Management*, Vol. 15, pp. 135-159.

Lord, R.G. and Emrich, C.G. (2000), "Thinking outside the box by looking inside the box: extending the cognitive revolution in leadership research", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 11, pp. 551-579.

Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K.G. and Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996), "Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 7, pp. 385-425.

Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (1994), *"Qualitative Data Analysis"*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moynihan, L.M. and Peterson, R.S. (2001), "A contingent configuration approach to understanding the role of personality in organizational groups", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 23, pp. 327-378.

O'Broin, A. and Palmer, S. (2006), "Win-win situation? Learning from parallels and differences between coaching psychology and sport psychology", *The Coaching Psychologist*, Vol. 2, pp. 17-23.

Phillips, A.S. and Bedeian, A.G. (1994), "Leader-follower exchange quality: The role of personal and interpersonal attributes", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37, pp. 990-1001.

Schyns, B. and Sanders, K. (2007), "In the eyes of the beholder: Personality and the perception of leadership", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 37, pp. 2345-2363.

Shamir, B., House, R.J. and Arthur, M.B. (1993), "The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory", *Organization Science*, Vol. 4, pp. 577-594.

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. C. (1986). "The social identity theory of inter-group behavior". In S. Worchel and L. W. Austin (eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chigago: Nelson-Hall.

Tamir, M. (2005), "Don't worry, be happy? Neuroticism, trait-consistent affect regulation, and performance", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 89, pp. 449 – 461.

Turner, B.A. and Chelladurai, P. (2005), "Organizational and occupational commitment, intention to leave and perceived performance of intercollegiate coaches", *Journal of Sport Management*, Vol. 19, pp193-211.

Watson, D. and Clark, L.A. (1997), "Extraversion and its positive emotional core". In: R. Hogan, R. Johnson, and S. Briggs (Eds). *Handbook of Personality Psychology*, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, pp 767-793.

Yukl, G. (1999), "An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformation and charismatic leadership theories", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 10, pp. 285-305.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics and correlations between personality, perceived leadership and boat performance

	Mean	SD	Alpha	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Neuroticism	71.18	20.09	.82							
2. Extraversion	117.54	18.25	.73	-.27**						
3. Openness	120.01	18.68	.71	-.12	.39***					
4. Agreeableness	126.14	13.96	.67	-.15	.08	.12				
5. Conscientiousness	124.64	19.39	.85	-.47***	.35**	.07	.10			
6. Transformational leadership	2.86	.71	.91	-.14	.21*	-.03	.11	.02		
7. Leadership effectiveness	2.97	.82	.91	-.07	.11	-.15	.10	-.07	.87***	
8. Performance†	5.01	2.77	N/A	.15	-.19	-.16	-.25*	-.06	-.06	--.12

† 1 = maximum performance

* p < 0.05 level; ** p < .01 level; *** p < .001 level;

N=90

Table 2: Intraclass correlations for perceived leadership and leadership outcomes, and performance data for each skipper

Skipper	Transformational leadership	Leadership effectiveness	Mean performance
1	.72***	.73***	2.38
2	.83***	.44***	2.65
3	.32***	.30***	2.67
4	.62***	.19***	4.67
5	.64***	.49***	4.92
6	.48***	.51***	5.75
7	.64***	.42***	5.85
8	.83***	.81***	6.00
9	.87***	.65***	8.7
10	.97***	.97***	10

*** $p < .001$

Table 3: Regressions of transformational leadership, leadership effectiveness and performance on personality and leadership

	Transformational leadership	Leadership effectiveness	Performance
Neuroticism	-.13	-.11	.10
Extraversion	.27*	.24*	-.15
Openness	-.16	-.26*	-.07
Agreeableness	.10	.12	-.23*
Conscientiousness	-.14	-.20	.06
Transformational leadership			.01
R	.30	.32	.33
R^2	.09	.10	.11
df	5,84	5, 84	6, 82

* $p < .05$