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Abstract

This study of cognitive categorization explores the content of the schema "emergent leader." Three variables, each with two levels, are rotated to form eight leader profiles. These variables are achievement, task, and relationships orientations. Each profile is evaluated by subjects on two dependent measures, leader qualifications and leader acceptance. Profiles are rank-ordered based on ratings given, establishing the schema structures for qualified leader and acceptable leader, which in turn establish minimal conditions for leader emergence. The emergent leader is defined as one who is both qualified and acceptable to group members.

Level of task difficulty and the perceiver's achievement motivation are proposed as moderating variables influencing candidate leadership ratings.

High task orientation dominates the schemata for leader qualifications and acceptance. It is a necessary factor in order to form a perception of the candidate as qualified and to be accepted. Alone, it is sufficient to form the perception of a minimally qualified leader. This is true for the overall schema and for the low achiever's schema. In the high achiever's schema, however, task orientation alone is not sufficient to be perceived as a qualified leader.
Personal achievement and relationships orientations are supplementary to task orientation in forming perceptions of leadership. Alone or in combination, they are insufficient to form a leadership perception. The difference in contribution each makes to strengthening the perception of a qualified leader is not significant. However, for leader acceptance, relationships orientation enhances leader perceptions significantly more than personal achievement orientation. A hierarchical model of schema structure is suggested.

Achievement motivation of the subject and task difficulty moderate qualifications and acceptance ratings. Where moderators operate, they alter leadership ratings but do not notably alter schema structures.

Minimal criteria for leaders to emerge require a task orientation supplemented by a least one of the other personality factors studied, personal achievement or relationships orientation. The candidate demonstrating all three attributes received significantly higher qualifications ratings than any other candidate.

Finally, the study sought to determine whether we prefer leaders who are like ourselves. Due to operationalization problems, the findings are inconclusive.
Introduction

This inquiry began by investigating a rather common presumption in the everyday understanding of leadership. Those who are motivated to achieve emerge as leaders within their groups and organizations. Research has found that no such straightforward relationship exists between the desire to achieve and leader emergence. Rather, achievement motivation is one determinant of behaviors resulting in leader emergence.¹

Contemporary literature of leadership explores the influence of cognitive attribution on ratings of leaders and subordinates, and the emergence of leaders. These studies investigate different factors which influence attributions, such as knowledge of performance.

This study delves more deeply into the attribution formation process by examining the social constructions which serve as the operating paradigms for perceptions. These paradigms, or schemata, are patterns of information which are employed to make sense out of a constant stream of data bombarding the senses. Schemata help sort and organize data into patterns which can then be recognized and gain meaning.

The purpose of this research is to investigate the content of the cognitive schemata which define the concept of emergent leader. Schemata appear to be comprised of two basic components, a socialized component drawn from the culture and the experiences of others, and a personalized component based upon individual experiences and the assessment of those experiences in light of individual qualities and characteristics.

The first component is derived by social learning and includes the understandings gained from observing the experiences of others. These include the qualities and characteristics of others observed in leadership positions, the problems which they have faced, and the means by which they have been resolved, either successfully or otherwise. The individual learns from these observations, establishes connections between actions and outcomes, and effectively forms a schema for leadership. This component of the schema also includes those understandings which are general to the culture and provide the basis for a common language. That is, within the culture generally, there are a few qualities which are readily agreed to be representative of the concept of a leader.

The second component is representative of the individual's personal experience. In this portion the person's own talents, abilities, qualities and characteristics form the basis for the schema. Individual leadership experiences, successful or otherwise, are
associated with personal characteristics to define effective leadership and its associated personal qualities. Further, how the individual evaluates these personal experiences is in part a function of his or her uniqueness, a function of individual difference variables. Thus, evaluation of personal leadership experiences is a function of numerous variables, such as need to achieve, on which the individual differs from others.

In the process of determining whether an individual qualifies as a leader, the characteristics and experience of the individual are matched against the leadership schema which forms a prototype for evaluating potential leaders. The more closely the individual's qualities align with the schema, the more qualified the person is perceived to be. If the process works in this manner then the content of an individual's schema can be mapped by examining the qualities of those individuals who are believed to be qualified as leaders.

This study will explore the content of the schema "emergent leader". Three variables will be tested for their influence within the schema: 1) personal achievement orientation; and two measures of leadership characteristics, 2) task orientation; and 3) relationships orientation.

Contemporary leadership theory is contextual, and establishes firmly the significant influence of situational moderators on leader effectiveness. Prior investigations on schemata establish two theses: 1) Schemata are broad
categorizations which apply across situations and are not sensitive to individual differences, that is, they are normative social constructions within the culture; or 2) schemata are organization, job and individual specific with each individual forming separate, personalized schemata for each position within the group or organization. The latter hypothesis, that schemata are contextually specific, will be tested in this study by varying the level of job difficulty. If true, job difficulty will moderate the content of the leader schema.

The means by which candidates are initially perceived as qualified for leadership is represented as a matching process in the model developed. In this process, the qualifications of the candidate are compared to the perceiver's schema of leadership for the particular position sought, with the candidate best matching the schema being the most likely to be supported for emergence as leader. This matching thesis will be tested.

Finally, perception research provides evidence that the characteristics of the person forming the schema influence the qualities of the schema. The study will examine this

---


thesis by testing whether achievement motivation of the subject has a significant moderating effect on the content of the schema.
CHAPTER ONE
Review of the Literature

I. Cognitive Categorization

Social reality is phenomenological in nature. It is a constellation of thoughts, perceptions, and feelings which, taken together in relationship to one another, form the individual's phenomenal field. In order for the individual to perceive and respond meaningfully, the sensations of the phenomenal world must be organized by the individual's cognitive structure. Cognitive structure, the system of interrelations among thoughts, enables sensory data to be formed into meaningful patterns which serve as the basis of perception.

In cognitive psychology there is renewed interest in schema and related concepts as the most promising archetypes of cognitive structure. Among the related concepts associated with schema are prototypes, implicit

---


theories, causal schemata, and scripts. Schemata (singular, schema) are cognitive structures specifically associated with objects, persons, or social situations. They are the means by which A is perceived to be the letter "A"; an exuberant, outgoing party-type is classified as an extrovert; and a girl scout meeting is differentiated from a baseball game. A schema is a network of relationships between variables which define the complex phenomenon perceived. Schemata represent cognitive categories and assist in the acquisition and recall of information, the evaluation of sensory input, and the processing of memory. Most importantly, schemata provide for the accurate encoding and modification of perceived reality.

For broad cognitive categories, there are central characteristics critical to defining an object, person, or social situation as belonging to that category. Thus a ball, a clown, and a girl scout meeting have central qualities without which they could not be accurately

---


identified. These core characteristics comprise the prototype for the cognitive category and its associated schema. While the prototype may not represent all of the dimensions and relational nuances of the schema, it does constitute a skeleton of the schema around which refinements can be developed.

A schema is a set of interrelated variables which define a perceptual construct. While the variables can take on different values, the core structure of the variables and the relationship between them does not change. For example, our perceptual construct of a ball may be that it is round, three-dimensional, and has size and color. While the values taken by size and color may be numerous, the prototypic variables of roundness and three-dimensionality are invariant. If it has only two dimensions it is a circle; if it has an edge in the surface, it becomes a figure other than a ball.

Schemata are the means by which we make sense of the world around us, both simple perceptions and complex social phenomena. Wegner and Vallacher observe,

The individual is continually striving to understand his social reality. . . .(I)n a sense, then, every person is a naive psychologist who goes about his activities--collecting data about people, testing his guesses about how people behave and think, building theories to explain the data and to predict and control future events--and
yet is seldom aware that he is doing these things.7

Schemata represent implicit theories of social realities. Often, implicit theories of the world (schemata) operate automatically. However, the presence of strong counter-prototypic data requires conscious attentive processing to determine the appropriate categorization of the stimulus.8

To clarify some problems in language used in the study of cognitive categorization and social perception, categories are broad terms used for the classification of data. Particular attributes, qualities, or other representative dimensions are assigned to the category. Each category supports one or more prototypes reflective of the attributes of the category. An individual, assigned to the category based upon a few personal attributes, often is represented at a later time as possessing additional qualities related to the category or its prototypes which were not present originally. Schemata are the conceptualized patterns of relationship between the attributes in the category; prototypes are visualizations or personifications of a particular schema.

Recently, management literature has given attention to attributional phenomena.\(^9\) Attributions, while most often related to causal explanations\(^10\) can also be dispositional in nature.\(^11\) The pattern recognition model of schema by Cantor and Mischel "provides an alternative to attributional models of trait inference. . . . Everyday experience suggests that you do not have to make an attributional analysis every time you want to know what someone is like. Often you may simply say something like: 'This person who seems to be enjoying himself at this loud party, who is drinking a great deal, and who is talking to lots of people is just like most of the extroverts I know.'\(^12\)

---


Phillips and Lord studied causal attributions as the source of leadership perceptions. Their results showed that explicit causal analyses were unnecessary. They suggest that their data were more consistent with cognitive categorization processes.13

Fundamentally, it is unclear if there is any functional difference between the pattern recognition model and that of dispositional attributions. They both revolve on the presence of prototypic characteristics, and the assignment of an individual to a category based upon these characteristics. Feldman observes that Cantor and Mischel's research supports the idea "of dispositional attributions as a categorization process."14 One significant difference is that attributions explain past behavior, while schemata, scripts and other cognitive representations operate in a contemporaneous time frame or are projective. The work on scripts is strongly suggestive of this dynamism.15 Lord and Smith see the primary difference being the level of cognitive activity required. Considering an example of


whether a person possesses leadership qualities, they suggest that attributional assignments require highly cognitive, conscious, "controlled" decision-processes while "less cognitive models might rely on principles such as the match of the stimulus person in question to the perceiver's prototype."16

The linkage between attribution models of leadership and schemata or implicit theories is addressed by Calder. In attributional analyses, "behavior is tested against standards of distinctiveness, typicality and social desirability, alternative behavioral choices, and goals. Implicit theories are important in assessing the 'typicality' of behavior."17 Presumably, this is a process of matching explicit behavior against a prototypic model of behavior for leaders. The stronger the match, the more "typical" the behavior. Calder's logic suggests that implicit theories are necessary to be able to make attributions, but that perceptions based upon such theories need not employ attributional processes. A leadership perception can be formed simply by matching behavior to a leadership prototype. Calder embraces the phenomenological perspective when he states, "leadership exists only as a


perception. . . . It is. . . extremely important as naive psychology."18

Cognitive categorization serves as a useful framework for examining leadership perceptions.19 In such studies, qualities of an individual are matched against a prototype for the cognitive category 'leader'. Sufficient alignment results in the stimulus person being classified into the existant category of leader. "Such a process provides observers with an efficient means of storing leader-relevant information because it allows them to map nonidentical leaders into equivalent, preexisting, and meaningful cognitive categories."20

The meaning of leadership for any particular group at any particular time influences which attributes will be perceived as leadership. The social reality of leadership and its meaning, in turn, "depend upon a deeply embedded set of beliefs which link behaviors, personal qualities, and sets of happenings."21


Implicit theories have also received attention in the leadership literature, most often as a mediating variable in ratings of leader behavior and leadership effectiveness. Lord et al. maintain that all observers have implicit theories of leadership which constitute the standards by which leader behavior and performance are assessed. These standards comprise the leader prototype. When observing or rating performance, leader behavior is measured against this prototype. Phillips found observers tend to ascribe to the leader more behavior that is consistent with an initial leadership label (prototypic behavior) than behavior that is either inconsistent with that label or unrelated to it (nonprototypic behavior). In addition, observers are more capable of accurately reporting the presence of nonprototypic behavior than prototypic behavior within an


immediate rating condition. This accuracy, however, deteriorates significantly with a temporal delay in rating. In contrast, to the extent that prototypic behavior is accurately rated within the immediate condition, temporal delay has no significant impact on observers' rating accuracy for these behaviors.

Accuracy of the immediate behavioral rating and the delay in recording the rating are significant factors influencing ratings accuracy of both prototypic and nonprototypic behavior, although somewhat different processes are at work.

Phillips confirms earlier work by Rush, Thomas and Lord which found that ratings of leader behavior as assessed by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Form XII) were susceptible to influence by implicit leadership theories. Performance information influenced ratings of both consideration and initiating structure. Sex of the supervisor was also found to marginally influence ratings on initiating structure. Rush et. al. suggest it is through the perceptual-memory processes that implicit theories impact on LBDQ ratings.

What is...likely is that raters rely heavily on stereotypes and implicit theories to reduce the amount of information processing required in perceiving and understanding the behavior of others.25

Most recently, selective encoding and probabilistic response bias have been identified as two separate cognitive mechanisms through which implicit theories operate to influence ratings of leader behavior. Growing evidence leads Larson et. al. to cautiously conclude, "the confounding influence of raters' implicit theories of leader behavior pose a significant threat to the validity of questionnaire-based leader behavior ratings."26

The cognitive categorization model of leadership has received support in numerous studies.27 These findings suggest that sensory information processing is simplified through the use of a leadership schema and associated prototypes. Cognitive processes are central to the operation of implicit theories. Thus, cognitive complexity should significantly influence how such theories impact leadership ratings. The relationship between cognitive complexity and the structure of implicit leadership theories was examined by Weiss and Adler who found "implicit theories


to be unaffected by differences in cognitive complexity."\textsuperscript{28}

The factor structure of implicit theories formed from worker descriptions of leader behavior corresponded with those generated by an undergraduate psychology sample's perceptions of the "idealized" leader. The authors conclude, "traditional leader dimensions are extremely stable across individual differences in cognitive complexity."\textsuperscript{29}

Butterfield and Powell found that indicators of group performance significantly influenced the evaluation of leader behavior. Managers with identical styles were rated differently depending upon whether the indicated group performance was high or low. Raters attributed higher levels of both consideration and initiating structure behavior to leaders of high performing groups. These investigators observe that the raters' "implicit theories of leadership associate high performance with more leadership behavior, perhaps on the assumption that...the leader must be engaging in behavior that brings the performance about."\textsuperscript{30}


\textsuperscript{29} Op. cit., 75.

These studies support the proposition that cognitive categorization processes do influence the perception of leadership, the identification of particular behavior as leadership behavior, and the labelling of specific individuals as leaders. The formation of dispositional attributions of leadership is based upon these processes. Determining the content of the schema for leader is critical to understanding how individuals are identified and labelled as such.

The literature of perceptual phenomena is not directly concerned with the relationship between contextual variables and perception formation, yet this is important to an understanding of leadership. Leadership literature establishes that changes in situational variables do influence leader effectiveness and group performance. In particular, no studies have been identified which investigate how changes in task difficulty influence the perception of leadership.

The literature implies that the perceptual process is based upon a matching of subject behavior against the model prototype. This assumption of a matching mechanism underlying perceptual phenomena has not been tested in any of the studies identified.

Finally, no studies have been identified which explore the boundaries of a cognitive category, seeking to identify the necessary and sufficient conditions required to classify an object, behavior, or person within the category.
II. Achievement Motivation

Achievement motivation is generally acknowledged to be one of the major theories contributing to the understanding of organizational behavior. Initial research by McClelland on the need to achieve was based on a history of clinical observations. Since McClelland's observations, achievement motivation has become a dominant variable of interest in some leadership models. Hersey and Blanchard include achievement motivation as one of the characteristics which form their composite of the organizational leader. House and House and Mitchell discuss achievement-oriented leadership as one of the four styles of leadership behavior which represent path-goal constructs. In both cases, however, no discussion of the finer points of achievement-oriented behavior is reflected in the presentation of the models, nor are the full findings of

achievement research adopted. Hersey and Blanchard use the term "achievement motivation" to represent striving for goals, while House and Mitchell suggest achievement-oriented leadership is the establishment by the leader of high performance goals and the provision of emotional support for subordinates to attain these goals. These concepts are akin to the two-dimensional leadership research of Stogdill and others, and Likert and his associates.

None of these leadership models reflects the breadth of knowledge regarding the need to achieve, achievement motivation, or achievement orientation. Comprehensive models of leadership will require a fuller understanding of achievement-related phenomena.

Achievement motivation, the desire to achieve, is defined as a striving for goal accomplishment. Most often, it is characterized by striving for tangible goals which are measurable, where outcomes of the effort are clearly identifiable with the individual achiever. It is achievement satisfaction, not the tangible reward, which is the true objective.

Postulates of achievement-related behavior have been explored primarily through laboratory studies and in nonwork

36Ralph M. Stogdill, Leadership and Structures of Personal Interaction (Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1957).
related settings. Additional research evidence from work-associated lab studies and field settings provides further insight to achievement behavior and its potential relationship to leadership phenomena.

McClelland has observed that achievement motivation is both culturally acquired and socially ingrained by parents and significant others. The desire or need to achieve can be taught. However, not all cultures are based on achievement motivation, and not all accomplishment is achievement-motivated. Gallimore and Howard (1968) found Hawaiians to be motivated by human relationships, identified as the need for affiliation (nAFF) rather than social and economic achievement (nACH). In a confirmatory study Gallimore found that "the results support the view that there are cultural variations in the motivational antecedents of achievement."42

Culture within the organization also is a contributing factor to achievement-based behavior. Michaelson and Scanlon observe "it is important for the manager to keep in mind that the climate for achievement is more important than

the achievement motive itself." They adopt a categorization of employees as motivation seekers or maintenance seekers, and outline a management system designed to stimulate an achievement orientation which encourages maintenance seekers to become achievement oriented.

This form of "results-centered leadership" does reflect some of the critical components necessary to motivate the achievement-oriented employee, namely, the establishment of measurable performance goals, the provision for feedback or knowledge of results, and positive reinforcement. Emphasis upon such practices, when adopted across the total organization, can influence the climate and heighten the value placed upon achievement orientation.

Climate has an influence on achievement. Achievement motivation can be latent, requiring activation of the achievement motive by environmental stimulation. Conditions must exist which indicate goal achievement is possible, performance will be measurable and attributable to the individual, and these goals will yield satisfaction.

Conditions necessary to arouse the achievement motive have implications for job design as well. The role of
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achievement motivation in job design was explored in a study by Steers and Spencer\textsuperscript{46} which tested the effects of job scope and need for achievement on organizational commitment and performance. Six dimensions (identified from previous studies by Steers, Hackman and Oldham, and others) were used to identify "enriched" or high-scope jobs. These job characteristic dimensions were: variety, autonomy, task identity, feedback, optional and required interaction. Five of the six job characteristics were significantly related to performance for high nACH subjects. Only required interaction was not significant. None of the six job characteristics were significantly related to performance for low nACH subjects. These results indicate that need for achievement mediates the effect of high job scope on performance.

The Steers and Spencer study also found a direct relationship between high scope jobs and managerial commitment to the organization which was not moderated by need for achievement. While "increases in job scope were positively related to increased organizational commitment," regardless of achievement need, job enrichment only resulted in enhanced performance for high nACH managers. "These findings can be interpreted as supporting the hypothesis that high need achievers respond more positively in terms of performance to enriched jobs than low need achievers." The authors suggest that achievement motivation is an "important

\textsuperscript{46}Steers and Spencer (1977): 477.
individual difference variable in future investigations of employee motivation and work behavior.\textsuperscript{47}

If desire to achieve is an important individual difference variable, understanding the relationship between it and other organizational performance variables is important. Achievement research has emphasized one attribute of the task, goal difficulty, but others exist. Steers investigated the influence of one individual difference variable (nAchievement) on the relationship between two measures of supervisory performance (goal effort and overall performance) and five task goal attributes: 1) participation in goal setting; 2) feedback on goal effort; 3) peer competition for goal attainment; 4) goal difficulty; and 5) goal specificity. It was hypothesized that all but peer competition would be positively related to performance.\textsuperscript{48}

The first level of analysis found little consistent relationship between performance and task goal attributes. In fact, "need for achievement was more strongly related to performance than were any of the five task-goal attributes."\textsuperscript{49} A second level of analysis re-examined these findings after a median split of the sample into high and low nACH groups. The results demonstrated significant

\textsuperscript{47}Op. cit., 478.


\textsuperscript{49}Steers (1975): 397-398.
effects of achievement need as a mediator between task goal attributes and performance variables. Participation in goal setting was only important for low need achievers. Feedback and goal specificity were significant factors only in the performance of high need achievers.

It is almost as clear that goal difficulty has a positive influence on performance while peer competition is detrimental. For low achievers, participation in goal-setting relates significantly to effort and overall performance. However, increasing goal difficulty may have a detrimental effect on overall performance. Individual differences in achievement motivation influenced responsiveness to task goal attributes.50

Achievement need also moderates the relationship between leader style and effectiveness as assessed by measures of group productivity and satisfaction.51 Using a performance-centered by maintenance-centered grid of leader styles, a high performance-high maintenance style was most effective for high nACH groups as measured by group productivity and group satisfaction. For low nACH groups, a strong performance-centered style was most productive. However, it generated the greatest hostility and the least satisfaction. The high performance-high maintenance style

50Ibid.

was the most effective in generating satisfaction in low 
nACH groups.\textsuperscript{52} Differences in leader behavior influenced 
group effectiveness. Leader style effectiveness was 
moderated by the achievement orientation of the group.

The most distinguishable quality of the achievement-
oriented personality is the preference for moderate degrees 
of risk by high need achievers. Atkinson and Feather\textsuperscript{53} 
describe this preference for middle range risk as the point 
where incentive value of the goal is maximized in 
relationship to the probability of success in achieving the 
goal.

For low need achievers who are threatened by the fear 
of failure, the determination of their preference for risk 
is more complex. The need to achieve and the fear of 
failure are competing motives. While the achievement-
oriented personality strives to maximize success, the 
failure-threatened personality seeks to minimize the degree 
of failure. Atkinson and Feather are clear in their 
differentiation of motivations to achieve and to avoid 
failure. Motivation to achieve is interpreted "as a 
tendency to undertake an activity that is expected to lead 
to success. Motivation to avoid failure must therefore be 
consistently interpreted as a tendency to avoid undertaking 
an activity that is expected to lead to failure."

Motivation to avoid failure must always be conceived as

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{52}Misumi and Seki (1971): 56.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{53}Atkinson and Feather (1966): 360-361.}
inhibitory. "It specifies what activities a person is not likely to undertake, not what activities he is likely to undertake."\textsuperscript{54} Failure-threatened personalities will not undertake achievement-oriented activity unless constrained to do so by some other extrinsic source of motivation.

The failure-threatened personality will select activities which are either very difficult or very easy. Easy activities provide very low threats of failure. Failure at activities of extreme difficulty are non-threatening because the odds of achieving the task are slim from the outset. This person never voluntarily undertakes any activity requiring skill where there is uncertainty about the outcome, except when constrained by social pressures or other external motivators. This erratic behavior can always be understood as defensive avoidance of intermediate levels of risk.

Both effort and ability requirements are considered in determining task difficulty and the assignment of risk. Research findings that high need achievers prefer intermediate risks were obtained when instructions emphasized effort as the principal determinant of success.\textsuperscript{55}

Set within the framework of Weiner and Kukla's attributional

\textsuperscript{54} Atkinson and Feather (1966): 19.

theory of achievement motivation56, this study concludes that achievement motivation, "is more appropriately identified with subjects who believe that effort determines their outcomes."57

Contrary to this more established understanding, Touhey and Villemez found that "differences in risk-taking preferences among low need achievers were moderated by ability instructions, while differences among high need achievers were moderated by effort instructions."58 The authors urge a reformulation of achievement motivation. They suggest

high need achievers have come to infer their own abilities from the interaction of specific task outcomes and effort while low need achievers view their abilities as relatively stable personal characteristics independent of momentary variations in personal effort.59

The authors conclude "further research might be in order to specify the antecedents of the self-attribution of ability among subjects who differ on achievement motivation."60

57 Touhey and Villemez (1975): 718.
60 Ibid.
A study of this type could further explain findings on the persistence of high need achievers. Atkinson and Feather observe that high need achievers are more confident in the face of ambiguous tasks, primarily due to a history of successful accomplishment. "Consequently, many tasks which appear very difficult to others are likely to be viewed as realistic or calculated risks by the achievement-oriented personality." Thus, perceptions of self-ability may be due to prior learning.

The plausibility of this form of a relationship is supported by Weiner and Kukla's proposition that high nACH individuals prefer tasks of intermediate difficulty because "outcomes on such tasks provide the most information concerning personal attributes such as ability. Outcomes on high- and low-difficulty tasks, on the other hand, are seen as providing information largely on the task." Easy tasks can be accomplished by almost anyone and provide little information about one's ability compared to others. Likewise, very hard tasks have comparatively little information value as almost no one can accomplish them.

Continuing development of the achievement construct has broadened from achievement need to a multidimensional motivation concept more aptly termed achievement
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62 Touhey and Villemez (1975): 713.
orientation. Henceforth, achievement motivation and achievement orientation will be used interchangeably, depending upon which better reflects the context under consideration. Achievement need, however, will refer to the concept denoted in traditional research as a need construct for which projective instrumentation and research protocols exist.

Achievement motivation is an important individual difference variable in organizational research. It explains significant differences in personal response to supervisory style, job design, organizational climate and leadership style. Organizational culture and the qualities of the organizational climate are important in activating the need to achieve. The studies by Steers and others suggest that achievement constructs mediate employee performance response to job design characteristics and task goal attributes. The differences in response of high and low achievers to goals, the level of risk associated with goals, and the conditions under which successful performance can be demonstrated all suggest powerful motivational strategies for leaders working with high and low achievers. As Steers and Spencer suggest, achievement motivation is an important individual difference variable to be considered in studies of work behavior.

---


64 Steers and Spencer (1977): 478.
III. Leader Emergence

Among the more critical components of implicit theories of leadership is the presumed obvious relationship between the desire to achieve and emergence as a leader. Yet, this relationship is probably more complex than anticipated.

Studies of leader emergence reviewed suggest the following as possible predictor variables of leader emergence: Quality of verbal interaction;\(^{65}\) quantity of task-relevant verbal interaction;\(^{66}\) quantity of task-irrelevant verbal interaction;\(^{67}\) non-verbal behavioral cues;\(^{68}\) participation rates in group tasks;\(^{69}\) airtime; expertise;\(^{70}\) instrumental behavior and supportive


\(^{67}\)Sorrentino (1973).

\(^{68}\)Stein (1975).


\(^{70}\)Bottger (1984).
behavior;\textsuperscript{71} cognitive complexity;\textsuperscript{72} performance on tasks;\textsuperscript{73} sex;\textsuperscript{74} LPC score;\textsuperscript{75} probability of success;\textsuperscript{76} socioemotional leadership ability; interest; and ratings by self and others of competence, actual influence, task-leadership ability, confidence, and contribution to group goal.\textsuperscript{77}

Sorrentino, exploring the function of achievement motivation in leader emergence, employed many of these as intervening variables between achievement need and emergence. Many were found to be the behaviors and perceptions by which group members gain recognition, demonstrate their abilities, and emerge as leaders. Sorrentino observes that "achievement-related motives can


\textsuperscript{73}Sorrentino (1973).


\textsuperscript{75}Schneier (1978); Schneier and Bartol (1980); Lord, Phillips and Rush (1980); also, R. W. Rice and M. M. Chemers, "Predicting the Emergence of Leaders Using Fiedler's Contingency Model," \textit{Journal of Applied Psychology} 57 (1973): 281-287.

\textsuperscript{76}Sorrentino (1973).

\textsuperscript{77}Sorrentino (1973); Sorrentino and Boutillier (1975).
serve as the source of the determinants of emergent leadership." He also observes that "it remains for future research to ascertain whether, and to what extent, each of these variables is a determinant of leadership." The relationship is clearly complex, and is not restricted solely to the achievement motive. Affiliative needs were also found to be important in determining emergent behavior. Sorrentino concludes that achievement motivation serves as a determinant, but not the sole determinant, of behaviors and perceptions which account for leader emergence.

To more fully establish the relationships between achievement motivation, antecedent conditions and leader emergence, the research will be reviewed on the antecedent variables identified.

The impact of quantity and quality of verbal interaction on ratings of leadership ability and the emergent leader phenomenon were studied by Sorrentino and Boutillier. Only quantity of verbal interaction predicted differences in leadership ability as perceived by raters. Quality of verbal interaction predicted perceived differences between leaders and others on competence, influence and contribution to the group's goal. Significant main effects were found between quantity of verbal interaction and ratings of competence, confidence, interest, influence, task leadership ability and

79Sorrentino and Boutillier (1975): 403.
socioemotional leadership ability. Quality of verbal interaction generated significant main effects associated with ratings of competence, influence, and contribution to the group's goal. Finally, "a significant interaction between quantity and quality of verbal interaction was obtained for ratings of socioemotional leadership ability."\(^{80}\) The authors conclude that quality of verbal interaction is an indicator of a person's ability, while quantity of verbal interaction is an indicator of a person's motivation.\(^{81}\)

Independent of participation rates, both verbal and non-verbal behavior provide cues of the status of members as emergent leaders in small groups.\(^{82}\) Stein's study provides evidence that non-verbal behaviors aid members of work groups to perceive and select leaders.

Stein asserts that an alternative approach to controlled studies of leader emergence is needed. Established approaches of content analysis of leader behavior and communication have been important in role theory research of leader emergence. A different perspective will be useful to further understanding of emergence. Stein suggests that leader emergence be examined from the perspective of the group member rather than the leader. Such studies should be directed toward examining
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\(^{81}\) Op. cit., 408.
\(^{82}\) Stein (1975): 132.
the decision-making processes group members employ and the criteria used in selecting leaders.\textsuperscript{83}

Bottger, after reviewing the research on influence in small groups, identifies two competing hypotheses. The first suggests that member influence in small groups is principally determined by air time, the percentage of group communication time controlled by any one member. The second, however, suggests that influence is a function of expertise. Bottger observes that such conflicting views "can be integrated by distinguishing between perceived and actual influence."\textsuperscript{84} He investigated the respective influence of expertise and airtime in problem-solving groups using thirty-three groups of managers or students. Air time was measured by analysis of tape recordings. Expertise was determined by variance between individual and group performance on the NASA moon exercise, and the preferred solution rankings as rated by NASA. "Perceived influence [was] found to be more strongly predicted by air time than expertise. By contrast, actual influence [was] determined more by expertise than participation."\textsuperscript{85} The relationships between expertise and air time and their perceived and actual influence on group problem-solving are important. Clarity of the relationship between expertise and actual influence is particularly cogent for high group performance.

\textsuperscript{83}Op. cit., 134.
\textsuperscript{84}Bottger (1984): 220.
\textsuperscript{85}Ibid.
Greene and Schriesheim investigated the relationships between instrumental and supportive leader behavior and group arousal and cohesiveness. The study was conducted as a longitudinal field investigation using cross-lagged correlational and path-analytic procedures to establish causality. Recency of group formation and group size were moderators. Effective leader behavior in recently formed groups appears to be contingent upon group size. Instrumental behavior is more effective for large groups, while supportive behavior is more effective for smaller work units.86

Gender is a significant variable in emergent leader research. Schneier and Bartol investigated four issues through which sex differences might influence leader emergence, and established the following:

1) similar proportions of males and females emerged as leaders.

2) no significant sex differences were found in leader behavior of females and males.

3) emergent leaders, regardless of gender, were perceived as demonstrating more positive socioemotional behavior than non-leaders. However, while socioemotional behavior was present, it was dominated by task behavior.

4) group performance was similar, regardless of gender of the leader.87
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In earlier work, Schneier established that leader emergence and leader performance were not related to sex, but were dependent on personality characteristics alone, as measured by Fiedler's least preferred co-worker (LPC) scale. This study extends Fiedler's work to the exploration of leader emergence, and examines the influence of leader sex, cognitive complexity, and behavioral characteristics on the emergence phenomenon. Differences between LPC scores for males and females who emerged as leaders were not statistically significant. Significant differences were found between those males who emerged as leaders and those who did not; the results for females approached significance. Also, leaders' LPC scores were significantly lower than the mean LPC score for the remaining members of their respective groups. Indeed, in 74 percent of the groups, leader LPC was the lowest for any member in the group. Finally, Schneier established that other group members perceive leaders to be cognitively simple, low on flexibility and sociability, but having a high capacity for status and achievement. Both of these studies by Schneier used extended classroom group work conditions; females comprised between 30-40 percent of each sample.

As the qualities of the situation in which the Schneier studies were conducted are representative of a highly favorable quadrant II condition, these findings fail to
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88 Schneier (1978).
support Fiedler's goal hierarchy hypothesis. Under such circumstances, Fiedler's hypothesis suggests that low LPC leaders should dominantly be manifesting relationship-oriented behavior.\textsuperscript{90} In these studies, task-oriented behavior dominated.

Schneier's research found low LPC to be the style which emerged in highly favorable (quadrant II) conditions. Rice and Chemers\textsuperscript{91} investigated leader emergence and LPC scores in moderate (quadrant IV) and low (quadrant VIII) favorability situations. Using four-person test groups comprised of two high- and two low-LPC subjects in each group, their findings uniformly support the preference for low LPC personalities as emergent leaders. Low LPC subjects were "preferred as leaders of future groups. . .perceived as more desirable co-workers, . . .more important contributors to group success, . . .[and] as more popular and enjoyable co-workers than were high LPC subjects. . . . There were no significant differences in the frequency of nomination for socioemotional leader as a function of LPC scores."\textsuperscript{92}

The data were also examined to see if the LPC score of the nominator was significant in predicting the emergence of leaders. It was found that both high- and low-LPC nominators preferred a low LPC subject as future leader, future co-worker, most enjoyed co-worker, and most valuable

\textsuperscript{90}Op. cit., 231.

\textsuperscript{91}Rice and Chemers (1973).

group member, while both nominated a high-LPC subject as
least preferred co-worker, although the latter three
findings did not achieve conventional levels of statistical
significance. No preference was shown by either LPC type in
nominations for socioemotional leader.93

The research clearly suggests that task oriented (low
LPC) behavior is dominant in leader emergence and
performance, regardless of the gender of the leader or the
level of situational favorability encountered.

The hypothesis that rater characteristics would be
significant in predicting leader emergence was developed by
Lord, Phillips and Rush. The effects of sex and of
personality, as assessed by the LPC measure, were
investigated for their significance in the formation of
perceptions of emergent leadership, influence, and social
power. "Rater sex, locus of control and LPC explained
significant amounts of variance in person perceptions. . . .
Differences among raters accounted for between 17 and 44
percent of the variance in person perception. Moreover, up
to 30 percent of this rater variance could be explained by
the individual differences investigated in this study."94
These findings suggest that the relationship between
individual difference variables and the content of implicit
leadership theories held by raters of leader behavior would
be a significant investigation. The implications are

important wherever observational techniques are employed to
assess or report leader behavior and performance. The
content of implicit theories may function to determine those
behaviors which group members will accept from prospective
leaders. Content may also serve to form perceptions of
leadership, thereby permitting the latter to emerge as
leader.

Personal qualities of the rater significantly influence
the formation of rater perceptions, and such perceptions can
serve as the basis for leader emergence. Sex, LPC score,
and locus of control have been found to influence perception
formation. It is suggested that the content of group
members' implicit theories also contribute to the formation
of perceptions of leadership.

Research has identified many possible predictor
variables of leader emergence. Among the more powerful are
quantity and quality of verbal behavior, expertise,
performance, and socioemotional and task leadership ability.
Sorrentino and others suggest these behaviors and acquired
attributes are associated with achievement motivation. The
desire to achieve drives much leader behavior.

Leader emergence and performance has been shown to be
dependent upon these manifested characteristics. Task
orientation in particular, as measured by LPC scores, is a
dominant variable. It has significant power to account for
leader emergence, performance, and acceptability. All of
these factors potentially are accessible as content in the
leadership schema employed by raters to evaluate leader behavior. To the degree they are incorporated in the schema, the perception of leadership will be enriched.

This review has examined pertinent research on achievement and leader emergence, and established much about the perception formation process. Attention has been focused on prototypes and schema and the processes employed to form leadership perceptions. The content of leadership schema will be the subject of this study.
CHAPTER TWO
Research Model and Hypotheses

I. Statement of the Problem

Stated succinctly, the research problem presented is to determine the content of personal implicit theories which lead to the perception of leadership. It is anticipated that the dimensions of such perceptions can be broadly categorized as either personal qualities, prior performance, or job difficulty. It is also of interest to determine which variables are minimally sufficient to form a perception of leadership. It should be possible to identify those dimensions used by individuals to recognize emergent leaders. More precisely, the study seeks to determine the content of the schema "emergent leader", itself a more specified level of the superordinate category "leader."\(^1\)

In their work on prototypes, Foti, Fraser and Lord assert that prototypes are effected by category labels; changes in labels do effect the content of prototypes. As an example, consider the category labels "effective" and "ineffective" as qualifiers on the more general (superordinate) level label of "leader". Clearly, the prototypes implied for "effective leader" and "ineffective

leader" will differ, but in what manner? Are they polar 
opposites, or do they vary only on a few, highly critical 
dimensions? The content of leader prototypes have yet to be 
identified. However, "the concept of prototypicality has 
substantial predictive value in understanding what 
information is closely tied to the construct of 
leadership."\(^2\) Prototypes are integral to leader 
identification processes and serve to form sensory 
information into a perception of leadership.

The first issue is to determine the standards by which 
individuals are judged to be emerging leaders. In the 
language of social cognition, this means to determine the 
attributes of the prototype "emergent leader" as a 
representative of the schema for the same.

Theoretically, the issue of which criteria are 
necessary and sufficient to form the leadership perception 
is an important one, yet no studies have been identified 
which determine the minimal criteria required to form a 
cognition of "emergent leader". This study will attempt to 
do so. It is suggested that as task difficulty varies, so 
too will the understanding of which criteria are necessary 
and which sufficient to form a cognition of "emergent 
leader". Therefore, the second issue is to determine the 
minimum qualifications required to be regarded as a 
candidate for the leadership position and how these will 
vary with the level of task difficulty of the position.

Earlier discussion suggested that the content of the implicit theory is moderated by the achievement orientation of the person forming the schema. It has already been established that achievement orientation is an important individual difference variable relevant to leadership and leader emergence. Therefore, the third matter of interest is the achievement orientation of the person forming the schema and how it moderates the contents of the schema.

Finally, the means by which candidates are initially perceived as qualified for leadership and eventually supported for office has been represented as a matching process. In this process, the qualifications of the candidate are compared to the perceiver's schema of leadership for the particular position sought. This schema is based upon knowledge of the demands of the position and the personal qualities and performance of prior officeholders. Therefore, the fourth issue of interest is the correspondence between the qualities of the candidate and the standards contained in the perceiver's leadership schema.

II) Justification

Why is this study important? Calder,3 in his theory of leadership, established phenomenology as an important new
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perspective from which to evaluate leadership processes. This viewpoint asserts that leadership is a social construction of the individual perceiving the behavior of another. When the outcomes of this behavior are identified by the perceiver as those associated with leadership, the label of 'leader' is attached to the individual being observed.

From this perspective the critical question becomes the means by which the perceiver identifies and labels the behavior as 'leadership'. The model to be presented suggests that this occurs by matching the behavior to a prior social construct established in the cognitive realm of the perceiver. This construct has been referred to as a schema or implicit theory. Thus, knowing the content of such a schema, how it is established, and what factors influence it is the root of the phenomenological viewpoint of leadership. The investigation of these cognitions is the purpose of this study.

From a practical perspective, understanding more about the source of leadership perceptions is also important. Several studies conducted by Lord and his associates indicate that perceptually-based attributions can and do

---

contaminate leadership ratings, and that individual differences between raters accounts for between 17 and 44 percent of the variance in personal perception. These findings have two implications. First, knowledge that perceptual phenomena influence leader ratings is significant for personnel evaluation practices, leader selection processes, and the training of supervisors. A better understanding of the contents of raters' schemata is the key to minimizing bias in rating processes. Second, the fact that individual differences account for a significant portion of the variance in personal perception validates the significance of examining one individual difference variable, achievement motivation, in this study.

No studies have been identified thus far which have investigated the relationship between contextual variables and perceptual phenomena. This study will do so by examining the impact of changes in the level of job difficulty on the content of the leadership schema. As well, no studies have been found which investigate the minimal conditions necessary for forming the perception of leadership, so this will also be examined.

This study also proposes to investigate the idea that the individual preferred as leader is the one who most closely matches the perceiver's schema for leader. While intuitively plausible, no studies have been found which establish this as the operating process.
Finally, on a different level, the model to be proposed makes a contribution to the conceptual understanding of leader emergence processes.

III) Presentation of Model

What is the content of the schema for "emergent leader"? The model presented requires a hypothesized relationship between the personal qualities and prior performance of the emergent leader, the content of the schema for "emergent leader" held by the perceiver, and the level of job difficulty for which the emergent leader is perceived to be qualified. Job difficulty itself, however, is a complex variable formed from an assessment of the position requirements and the qualities and performance of prior officeholders. Job difficulty, therefore, is an evaluation of a schema for the particular job under consideration.

The confusion here can be clarified by recognizing that two different schema are, in fact, at work. The first, that represented in the upper portion of the model, is the schema for the particular position or office to be filled. The second schema, the implicit schema for emergent leader, is beneath the surface of this model. It is only derivable by comparing the attributes of potential candidates against the schema for the position sought. Those attributes which
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match can be regarded as components of the schema "emergent leader," while those that do not match are not salient attributes of the emergent leader schema.

The schema "emergent leader," as depicted in the model, is comprised of elements of personal attributes and behavior, prior performance, and job difficulty. The cognition "emergent leader" is formed within the context of task demands and their associated levels of difficulty. It follows that the perception of emergence will vary depending upon the level of task difficulty. As the level of difficulty of the task varies, so too will the attributes sufficient to establish the perception.

Because each of the dimensions comprising the schema model is a complex, multi-facited variable, it is necessary to narrow the focus of the study. Only the personal characteristics of the candidate will be tested in the research design. This dimension will be operationalized using three variables--achievement orientation, task orientation, and relationships orientation.

The model suggests that as job difficulty varies, the sufficiency of each of these variables in forming the perception of leadership will vary also. As task difficulty increases, it is reasonable to anticipate that one of two conditions, or both, will pertain: 1) The number of variables present in the schema will increase; 2) the relative strength of each variable in the schema will
change; or 3) both the number of variables in the schema and their relative strengths will change.

The perception of leadership draws upon information pertaining to the personal qualities and prior performance of prospective leader candidates, as well as the requirements of the position. Once formed, the sufficiency of the leadership perceptions are tested against the group member's implicit theory of leadership, a constellation of beliefs about the linkages between personal qualities and behavior and their consequent effects. This implicit theory constitutes the standards by which aspiring candidates are assessed; it represents what the group member believes are the qualifications for successful performance of the job. Some of these standards are necessary, others are sufficient, and can alone qualify a candidate for consideration.

The distinction between necessary and sufficient criteria is important. A sufficient criterion is one which, by its own power, establishes the perception of leadership. No other conditions are required and no additional qualities need to be associated with it. It has the strength, without additional support, to form the perception. Necessary criteria do not have this power, but must be present in order that a perception can be formed. These are supplemental criteria that must be fulfilled before the perception can be formed, or they may be additional criteria that combine to form a constellation of criteria which has
the power to form the perception. Each criterion must be present, but lacks sufficient power of its own to form the perception alone.

The correspondence between the content of group members' implicit theories and the qualifications of emergent leaders serve as the basis for members' support of emergent leaders.\(^5\) This perspective suggests it is members of the group who permit leaders to emerge. The decision to support a candidate for emergence is based upon a comparison of the candidate's qualifications to those standards represented by the implicit theory. The greater the correspondence, the greater the likelihood that the prospective leader will successfully emerge.

IV) Description and Justification of Variables

**Achievement Orientation (of the Perceiver):** An important aspect of this research is the proposition that individual difference variables are significant in the formation of personal schema. The literature review in Chapter One has amply established that achievement motivation is one important individual difference variable associated with personal performance in work environments. Specifically, it is argued that the motivation to achieve is
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an important variable which influences the content of the individual's schema. The leader schema held by high achievers is anticipated to be different than that held by those with a low achievement orientation.

High achievement oriented individuals are characterized as goal oriented individualists who prefer projects of intermediate levels of risk where they can receive personal recognition, and where the task provides rather immediate performance feedback. Such individuals compete against standards they set for themselves more so than they compete against others, and persist as long as the task presents a challenge and a reasonable chance of success.

Low achievement oriented individuals are primarily motivated by the fear of failure. Such individuals avoid intermediate levels of risk in task assignments, and seek to avoid any competitive situation unless constrained to participate. When required to do so, they will select tasks which are either very easy or very difficult as these provide the least information (feedback) on their ability to perform the task. They do not voluntarily seek activities requiring the use of their skills, and often appear erratic in their work behavior.

Task Difficulty: Another of the primary components of the model is task difficulty. A position may be perceived as difficult for numerous reasons. The tasks may be complex, the number of people supervised may be many, the level of skill within the group may be inadequate to the
situation, time may be at a premium, or the precise nature of the assignment may be unclear. In operationalizing task difficulty, many of these dimensions will be utilized.

Task difficulty is important because it represents the level of risk associated with the position, an important condition related to achievement motivation. Task difficulty is also an important consideration in assessing performance and the requisite skills necessary to success. Most importantly, however, it is included in this model because it is believed to mediate the content of implicit leadership schema. As job task difficulty varies, so too will the content of leadership schema.

**Task Orientation:** The work of Stogdill, Fleishman and others at Ohio State, and of Likert and his associates at the University of Michigan establish task orientation as a separate dimension of leadership with its own construct validity. This dimension, and relationships orientation, have served as the basis for much of the leadership theorizing and research for the last thirty years.

Literature reviewed, especially the studies by Schneier and by Misumi and Seki indicate that task orientation, often measured by LPC scores, is a dominant characteristic of

---


emerging leaders and perhaps more than any other accounts for leader emergence, especially in newly-formed, larger groups.8

Task orientation, initiating structure, and concern for production all represent the dimension of leadership concerned with the organization of work and the achievement of the group's goals. High task oriented individuals focus on the achievement of group goals, structure the work of others, provide direction, emphasize the output of the group, and seek closure. Those with low task orientation are characterized as aimless, lacking in direction, unclear about what needs to be done, and generally are not concerned with the group having high goals or achieving them.

Relationships Orientation: The same seminal studies establishing the task dimension also established relationships orientation as a separately-validated construct of leader behavior. The Greene and Schriesheim9 study also found this orientation to be important for leader emergence in newly-formed, small groups. As well, all of the earlier work cited by Sorrentino, Boutillier and others on leader emergence establish this and the task dimension as important characteristics of emergent leaders.

Relationships orientation, consideration for others, and concern for people each represent the dimension of

leadership focusing on interpersonal relationships, the provision of personal support, and the desire for a positive affective climate within the group. Individuals high on relationships orientation demonstrate concern for the welfare of the group and the personal needs of each of its members. They seek to maintain harmony within the group and seek positive relations with other workers. Generally, they are regarded by colleagues as supportive and considerate. Those with a low relationships orientation are characterized as being aloof and insensitive to the needs of others. They are less concerned with the quality of relationships within the group than with other aspects of group life, and may be perceived as inconsiderate, cold, or uncaring.

Achievement Orientation (of the Candidate): Defined in the same manner as the achievement orientation of the subject, it is mentioned here again as it will serve as one of the three personal characteristics representative of the candidates. It will be important as one of the within-subject variables under consideration.

VI. Discussion

Stein\(^{10}\) suggests that the criteria group members employ in selecting leaders, the attributions made, and the decision processes used are important areas for research.

Weiss and Adler\(^{11}\) observe that the contents of implicit theories are quite stable across populations and levels of cognitive complexity, yet Calder asserts that for any group leadership is defined by common beliefs which connect leadership qualities to specific behavior.\(^{12}\) This construct of leadership has meaning only when defined by the particular group, and is situationally specific. This constellation of beliefs associating behaviors and leadership qualities constitutes the individual's implicit theory of leadership. The lack of agreement between these positions is due to differences in content of the implicit theories employed by these respective researchers.

Weiss and Adler employ four leadership factors comprised of specific attributes identified by Bowers and Seashore in their Survey of Organizations. These factors—support, interaction facilitation, goal emphasis, work facilitation—comprise the stable content of implicit leadership theories. Calder suggests, however, that the contents of implicit theories are specific qualities—behavior linkages, beliefs that "personal leadership qualities produce certain behaviors and effects."\(^{13}\) The content of such implicit theories, and especially an


\(^{13}\)Ibid.
understanding of their structure, is an important area for investigation.

In the model presented, it is proposed that personal characteristics and behavior influence performance, and that prior performance influences the leadership perception. Yet, given the presence of an implicit theory, it can be argued that personal characteristics, even in the absence of prior task-specific performance, can serve as a source of the perception of leadership. Such a perception would be based on the personal characteristics and known skills and abilities of the candidate rather than being based on knowledge of performance.

The formation of the perception of leadership is dependent upon affirming those attributes both necessary and sufficient to support such a perception. The influence assignable to any one source is discounted when other possible sources are present. In cases of multiple sufficient schemata, any one of the schema alone is sufficient to support the perception. Multiple necessary schemata, however, require that multiple factors, in association with one another, must be present to support the perception. The establishment of multiple necessary schemata as requisite conditions to support a leader perception is a more stringent test than that of multiple

sufficient schemata. It can be inferred that the perceptions formed under multiple necessary conditions will be more certain and made with greater confidence.

No work has been identified which investigates the minimal conditions for the formation of perceptions of leadership. Yet, such conditions are important to the early identification of emergent leaders. What are the minimal perceptions necessary for an individual to be identified as an emergent leader?

The model suggests that each group member has an implicit theory of the leadership position which essentially constitutes the standards against which emerging leaders are measured in determining their qualifications. This schemata is multi-dimensional and represents those components believed to be representative of leaders for a specific position within a specific organization.

Intuitively, it is suggested that the complexity of the implicit theories held by group members will show some relationship to the complexity of the organization, its goals, its program, and the associated responsibilities of the leader. The greater the complexity, the richer the implicit theory; that is, the more multi-dimensional the leadership position will be perceived to be. It is reasonable to anticipate that as the implicit theory of leadership becomes richer, it will also demonstrate a movement from a simple sufficiency criterion to more complex, multiple-necessary criteria to qualify for
recognition as an emergent leader. This is in keeping with previous reasoning on member support of candidates being influenced by the correspondence between prior experience of the emergent leader and the dimensions of the leadership position. The development of implicit theories will progress from simple to complex as task difficulty increases.

VI) Presentation of Hypotheses

The literature reviewed provides insight for the formation of hypotheses. First, pertaining to the relationship between the dimensions of leadership style, task- and relationships-orientation, and achievement orientation, the study by Misumi and Seki15 found that employees with high achievement orientations prefer supervisors who have a high task, high relationships style. For employees with a low achievement orientation, they found that supervisors with a high task style were rated most productive, while those with the high task, high relationships style were rated as most satisfactory. There is an interaction between employee achievement orientation and the two dependent measures of supervisor productivity and satisfaction with supervisor.

While not working specifically with the achievement variable, Schneier16 found that low LPC leaders were

16 Schneier (1978).
preferred. However, these leaders were also high on providing emotional support and demonstrated both task and relationships behavior. The general profile of a leader derived from his work also establishes that leaders are perceived as having high achievement interests and are low on sociability.

The field study conducted by Rice and Chemers\(^{17}\) found that low LPC leaders were preferred under all leadership conditions. Both high and low LPC nominators preferred as leaders low LPC rather than high LPC personalities.

High achievement oriented individuals prefer moderate levels of task difficulty and avoid situations of very high or very low risk. These, however, are the conditions sought by low achievement individuals as they can minimize their sense of failure under these conditions.\(^{18}\) Steers\(^{19}\) found that goal difficulty has a positive influence for high achievement oriented subjects, while peer competition has a negative influence. Low achievement oriented subjects were found to exert more effort and yield a higher overall performance under conditions where they participated in goal setting, but that increases in goal difficulty may have a


detrimental effect on goal performance for these individuals. Steers concluded that individual differences in achievement orientation do influence employee responsiveness to task goal attributes.

Drawing upon these findings, hypotheses regarding the relationships between achievement orientation, level of task difficulty, and the three personal characteristics dimensions will be formulated.

A1 Within-Subject Hypotheses: The within-subject hypotheses explore the relationships between the three personal characteristics variables which comprise the dimensions of the candidate profiles. These are task orientation, relationships orientation, and the achievement orientation of the candidate. The rotation of these variables yields eight candidate profiles. Each profile is evaluated on two dependent measures, the qualifications of the candidate, and the acceptability of the candidate as a leader.

1) What is the Schema for the Emergent Leader?

Based upon the literature reviewed, the following relationships are anticipated. Regardless of achievement orientation, low task, low relationships candidates will not be regarded as qualified or accepted as leader, while high task, high relationships candidates will always be regarded
as qualified and be accepted as leader. Therefore, the first hypothesis will be:

H.1. Of the low achievement candidates, only those who are high task, high relationships will be considered as qualified and accepted as leaders.

For high achievement oriented candidates, the opposite effects are hypothesized.

H.2. Of the high achievement candidates, all candidates will be regarded as qualified and accepted as leaders, except for the low task, low relationships candidate.

The exceptions need some explanation. The high task, high relationships candidate in hypothesis one is the only low achievement candidate to be considered. It is argued that the leader qualities of this individual (high task, high relationships) will be perceived positively by the members of the group, and they will follow his leadership as long as he is motivated to exit the task by accomplishing it. This candidate can be regarded as a martyr. The opposite is true for the high achievement candidate who is rejected. While achievement oriented, this candidate has no skills important to the quality of group life and the achievement of the group's goals. Therefore, the group will reject the candidate, in spite of a high achievement orientation. This candidate can be regarded as a rugged individualist.
B) Between Subjects Hypotheses: The between-subjects hypotheses will assess some of the effects between achievement orientation of the subject, levels of task difficulty, and the within-subject matrix.

21. Does the Perceiver's Achievement Motivation Moderate the Content of the Schema?

This set of hypotheses tests the influence of the subject's achievement motivation on the content of the leadership schema. It is hypothesized that achievement motivation moderates the content of the schema by influencing the standards for leader emergence.

Subjects with high achievement motivation will see the achievement oriented candidate as qualified and acceptable as leader. Low achievement motivated perceivers, however, will see the achievement oriented candidate as qualified but not personally acceptable as leader.

An intuitive observation needs to be made at this point. The literature does not suggest how low achievement personalities respond under high task demand conditions. However, it seems that such conditions would not be preferred, and the low achiever would seek to quit the task unless restrained. It seems plausible to anticipate that the low achiever under conditions of constrained participation would seek high levels of personal support from the leader in order to continue functioning. Goal-directed behavior of the low achiever is motivated by a
desire to be relieved of the task or to minimize the degree of risk associated with the task. As high task oriented and high achievement leaders seek to maintain these conditions, it is reasonable to anticipate that low achievers will perceive high task or high achievement orientation as an unacceptable leader quality. The acceptability of high task and high achievement oriented leaders to low achievers will be based on the presence of a high relationships characteristic in the leader's behavior. This behavior offers support to the low achiever functioning under adverse conditions.

While low achievement subjects can recognize high achievement and high task orientation as positive qualifications for leaders to get the job done, they are not qualities which produce personal acceptance of the leader. High achievement and high task candidates will be perceived as qualified by low achievement subjects, and may even be sought under adverse conditions, as these are the leaders who will most quickly get the job done and allow the low achiever to be relieved of the task. Therefore, high achievement and high task oriented candidates will be perceived as qualified by low achievement subjects, but will not be accepted as leaders unless there is a relationships factor present in the candidate profile.

The following hypotheses are related to the achievement motivation level of the perceiver:
H.3. Achievement orientation of the subject does not moderate the perception of A+ and T+ candidates as qualified to lead, but does moderate the acceptability of A+ and T+ candidates as leaders.

3.a. For high achievement subjects, achievement oriented and task oriented candidates will be perceived as qualified and accepted as leaders.

3.b. For low achievement subjects, achievement oriented and task oriented candidates will be perceived as qualified, but not accepted as leaders.

3.c. For both high and low achievement subjects, relationships oriented candidates will be perceived as qualified and accepted as leaders.

H.4. For high achievement subjects, achievement orientation moderates the perceived qualifications and acceptability of the high task, high relationship candidates. That is, candidates who lack high achievement orientation, regardless of other qualities, are perceived as neither qualified nor acceptable to high achievement oriented subjects.

H.5. For low achievement subjects, relationships orientation moderates the acceptability of the high achievement, high task candidate, but does not influence the perceived qualifications of this candidate.

3) Does Task Difficulty Moderate Leader Emergence?

To determine the answer, the differences between the high and moderate conditions of task difficulty will be
examined. A study by Rice20 found followers more satisfied with low LPC (high task) leaders under favorable conditions and more satisfied with high LPC (high relations) leaders under less favorable conditions. Schneier's study21 (1978), conducted in quadrant II of Fiedler's theory (favorable conditions) found high task oriented leaders preferred by all subjects. The Rice study suggests that task difficulty does moderate leader emergence by influencing the preferred style of the leader. Fiedler's work also suggests that situational favorability moderates leader effectiveness. However, his predictions, as originally proposed, are the opposite from the Rice findings. The difference between the studies is that Fiedler used group performance as the dependent measure, while Rice used employee satisfaction. Therefore, in constructing the predictions in this matrix, Fiedler's predictions have been used for the hypotheses regarding qualifications of the leader, while Rice's findings pertain to the level of acceptance of the leader.

H.6. Regardless of the levels of task difficulty or achievement orientation of the candidate, low task, low relationships candidates will always be perceived as not qualified. High task, high relationships candidates will always be seen as qualified.

H.7. Task difficulty does moderate the perception of candidates as qualified.

---


21Schneier (1978).
with high task orientation preferred under high task difficulty conditions and relationships orientation preferred under moderate task difficulty conditions.

H.8. Regardless of level of task difficulty or achievement level of the candidate, low task, low relationships candidates will not be accepted as leaders, while high task, high relationships candidates will always be accepted as leaders.

Adopting Schneier's findings confirmed by Rice, that followers are more satisfied with high task oriented leaders under favorable conditions but prefer high relations oriented leaders under unfavorable conditions, it can be stated:

H.9. Regardless of achievement orientation of the candidate, high task oriented candidates will be preferred as the accepted leaders under moderate task difficulty conditions, while high relationships oriented candidates will be preferred as the accepted leaders under conditions of high task difficulty.

41 Do We Prefer Leaders Who Are Like Ourselves?

To assess this question, one personal characteristic variable of the subjects, achievement motivation, will be measured.

This question is more complex than it appears. A simple interpretation suggests that high achievement subjects would rate high achievement candidates as qualified, and low achievement subjects unqualified.
However, the true point of correspondence is between the subjects' self-ratings of their qualifications to provide leadership under the task difficulty problem assigned and how they rated candidates reflecting the same achievement orientation as their own. Correspondence would be demonstrated by a match between 1) the qualifications ratings of the subject and the candidate and 2) their respective achievement ratings.

H.10. Subjects will consider candidates qualified and acceptable based upon the correspondence between a subject's self-ratings of his or her own qualifications to perform the job and the ratings of candidates with the same achievement orientation as the subject.

It must be noted that these predictions do not correspond completely with the literature. High task, high relations candidates are preferred as supervisors, regardless of the achievement orientation of the worker.\textsuperscript{22} However, Rice\textsuperscript{23} found that followers are more satisfied with leaders who have complementary styles. Regardless, the hypothesis is an important one and will be retained. Perhaps it will only hold for high achievement oriented subjects.

\textsuperscript{22}Misumi and Seki (1971).
\textsuperscript{23}Rice (1981).
51. What Are the Minimal Criteria for Leader Emergence?

Emergence will be defined operationally as the candidate having been rated at or above both the minimal qualifications and minimal acceptance levels on the dependent measures. The candidate must be both accepted and perceived as qualified to be considered an emergent leader.

Most important here is not the specific hypotheses proposed, but the exploratory study of the factors hierarchy which defines the schema for leadership under varying conditions. The objective is to map the leadership schema and determine the relationships between factors as the candidates are rated from least to most qualified. Which factors have the most salience, and under what conditions, will be an important finding of this study.

The Misumi and Seki study explored the relationships between worker achievement orientation and the leadership style of the supervisor, employing two style dimensions, the productivity and maintenance behavior of the supervisor. Importantly, they examined the ordering of style preferences of workers. The following hypotheses are formulated based upon their findings.

H.11. Under conditions of moderate task difficulty, high achievement oriented subjects will arrange the qualifications variables in the leadership schema in the following order of importance: achievement, then task by relations, then task, then relations. For the acceptance component of the schema, task and relations will be reversed.
H.12. Under conditions of moderate task difficulty, low achievement oriented subjects will arrange the qualifications variables in the leadership schema in the following order of importance: achievement, then task, then task by relations, then relations, the low task, low relations. The order for the acceptance component will be: achievement, then high task by high relations, then low task by low relations, then relations, then task.

H.13. Under conditions of high task difficulty, high achievement oriented subjects will arrange the qualifications variables in the leadership schema in the following order of importance: achievement, then task by relations, then task orientation. Relationships orientation will not be a part of the schema. For the acceptance component, relationships will substitute for task.

H.14. Under conditions of high task difficulty, low achievement oriented subjects will arrange the qualifications variables in the leadership schema in the following order of importance: achievement, then task by relations, then relations. Task orientation will not be a part of the schema. For the acceptance component, the order will be: achievement, then relations, then task by relations.

This concludes the presentation of hypotheses. In this chapter, a model of the leader emergence process has been proposed, the important variables described and discussed, the importance of the study justified, and pertinent hypotheses developed.
CHAPTER THREE
Design and Execution of Research

1. Experimental Design

The objective is to determine the significance of each of the variables in the model as a contributor to the schema "emergent leader". It is anticipated that the influence of the three leadership factors--achievement orientation, task orientation, and relationships orientation--will vary. Task difficulty and achievement motivation of the subject will influence the schema's content.

An ANOVA design is employed to analyze the within-subjects data. The characteristics of the candidates for emergence are varied within each candidate profile. Each of the three characteristics has two levels, a high and a low condition. This produces a 2 x 2 x 2 design for the candidate characteristics, eight profiles in all. By rotating the candidate characteristics against one another, there is a complete replication of each characteristic matched against the other.

A second ANOVA design is used to analyze the between-subjects data related to task difficulty and achievement motivation of the subjects. Two levels of task difficulty, moderate and difficult, are operationalized using complex task descriptions. Each candidate characteristic is evaluated against each of the four job difficulty by achievement motivation cells.
Between-subject data is analyzed to test hypotheses related to the influence of job difficulty and subject achievement motivation on the content of schema. The contextual nature of leadership can be evaluated by the between-subjects data.

Due to the complete replication of each candidate characteristic for each level of task difficulty, the research design is quite powerful and minimizes within-subject random error.

Importantly, the environmental validity of the study is enhanced by the use of subjects who are professionally employed, who were tested under job relevant conditions using a test problem of immediate professional interest.

II. Sample

The sample is comprised of Student Affairs professionals from twenty-seven of the twenty-eight Jesuit colleges and universities within the continental United States. Many of these individuals assembled for a five day professional renewal conference in Los Angeles, California, July 15-19, 1985. Conference registration was approximately 180 individuals.

Demographically, the 116 participants constituting the final sample were 24 to 59 years old, the mean age being 37 and the mode 26. Years of professional experience ranged from one to twenty-four, with a mean of 8.4 years, mode of four years. This is representative of the relative youth of
professionals in this field, due primarily to the large number of entry-level positions. Sixty-one percent were men, 39 percent women. Caucasians constituted 90.5 percent of the sample, blacks 4.3 percent, with the other 5.2 percent being of Asian and Spanish extraction. The sample is well-distributed among the 19 occupational groupings used. However, vice president/dean of students was over-represented in the sample (18.3 percent). Regarding career level, 14 percent were direct service delivery personnel with no supervisory responsibility; 56 percent were first level supervisors; the remaining 30 percent were second level or higher supervisors. At some time in their careers, 93 percent of the sample report having participated directly in the assessment of personnel, either for employment or for special assignment.

III. Measurements

A) Scales of Dependent Measures

Two dependent measures are used to evaluate the qualifications of candidates and the likelihood of their emergence as leader. The first scale assesses the degree to which the candidate is qualified to successfully lead the group. This scale is a self-constructed five-point Likert scale ranging from "absolutely not qualified" to "absolutely qualified". The neutral condition, mid-point on the scale, is designated "minimally qualified". While this is not
neutral in the truest sense, it does represent a reasonable mid-point in the range of possible qualifications.

Subjects are asked to respond to the following question using the first scale: "To what degree is this candidate qualified to successfully lead your group?" The scale points for response are: 0) absolutely not qualified; 25) not qualified; 50) minimally qualified; 75) qualified; 100) absolutely qualified.

The second scale is designed to measure the degree to which the candidate is supported by the subject as the leader of the group. A five-point Likert scale is used to rate the candidate on the following question: "If this person became the leader, to what extent would this candidate be personally accepted by you?" The five points on the scale are: 0) absolutely unacceptable; 25) unacceptable; 50) minimally acceptable; 75) acceptable; 100) absolutely acceptable.

B) Operationalization of Variables

Leader Qualities: Three leader characteristics, each with a high and a low condition, form the basis for deriving candidate profiles. The three characteristics of a candidate are: 1) achievement orientation, 2) task orientation, and 3) relationships orientation. A sample profile for a candidate who is 1) high task, 2) low achievement, and 3) high relationships oriented in leadership style is as follows:
CANDIDATE B.K.

Those who have worked with this candidate indicate that this individual provides the group with direction and often pushes the group to finish its work. Getting the job done is very important. As a person, this individual is often seen as erratic, and seldom volunteers for assignments. When required to do so, this candidate will select activities which are very easy or quite difficult. As a co-worker, this person is known to be highly supportive of others, and demonstrates a genuine concern for their welfare. Maintaining positive relationships with colleagues is very important.

The description for the second candidate parallels the above description with the exception of the statement pertaining to level of achievement orientation. Phrasing of the rotated variable is underlined.

CANDIDATE C.B.

Those who have worked with this candidate indicate that this person is highly supportive of others, and demonstrates a genuine concern for the welfare of co-workers. Maintaining positive relationships with colleagues is very important to this individual. In working with others, this person provides the group with direction and often pushes the group to finish its work. Getting the job done is very important. As an individual, this candidate is strongly oriented toward personal success and strives hard to achieve individual goals. This person prefers assignments which are challenging, but not impossible, and
which provide the opportunity to attain personal recognition.

The candidate profiles maintain parallel structure in their descriptive language although the order in which different characteristics are presented is varied to avoid monotony and subject response bias. This assures that each profile will be considered fully. Candidate profiles are included in the Addenda.

**Task Difficulty:** Two levels of task difficulty are operationalized. The descriptions differentiate on job characteristics identified within the literature as well as those reasonably associated with the particular demands of the task described. In these descriptions it is quite important to retain the focus of the task being the provision of leadership within the group. The difficulty level pertains to the leadership demands within the group, not the desired outcomes of the task itself and its technical requirements.

In considering task difficulty, the literature reviewed in Chapter One identifies two dimensions, qualities of the job and the social realities faced by the leader. Representative characteristics of the job include scope of the position, task attributes, complexity, demands of the external environment, and the degree of risk related to successful performance of the assignment. Social realities include the degree to which accomplishments will be directly attributable to the leader, leader-member relations, leader
position power, and the general achievement orientation of
other members of the group. Task significance, variety, and
identity and the degree of personal autonomy and feedback on
performance is also important.

Intuitively, it seems that a difficult and a
moderately difficult task would be differentiated by
complexity of the task, the amount of new learning needed to
accomplish the task, the number of individuals supervised
and their qualifications, the time constraints faced in
accomplishing the task, and the level of accomplishment
sought or anticipated by others who will evaluate the
performance of the group.

Employing these characteristics, parallel descriptions
of moderate and difficult tasks were designed. The
descriptions are included in the Addenda.

C) Pretest of Task Difficulty Instrument

Clear operationalization of the task difficulty
variable is critical to this study. Therefore, the
statements describing a moderate and a difficult task were
pretested. Student Affairs professionals at Tulane
University were requested to evaluate the task descriptions
using a Task Description Rating Form (see Addenda). Each of
the 31 participants was mailed a rating form and one of two
task descriptions, randomly assigned, and requested to
return the rating form within seven days. Sixteen responses
were received, equally distributed between the moderate and difficult task conditions.

The Task Description Rating evaluated the test instruments on nine dimensions. Significant differentiation was obtained on five dimensions. Four dimensions were not significant at the .05 level. These were: 1) severity of the problem; 2) level of institutional support for the group's work; 3) the significance of the group's assignment; and, most importantly, 4) the overall rating of how difficult an assignment this would be for the leader of the group.

The lack of significance on the overall rating was a major concern as this was the only scale to be used in the final study. Therefore, additional refinements were made to further differentiate the descriptions on the dimensions identified. Due to time constraints, the revised descriptions were not able to be further tested. Fortunately, the results obtained from subject ratings of the degree of task difficulty proved to be significant beyond the .00001 level ($F=25.146$).

D) Selection of Instruments

The methods employed for data collection required that the instruments used be able to be completed individually rather than in group administration, be capable of completion in a short period to assure high participation
and quick response, and be able to be hand scored, or machine scored in no more than five days.

These parameters eliminate the most widely used method of measuring the need for achievement, the achievement protocols of the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) developed by McClelland and Atkinson. The desire for a self-administered, quick instrument eliminates the use of other achievement scales embedded in longer personality profiles such as the California Psychological Inventory. Two instruments were identified which meet the parameters set and have acceptable psychometric properties.

**Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNO):** Developed by Steers and Braunstein, this is a behaviorally-anchored instrument with a seven-point Likert response format. Its achievement measure correlated (.55) and (.58) with behavioral measures of achievement ratings by judges in two separate samples. Steers and Spencer also report that cross-validated evidence of convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity was found for the MNO.

---


Buros' Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook reports that the ACL has attained the twenty-sixth position of the 100 most-used and cited tests in psychology. As of 1980, it had been used in almost 700 studies and research reports.

Gough reports test-retest reliability data of (.73), (.64), (.69), and (.63) on four samples tested 10 weeks, 10 weeks, six months and 5.5 years apart, respectively. While he notes that these reliability factors are somewhat lower than those for other personality tests, this is due to its susceptibility to short-term changes in the mood of subjects. Other stability studies, however, have established the reliability of the instrument. Gough's own studies report median reliability factors for all scales of (.76) and (.75) for male and female samples respectively. Test-retest reliability coefficients for the achievement scale are (.72) and (.73) for male and female samples.

Regarding validity, Gough reports that acquiescence is controlled for by assigning standard scores after taking "total number checked" into account. Additional studies have also established that social desirability is not a major contaminant. A wide variety of studies have

established the construct validity of the instrument and of its achievement scale. Steers reports, "nACH measures on the ACL have been shown to be highly significantly related to Ac (achievement via conformance) measures on the California Psychological Inventory and to originality ratings on the Thematic Apperception Test."\textsuperscript{5}

The Adjective Check List is the instrument chosen to determine achievement motivation of the subject.

IV. Methods of Analysis

A) Methods of Data Collection

Participation in the study was solicited by mail in advance of the conference using mailing lists of conference registrants. The solicitation letter described briefly the general nature of the request (to participate in a doctoral research study), the time commitment required, and requested the return of a postage-paid card confirming the individual's willingness to participate. Advance confirmations were received from approximately 113 of the 154 persons registered as of July 1, 1985.

Initially, it was proposed to include with these materials a demographic data sheet and the Adjective Check List, requesting that both be returned with the commitment card in advance of the conference. This would have permitted scoring of the check lists for achievement

motivation and the assignment of subjects to task difficulty levels in advance, assuring a random distribution of subjects within the between-subjects cells. However, due to time constraints, this procedure was abandoned and a alternate procedure followed.

Additionally, letters were sent to the Chief Student Affairs Officers in the twenty-seven Jesuit institutions requesting their support for the study and asking their encouragement of others on their staffs to participate.

The last mailing of requests for participation was sent July 1, two weeks in advance of the conference. Additionally, voluntary participation in the research project was solicited at dinner the evening previous to the testing day.

The schedule for Monday, the first day of the conference, provided for a ninety minute break for lunch. The last forty-five minutes was used for data collection. During this time, subjects checked in to the testing room and were given a numbered, closed envelope containing the testing packet designed for self-administration. This packet contained general instructions, eight sheets containing the candidate profiles and rating scales in random order, one of the two task descriptions, a demographic checklist and a copy of the Adjective Check List. A sample copy of the packet is included in the Appendices. Once seated, all subjects were given brief instructions on the tasks to be completed, and requested to
turn in all materials and exit the test center when finished. The remainder of the forty-five minutes was given for the task to be done. The average time for completion was approximately twenty minutes.

Initial testing yielded 95 participants. The achievement need scale of the Adjective Check List was scored at the conference to determine the distribution of achievement scores within the task difficulty groups. A range restriction problem was identified, with low achievers under-represented in both task difficulty conditions. Therefore, arrangements were made for Chief Student Affairs Officers at the conference to test additional members of their staffs on the home campuses following the conference. These individuals, all of whom had participated in the study, were briefed on the study and given instructions for test administration. The campuses selected for follow-up testing were chosen to further broaden the geographic distribution of the sample. Results were requested to be mailed within two weeks. An additional 64 surveys were completed and returned within this timeframe, giving a total response of 159, of which 154 had complete data and were useable.

Special attention was given to the preparation of the testing packets to assure that the candidate profiles were in random order. This was critical to avoid presentation effects biasing subjects' evaluations of the candidates. The packets, once prepared, were randomized within groups of
twenty, ten from each task difficulty condition. In this manner, balance was retained between task difficulty conditions as the packets were distributed to subjects as they entered the testing site. These procedures were quite effective and achieved the desired results. The test packet envelope, the test packet cover, the task description, and the Adjective Check List were each marked with a common identification number.

B) Treatment of Data

Standard statistical methods for ANOVA designs are used employing conventional levels of significance. Statistical packages used are SPSS and BMDP. Each subject evaluated each candidate profile using two five-point continuous Likert scales. Data on achievement motivation of the subject was gathered using Gough's Adjective Check List.

In order to maximize the differentiation in achievement scores, the middle third of the achievement score distribution was discarded, reducing to 116 the size of the sample used in the analysis. Achievement scores ranged from 26-76. The highest achievement standard score attainable is 113 for men, 105 for women. The cut points employed to differentiate scores were 52 and 59, with 58 subjects in each achievement condition. Due to randomization procedures employed, these subjects were distributed on task difficulty with 59 in the moderate condition and 57 in the high difficulty condition, achieving excellent balance in the
V. Summary

The quality of the data is quite good. A large number of subjects were obtained with reasonable demographic and professional diversity. The nature of the problem presented and the self-designed instrumentation employed have strong ecological validity. Established instruments used have acceptable psychometric properties. Randomization procedures yielded excellent distribution of subjects across conditions, and minimized presentation effects and response bias in the rating of candidate profiles. The results, presented in Chapter Four, confirm the strength of the design and the quality of the data obtained.
CHAPTER FOUR

Presentation of Results

This chapter presents the results of the study. Two different forms of analysis are employed to test the hypotheses.

First, multivariate analysis of variance is employed to test for main effects and interactions involving the within-subject leadership factors and the between-subjects grouping variables. Within-subject leadership factors are identified as personal achievement orientation (PACH), task orientation (TASK) and relationships orientation (REL). Between-subjects grouping variables are achievement motivation of the subject (ACH) and level of task difficulty (DIF). Two dependent measures are employed; the rating of candidates as qualified to lead (QUL), and a rating score for candidates reflecting their acceptability (ACPT) to the subject. The main effects and significant interactions are presented in Table 1.a. The means of the high and low conditions of each variable are presented in Table 1.b. Findings are reported for both dependent measures.

The second form of analysis maps the structure of the cognitive schemas used to rate leader qualifications and acceptance. The procedure used to construct the schema is based upon the composition of the leader candidate profiles. The profiles are constructed of the three within-subject leadership factors, each operationalized with a low and a high condition. This 2 x 2 x 2 structure generates eight
profiles, operationalizing a mix of high or low conditions for each of the three leadership factors. Thus, the profiles evaluated by subjects presented mixtures from low achievement, low task, low relationships through all intermediate mixes to high achievement, high task, high relationships. Dependent measures for qualifications and acceptance were collected for each profile. Means of the dependent measure scores were then ordered and the differences between mean scores tested for significance using Newman-Keuls range test.\(^1\) The ordering of the profiles based upon the mean scores of the dependent measures constitutes the structure of the schema mapped. The range tests determine whether one mix of characteristics is significantly different from the mix immediately above and below it in the ordering. Two schema were mapped, leader qualifications and leader acceptance. These schemata are presented in Table 2. The q value and its associated p value report the level of significance when the means for that profile and the previous profile are compared.

1. What is the Schema for Emergent Leader?

The most significant contribution of this study is the mapping of cognitive schemata for leadership. The investigation also assesses those criteria which are

necessary and sufficient to be perceived as a qualified leader, and for leader acceptance. Each of these schemas will be presented and analyzed.

A. Qualifications of Leader

The analysis of variance for qualifications ratings is presented in Table 1 (PACH: $F_{1,115} = 277.15$; TASK: $F_{1,115} = 773.28$; REL: $F_{1,115} = 233.79$). Highly significant main effects were demonstrated for each of the within-subject leadership factors ($p < .0001$). The perceptual distinction between the high and low conditions of these factors was quite clear to subjects.

The within-subject interaction (PT) between personal achievement orientation and task orientation was also significant ($F_{1,115} = 6.12$, $p = .0148$), suggesting that these two factors, working together, have additional explanatory power for leader qualifications ratings. Table 3 presents the means for the PT interaction. Differences between means are significant at the .00001 level. Analysis of the table shows the significant main effects and the interaction. High task, high personal achievement is evaluated more highly than low task, low personal achievement. This is to be expected. The nature of the interaction is that high task, low personal achievement is evaluated more highly than high personal achievement, low task. Graph 1 presents the interaction.
The schema of leader based on qualifications ratings is presented in Table 2. A mean score of fifty represents the level for minimal qualifications and acceptance ratings. Examining this schema, it is clear that task orientation is dominant in forming the perceived qualifications of leaders. Of the three leadership factors, task orientation alone is sufficient to achieve minimal ratings as a qualified leader \( (u = 50.6) \). Personal achievement \( (u = 28.28) \) and relationships orientation \( (u = 30.33) \) alone or in combination \( (u = 43.78) \) do not demonstrate this sufficiency. As might be anticipated, the combination of the two factors does attain significantly higher ratings than either factor alone \( (q = 12.30, p < .00001) \). There is no significant difference between the ratings for the factors separately \( (q = 1.87, p = .18768) \).

The stability of the profile across subjects was tested using Kendall's coefficient of concordance. Rank orderings of leader profiles across all subjects and moderating conditions were compared. Table 4 presents the results. The strength of the concordance coefficient \( (r = .698) \) demonstrates reasonable stability in the qualifications schema. Given the hypotheses put forth regarding moderating variables, this stability is surprising. Considering the levels of task difficulty, subject achievement motivation, and the varied personal qualities and job characteristics of the subjects measured by the exogenous variables, there is a notable level of agreement on the ordering of factors in the
cognitive schema for qualified leader. The identification of persons as qualified to be leaders is rather uniform across subjects and conditions. The moderating variables employed in this study do not notably influence the perceived qualifications of leaders.

**HYPOTHESIS 1:** Of the low achievement candidates, only those who are high task, high relationships will be considered as qualified and accepted as leaders.

**HYPOTHESIS 2:** Of the high achievement candidates, all candidates will be regarded as qualified and accepted as leaders, except for the low task, low relationships candidate.

Table 5 presents the qualifications and acceptance ratings for low and high achievement oriented candidate profiles. Hypothesis one is partially supported for qualifications scores and fully supported for acceptance scores. Within the low achievement candidates, both the high task, high relations \((u = 64.6)\) and the high task \((u = 50.6)\) alone profiles achieve minimal qualifications standards; and only the high task, high relationships \((u = 65.9)\) candidate attained the minimal acceptance score.

Hypothesis two is partially supported for both ratings. Within the high achievement candidate profiles, the low task, low relationships candidate was not qualified \((u = 28.3)\) or accepted \((u = 31.2)\), as hypothesized. Additionally the low task, high relationships candidate did
not achieve minimal qualifications (u = 43.8) or acceptance (u = 45.9) ratings.

Examination of Table 5 reveals that the schema structures are quite similar with respect to the influence of task and relationships irrespective of personal achievement orientation level. The only exception is that high task alone did not quite attain minimal acceptance scores in the low achievement profile. Personal achievement orientation is not the dominant variable in these leadership schemata.

B. Leader Acceptance

Strong main effects (PACH: $F_{1,115} = 147.86$; TASK: $F_{1,115} = 487.31$; REL: $F_{1,115} = 190.43$) were also observed for the within-subject leadership factors in ratings of leader acceptance (see Table 1).

A within-subject interaction between task (T) and relationships (R) orientations was also highly significant ($F_{1,115} = 11.56, p < .001$) for acceptance ratings. Table 6 presents the means associated with the TR interaction. The interaction is shown in Graph 2. Differences between means are significant at the .00001 level. Examination of Graph 2 suggests that as task difficulty increases, a high relationships orientation enhances leader acceptance ratings beyond the change in scores associated with the main effect.

In leader acceptance ratings a significant, but weak, main effect was also found for achievement motivation of the
subject \( (F_{1,115} = 5.07, p < .05) \). Low and high achievers do differ when evaluating leader acceptance. These differences will be discussed shortly. No significant main effect (see Table 1) was found for level of task difficulty \( (F_{1,115} = 0.26, p = .6128) \).

The schemata for leader acceptance are presented in Tables 2 and 4. Again, task orientation dominates these schemata. However, task orientation \( (u = 47.16) \) alone is not sufficient to be perceived as an acceptable leader. It is a necessary but not a sufficient condition to form the perception of being minimally acceptable. Task orientation must be supplemented by at least one of the other leadership factors, with relationships orientation \( (u = 65.93) \) yielding higher acceptance ratings than personal achievement orientation \( (u = 59.59) \). The difference in influence is statistically significant \( (q = 5.48, p = .00018) \). The highest acceptability rating \( (u = 80.20) \) was received by the candidate profile representing high conditions on each of the three leader factors.

The acceptance schema is also reasonably stable across all subjects and conditions, although less so than the qualifications schema. The coefficient of concordance for leader acceptability ratings was \( r = .609 \). Comparison of the schema structures based on means and rank orderings (Tables 2 and 4) show that rank orderings place the high personal achievement, high relations (PR) candidate above the task oriented (T) candidate, whereas in the ordering
based on ratings means these two profiles are reversed. This has little importance as the difference between the means is not statistically significant ($q = 1.09$, $p = .44022$).

II. What Are the Minimal Criteria for Leader Emergence?

Beyond the observations already made, consideration of minimal criteria for leader emergence suggests that the qualifications and acceptance schemata be examined more closely for the influence of moderating variables to assess whether notable differences do exist which influence leader emergence.

Tables 7-10 present the qualifications and acceptance schemas for subjects partitioned by the grouping variables employed in the study. Achievement motivation of the subject and level of task difficulty, the grouping variables, form four sub-schema which allow closer examination of the influence of moderating variables on the ordering of these schemata and the minimal criterion levels for leader emergence. A priori, it was suggested that a candidate must be both accepted and perceived as qualified to be considered an emergent leader.

HYPOTHESIS 11: Under conditions of moderate task difficulty, high achievement oriented subjects will arrange the qualifications variables in the leadership schema in the following order of importance: achievement, then task by relations, then task, then
relations. For the acceptance component of the schema, task and relations will be reversed.

HYPOTHESIS 12: Under conditions of moderate task difficulty, low achievement oriented subjects will arrange the qualifications variables in the leadership schema in the following order of importance: achievement, then task, then task by relations, then relations, then low task, low relations. The order for the acceptance component will be: achievement, then high task by high relations, then low task by low relations, then relations, then task.

HYPOTHESIS 13: Under conditions of high task difficulty, high achievement oriented subjects will arrange the qualifications variables in the leadership schema in the following order of importance: achievement, then task by relations, then task orientation. Relationships orientation will not be a part of the schema. For the acceptance component, relationships will substitute for task.

HYPOTHESIS 14: Under conditions of high task difficulty, low achievement oriented subjects will arrange the qualifications variables in the leadership schema in the following order of importance: achievement, then task by relations, then relations. Task orientation will not be a part of the schema. For the acceptance component, the order will be: achievement, then relations, then task by relations.

The schemata associated with high achievers rating candidates as leaders under moderate task difficulty conditions are presented in Table 7. The structure of these schemata correspond completely with the overall schemata for leader qualifications and acceptance. The only notable
difference is in the acceptance schema where the respective influence of personal achievement (\( u = 56.00 \)) and relationships orientation (\( u = 59.87 \)) is not significant (\( q = 1.498, p = .29811 \)). Under moderate task difficulty conditions, high achievers perceive no difference in acceptance between task oriented candidates who are also high on either personal achievement or relationships orientation.

Table 8 presents the schemata for low achievers under moderate task difficulty conditions. There are notable differences between the overall schemata and the findings for low achievers under this task difficulty condition.

In the qualifications schema, the first and most notable difference is that task orientation (\( u = 49.97 \)) alone does not quite attain the minimal level for qualifications ratings. The second is that the task-oriented candidate with a relationships orientation (\( u = 69.38 \)) is rated higher than the task-oriented candidate with an achievement orientation (\( u = 68.68 \)). The difference, however, is not significant (\( q = .346, p = 1.0000 \)).

In the acceptance schema, task orientation alone (\( u = 50.55 \)) is sufficient to be perceived as an acceptable candidate. High task-oriented candidates with a relationships orientation (\( u = 71.66 \)) continue to be preferred significantly more (\( q = 4.052, p = .00782 \)) over those oriented toward personal achievement (\( u = 62.41 \)).
Thus, for low achievers rating profiles under moderate task difficulty conditions, a notable shift occurs in these schemata. In comparison to the overall schemata, the association between personal achievement and relationships orientation is not influenced. However, the influence of task orientation is reversed. Task orientation alone is not sufficient to be perceived as qualified, but is sufficient to be perceived as acceptable.

Table 9 presents schemata derived from high achievers evaluating candidates under high difficulty conditions. High achievers are more conservative than others in their qualifications and acceptance ratings. Their ratings generally are lower than ratings for the overall profile (Table 2). Again, task orientation alone fails to achieve ratings sufficient to form the perception of being minimally qualified. High achievers more than others seem to require stronger qualifications of candidates when facing highly difficult situations.

The schema for high achievers evaluating profiles under high task difficulty conditions indicates that task orientation alone is not sufficient to form the perception of a qualified leader ($u = 45.89$) or an acceptable leader ($u = 44.07$). Also, in both schema, the differences are not significant between task-oriented candidates with a personal achievement orientation and one with a relationships orientation. In the qualifications schema, these profiles
are rated virtually the same ($u_{PT} = 63.43, u_{TR} = 63.46; q = .013, p = .15925$).

It appears that high achievers evaluating candidates under high task difficulty conditions employ comparatively more rigorous standards and use the same schema for assessing candidate qualifications and acceptance.

Low achievers evaluating candidates for high difficulty tasks operate with interesting schemata. These schemata, presented in Table 10, suggest that low achievers facing high difficulty tasks consider task-oriented candidates with high achievement ($u = 71.69$) more qualified than those with a high relationships orientation ($u = 68.14$). However, the differences are not significant ($q = 1.969, p = .17489$). Here, also, task orientation alone is sufficient to be perceived as qualified ($u = 54.10$) but not sufficient for leader acceptance ($u = 49.07$). Also, the difference between high task oriented candidates with a personal achievement orientation ($u = 61.69$) and a relationships orientation ($u = 68.66$) is significant ($q = 4.187, p = .00619$).

Low achievers' greater acceptance of relationships-oriented leaders in highly difficult conditions is further supported by the dislocation of task orientation as a completely dominant factor in the acceptance profile. Task orientation ($u = 49.07$) has been displaced by the combination of personal achievement and relationships orientation ($u = 52.49$). The difference, however, is not significant ($q = 2.049, p = .15856$). Under high difficulty
conditions, low achievers appear to extend greater acceptance to those leaders who have a high relationships orientation.

These observations must be interpreted cautiously as they are based on ordering effects of the schemata only. Only very slight changes occur in the ordering of factors within these schemata as a function of the grouping variables forming the cells. The uniformity of the schema structures under varied conditions negates the anticipated findings suggested by hypotheses 11-14. The hypotheses are rejected.

Variance analyses were conducted on within-subject factors under each of the four conditions. Examination of candidate ratings indicates that those profiles perceived as minimally qualified are dominated by the task orientation characteristic, with task being necessary and sufficient in most cases to be perceived as minimally qualified. This is not so for leader acceptance. While task orientation is a necessary condition for leader acceptance, it is only rarely sufficient. For leader acceptance, task orientation must usually be supplemented by another positive personal attribute. Here, relationships orientation often yields significantly greater acceptance ratings than personal achievement orientation. For qualifications ratings, the difference between achievement and relationships orientations is not statistically significant. Finally, the strongest ratings for qualified leader and acceptable leader
belong to the candidate who supplements task orientation with both achievement and relationships orientations.

III. Does The Perceiver's Achievement Motivation Moderate the Content of the Schema?

The presence of moderator variables in leadership research has received recent attention.² The current accepted definition of a moderator variable is that put forth by James and Brett: "a variable z is a moderator if the relationship between two (or more) other variables, say x and y, is a function of the level of z."³ This definition is adopted for this study.

HYPOTHESIS 3: Achievement orientation of the subject does not moderate the perception of high achievement and high task candidates as qualified to lead, but does moderate their acceptability as leaders.

HYPOTHESIS 3.A.: For high achievement subjects, achievement oriented and task oriented candidates will be perceived as qualified and accepted as leaders.

HYPOTHESIS 3.B.: For low achievement subjects, achievement oriented and task oriented candidates will be perceived as qualified, but not accepted as leaders.


HYPOTHESIS 3.C.: For both high and low achievement subjects, relationships oriented candidates will be perceived as qualified and accepted as leaders.

Hypothesis three suggests that achievement orientation of the subject (ACH) will form interactions with the high personal achievement orientation (P), high task orientation (T) profile for leader acceptability ratings, but not for leader qualification ratings. Table 1 shows the PTA interaction for qualified ratings is not significant ($F_{1,115} = 0.04$, $p = .8394$); the PTA interaction for acceptability is stronger but does not achieve conventional levels of significance ($F_{1,115} = 2.13$, $p = .1472$). Hypothesis three is partially confirmed. Achievement orientation of the subject does not moderate qualifications scores for high achievement, high task candidates, nor does it moderate their acceptability ratings.

Hypotheses 3.a-c are amplifications of the general hypothesis. They are addressed by examining the qualifications and acceptance schema for high and low achievers presented in Tables 11 and 12 respectively.

For high achievers, both of the high achievement, high task oriented candidates are perceived as qualified ($u_{PT} = 62.52$; $u_{PTR} = 80.60$) and acceptable ($u_{PT} = 57.14$; $u_{PTR} = 78.62$). Hypothesis 3.a. is confirmed.

For low achievers, both of the high achievement, high task oriented candidates are also perceived as qualified
(u_{PT} = 70.16; u_{PTR} = 85.72) and as acceptable (u_{PT} = 62.06; u_{PTR} = 81.78). Hypothesis 3.b. is partially confirmed.

Hypothesis 3.c. is not supported. For both high and low achievers, when the relationships oriented characteristic stands alone it never reaches minimal qualifications (High Achievers: u_R = 29.52; Low Achievers: u_R = 31.14) and acceptance (High Achievers: u_R = 30.95; Low Achievers: u_R = 39.21) ratings. The relationships characteristic is perceived as qualified and acceptable only when it is associated with a high task orientation.

HYPOTHESIS 4: For high achievement subjects, achievement orientation moderates the perceived qualifications and acceptability of the high task, high relationship candidates. That is, candidates who lack high achievement orientation, regardless of other qualities, are perceived as neither qualified nor acceptable to high achievement subjects.

HYPOTHESIS 5: For low achievement subjects, relationships orientation moderates the acceptability of the high achievement, high task candidate, but does not influence the perceived qualifications of this candidate.

Hypothesis four and five are ill-formed. Given the nature of the design, within-subject factors cannot serve as moderators. While the term moderator is used, what is truly suggested is that there will be significant differences in ratings depending upon the level of one of the three within-subject factors specified in the hypothesis. The second
sentence in hypothesis four, then, is the intended interpretation of these hypotheses.

The results for hypothesis four and five are presented in Table 11 and 12. Two (PT, PTR) of the three candidates (PT, PTR, TR) receiving minimal qualifications and acceptance scores were high achievement oriented candidates. However, not all were. The high task, high relationships candidate (TR), despite a low personal achievement orientation, was rated qualified and acceptable. Also, other profiles containing a high achievement orientation did not attain significant ratings. Therefore, hypothesis four must be rejected.

Hypothesis five suggests that the perceived qualifications and the acceptability of candidates to low achievers depends upon the presence of a high relationships orientation in the profile. Two (TR, PTR) of the four qualified profiles (T, TR, PT, PTR) and two (TR, PTR) of the three acceptable profiles (PT, TR, PTR) contain a high relationships factor, but not all do. Here also, profiles containing a high relationships orientation did not attain significant ratings. Therefore, hypothesis five must be rejected.

The lack of a significant main effect \( F_{1,115} = 3.30, \ p = .0722 \) for subject achievement motivation (Table 1) indicates that there is no significant difference between the qualifications ratings given by high and low achievers. However, achievement motivation of the subject does approach
significance ($p = .0722$) and does form significant interactions associated with qualifications ratings: 1) $\text{ACH} \times \text{TASK} (F_{1,115} = 5.08, p = .0261)$, and 2) $\text{ACH} \times \text{PACH} \times \text{REL} \times \text{DIF} (F_{1,115} = 10.66, p = .0014)$.

Examination of the $\text{ACH} \times \text{TASK}$ interaction (Graph 3) associated with qualifications ratings reveals that low task orientation is evaluated the same by both low and high achievers, while high task orientation is evaluated more positively by low achievers than high achievers. The means of the TA interaction are presented in Table 13.

The second interaction associated with subject achievement motivation is far more complex. It involves personal achievement orientation ($P$) and relationships orientation ($R$) of the candidate, level of task difficulty ($D$), and achievement motivation ($A$) of the subject. This interaction $(PRDA)$ is significant for both qualifications ($F_{1,115} = 10.66, p = .0014$) and acceptance ($F_{1,115} = 13.18, p = .0004$) ratings. Graphs 4 and 5 present this interaction for qualifications and acceptance ratings respectively.

Table 14 dissects the interaction and confirms the locus of the interaction suggested in the graphs. The locus of the interaction is for high achievers ($A_2$) evaluating high personal achievement, high relationships candidates ($PR$) under moderate task difficulty conditions ($D_1$).

For acceptance ratings, there is a significant main effect ($F_{1,115} = 5.07, p = .0263$) for achievement, indicating that subject achievement motivation does
influence candidate acceptance ratings. There is a significant difference between high and low achievers' leader acceptability ratings. The only significant interaction involving achievement motivation (ACH) and acceptance scores is the PRDA interaction discussed above.

Based upon variance analysis, it can be concluded that achievement motivation of the subject does moderate leader qualifications and acceptance ratings although the influence is limited. Only three of the twenty-eight possible interactions which could have been formed were statistically significant. Two of the three were third-order interactions.

It is possible that the weak main effect and interactions observed for achievement orientation of the subject might effect the schema for leader acceptability. If so, low and high achievement subjects may generate different schema. The acceptance schemata for high and low achievers are presented in Table 12. However, examination of the schemata reveals no notable differences. The orderings of the schemata are the same, and correspond with the overall schema for leader acceptance (Table 2). There are no ordering differences between the respective schemata, nor any differences in the criteria required to form the perception of acceptable leader.

Between-schema comparison of the means for each leader acceptability profile indicates that, with one exception, high achievers rated candidates more rigorously than did low
achievers. Only for the profile where all factors are low did low achievers rate the profile less acceptable. It appears that the significant main effect for subject achievement motivation is attributable to high achievers systematically rating candidates more conservatively on acceptance than do low achievers.

IV. Does Task Difficulty Moderate Leader Emergence?

No significant main effect was identified for task difficulty in either qualifications or acceptance ratings (Table 1). Therefore, no significant differences in candidate qualifications and acceptance ratings are directly associated with level of task difficulty. However, task difficulty was a component of two complex interactions which appear for both dependent measures. The first interaction is between the leadership factors personal achievement (P) and relationships (R) orientations and level of task difficulty (D). The second, a four-way interaction, adds achievement motivation (A) to the three-way interaction. Notationally, the two interactions are PRD and PRDA.

The PRDA interaction has already been reviewed in the discussion of achievement motivation as a moderating variable. Those findings identified the locus of the interaction to be associated with high personal achievement, high relationships profiles (PR) being evaluated by high achievers (A) under low task difficulty (D) conditions. For
both qualifications and acceptance ratings, this interaction was significant at the \( p < .001 \) level.

The PRD interaction is less significant for both qualifications \( (F_{1,115} = 5.46, p = .0212) \) and acceptance \( (F_{1,115} = 6.24, p = .0139) \) ratings. Graphs 6 and 7 present the respective interactions. For qualifications scores, Graph 6 suggests that low relationships candidates with a low achievement orientation are perceived as less qualified as task difficulty increases, while low relationships, high achievement candidates are perceived as more qualified as task difficulty increases. For acceptance ratings, Graph 7 suggests that the acceptability of a low achievement, low relationships candidate or a high achievement, high relationships candidate is not moderated by task difficulty level. However, the acceptability of both the low achievement, high relationships candidate and the high achievement, low relationships candidate diminishes as task difficulty increases. Clearly, task difficulty moderates these acceptability ratings.

Are the leadership schemata modified when subjects are grouped by level of task difficulty? For qualifications ratings (Table 15) task orientation dominates these schemata, with no significant difference between personal achievement and relationships orientations as supplemental leadership factors. The acceptance schemata (Table 16) do have some variability in structure, but it all occurs beneath the level for minimal acceptability. In the range
of acceptability, the structures for high and moderate task
difficulty are the same.

To be perceived as an acceptable leader, task
orientation must be supplemented by either or both personal
achievement or relationships orientation. Task orientation
alone is insufficient. Comparison of the schemata under
high and moderate task difficulty conditions, the lack of
notable differences in their structures, and the limited
interactions associated with task difficulty suggest that
task difficulty does not influence leader emergence schema,
even though qualifications and acceptance ratings are
moderated under the very selective conditions reflected by
the interactions discussed.

HYPOTHESIS 6: Regardless of the levels
of task difficulty or achievement
orientation of the candidate, low task,
low relationships candidates will always
be perceived as not qualified. High
task, high relationships candidates will
always be seen as qualified.

HYPOTHESIS 7: Task difficulty does
moderate the perception of candidates as
qualified, with high task orientation
preferred under high task difficulty
conditions and relationships orientation
preferred under moderate task difficulty
conditions.

HYPOTHESIS 8: Regardless of level of
task difficulty or achievement
orientation of the candidate, low task,
low relationships candidates will not be
accepted as leaders while high task,
high relationships candidates will
always be accepted as leaders.
HYPOTHESIS 9: Regardless of achievement orientation of the candidate, high task oriented candidates will be preferred as the accepted leaders under moderate task difficulty conditions, while high relationships oriented candidates will be preferred as the accepted leaders under conditions of high task difficulty.

Hypotheses six and eight suggest that task difficulty does not influence the qualifications and acceptance ratings of low task, low relations and high task, high relations candidates, respectively. The lack of a significant main effect for task difficulty (QUL: $F_{1,115} = .00, p = .9928$; ACPT: $F_{1,115} = .26, p = .6128$) substantiates these hypotheses (see Table 1).

The schema for qualified leader under moderate and high task difficulty conditions are presented in Table 15. The schema for accepted leader under similar conditions are presented in Table 16.

For hypothesis six (Table 15), profiles (-,-,-) and (P,-,-) are not qualified. Profiles (-,T,R) and (P,T,R) each are qualified, regardless of task difficulty level, thereby confirming hypothesis six.

For hypothesis eight, profiles (-,-,-) and (P,-,-) are not accepted as leaders, while profiles (-,T,R) and (P,T,R) clearly are, irrespective of task difficulty level, thereby confirming hypothesis eight.

In hypotheses seven and nine, the term moderate is used to address anticipated modifications in the structure of schema associated with changes in task difficulty level,
high task orientation being preferred under high task difficulty conditions and relationships orientation preferred under moderate conditions.

Hypothesis seven is not supported. Examination of the schema presented in Table 15 verifies the lack of modifying influence of task difficulty on the ratings of candidate qualifications. The ordering of the qualifications schema clearly establishes that task orientation dominates relationships orientation under both task difficulty conditions.

Hypothesis nine suggests that task difficulty modifies the leader acceptability schema with task oriented candidates preferred under moderately difficult conditions and relationships oriented candidates preferred under highly difficult conditions. Examination of the acceptability schema presented in Table 16 offers no support. Here, also, task difficulty dominates the schema. However, earlier evidence reviewed suggests that low achievers are more accepting of high relationships oriented candidates under high task difficulty conditions (Table 10).

V. Do We Prefer Leaders Who Are Like Ourselves?

HYPOTHESIS 10: Subjects will consider candidates qualified and acceptable based upon the correspondence between a subject's self-ratings of his or her own qualifications to perform the job and the ratings of candidates with the same achievement orientation as the subject.
Test results of hypothesis ten are shown in Table 17. The coefficients reported represent the correlation between the subjects' self-ratings of their qualifications to lead and the qualifications and acceptance ratings of profiles containing the same achievement orientation as the subject. Low achievers' self-scores ($\mu = 59.95$) were matched with the ratings given to low achievement profiles and likewise for high achievers' self-scores ($\mu = 60.92$) and high achievement profiles.

For high achievers, the hypothesis is not supported. The correlation between high achievers' self-ratings of their qualifications to lead and the qualifications ratings given to the high personal achievement profiles was not significant ($r = .2054$, $F_{1,57} = .628$, $p = .6447$). The correlation was also checked for acceptance scores. Again, it was not significant ($r = .1191$, $F_{1,57} = .937$, $p = .4498$). The results for low achievers were also not significant for qualifications ($r = .2411$, $F_{1,57} = .818$, $p = .5195$) and acceptance ($r = .2570$, $F_{1,57} = .937$, $p = .4498$) scores. The matching hypothesis is not confirmed.

Subjects' self-ratings of their own qualifications to lead were also checked for correlation with their achievement scores. The only significant correlation is between low achievers' self-ratings of their qualifications to lead and their achievement scores ($r = .4150$, $F_{1,57} = 11.65$, $p = .0012$). The correlation between high achievers' self-ratings and achievement scores was not
significant. These findings, of course, are not directly pertinent to the matching hypothesis. They do, however, suggest that low achievers' self-perceptions of their qualifications to lead are associated with their motivation to achieve. This was not the finding for high achievers.

VI. Summary

1) The cognitive schemata to perceive leadership mapped by this study tend to be rather stable across subjects and conditions.

2) The structure of the schemata are not subject to notable influence by task difficulty or subject achievement motivation. Where these moderators do operate, they may alter the magnitude of leadership ratings but do not notably alter the structure of the schema.

   a. Under moderate task difficulty conditions, high achievers perceive no significant difference in acceptance between task oriented candidates who are also high on either personal achievement or relationships orientation.

   b. For low achievers under moderate task difficulty conditions, task orientation alone is not quite sufficient to achieve minimal qualifications ratings, but is sufficient to be rated as an acceptable leader.

   c. High achievers evaluating candidates under high task difficulty conditions employ comparatively more
rigorous standards and use the same schema for assessing candidate qualifications and acceptance.

d. Under high task difficulty conditions, low achievers consider achievement oriented leaders more qualified, but give greater acceptance to high relationships oriented leaders. Under moderate task difficulty conditions, low achievers perceived the relationships oriented leader as both more qualified and acceptable.

3) High task orientation dominates the schemata for leader qualifications and acceptance. It is a necessary factor in order to form a perception of the candidate as qualified and to be accepted. Alone, it is sufficient to form the perception of a minimally qualified leader. This is true for the overall schema and for the low achievers' schema. In the high achievers' schema, however, task orientation alone is not sufficient to be perceived as a qualified leader.

4) Personal achievement and relationships orientation are supplementary to task orientation in forming perceptions of leadership. Either alone or in combination, they are insufficient to form a leadership perception. There is no significant difference in the contribution each makes to strengthening the perception of a qualified leader. However, for leader acceptance, relationships orientation enhances leader perceptions significantly more than personal achievement orientation.
5) The schema for leader acceptance is more rigorous than the schema for leader qualifications, requiring high task orientation and one of the supplemental factors in order to support a perception of minimally acceptable leader.

6) Combined, the lack of influence of the hypothesized moderators on schema structure is one of the important findings of the study. Cognitive schemata employed in the identification and labelling of persons as leaders apparently are not notably influenced by the situational contingencies operationalized in this study. Perceptually, at least, a leader is a leader across most subjects and situational variables.

7) The lack of a significant main effect for task difficulty as a moderator is notable as there were statistically significant differences between subjects' evaluations of the two task difficulty scenarios presented.

8) A main effect for achievement motivation of the subject was statistically significant for acceptance ratings. Several interesting differences between high and low achievers' ratings of leadership factors have been identified. Overall, however, the influence of the subject's achievement motivation on the structure of the acceptance schema was negligible. This, too, is notable.

9) Achievement motivation of the subject and task difficulty moderate acceptance ratings and qualifications ratings, but only under very selective conditions.
10) Personal achievement orientation interacts significantly with task orientation for qualifications ratings; relationships orientation interacts significantly with task orientation for acceptance ratings. These interactions are significant overall and in ratings given by high achievers. Neither interaction is significant in ratings given by low achievers.

11) An interaction between task orientation and achievement motivation of the subject was significant for qualifications ratings. Low task orientation is evaluated the same by both low and high achievers, while high task orientation is evaluated more positively by low achievers than high achievers.

12) The PRD and PRDA interactions are significant for both qualifications and acceptance ratings. In both cases, the four-way interaction is stronger than the three-way interaction. Except for the TA interaction, these are the only significant interactions involving within-subject leadership factors and grouping variables.

13) Low achievers demonstrate a significant correlation between self-ratings of their qualifications to lead and their achievement scores. The correlation for high achievers was not significant. No correlational tests of the matching hypothesis were significant.

14) Minimal criteria for leaders to emerge require a task orientation supplemented by at least one of the other personality factors employed, personal achievement or
relationships orientation. While no significant difference was found between the two in determining leader qualifications, relationships orientation does yield significantly higher ratings for leader acceptability. The candidate demonstrating all three attributes received significantly higher qualifications and acceptability ratings than any other candidate.
### TABLE 1. a.

Significant Effects
Candidate Qualifications and Acceptance Ratings
Within Subject and Grouping Variables

**QUALIFIED (n = 116)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACH (P)</td>
<td>51151.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>277.17</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK (T)</td>
<td>307444.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>773.28</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL (R)</td>
<td>52276.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>233.79</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIF (D)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.9928</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACH (A)</td>
<td>2155.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.0722</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>1222.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>.0148</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>2021.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.0261</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRD</td>
<td>656.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>.0212</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRDA</td>
<td>1280.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>.0014</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.8394</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACCEPTED (n = 116)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACH (P)</td>
<td>32732.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>147.86</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK (T)</td>
<td>206729.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>487.31</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL (R)</td>
<td>66858.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>190.43</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIF (D)</td>
<td>321.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.6128</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACH (A)</td>
<td>6337.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>.0263</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>1666.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRD</td>
<td>855.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>.0139</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRDA</td>
<td>1807.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>388.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.1472</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
**** p < .0001
# TABLE 1. b.

## Means of Low/High Conditions  
Within-Subject and Grouping Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualified</th>
<th>Low Condition</th>
<th>High Condition</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIF</td>
<td>47.945</td>
<td>47.982</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.9823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>49.485</td>
<td>46.442</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.0701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACH</td>
<td>40.54</td>
<td>55.39</td>
<td>273.04</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>66.17</td>
<td>750.38</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>40.46</td>
<td>55.47</td>
<td>236.66</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>47.653</td>
<td>48.921</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.5909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>50.901</td>
<td>45.651</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>.0245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACH</td>
<td>42.33</td>
<td>56.48</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>63.22</td>
<td>492.82</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>39.78</td>
<td>56.78</td>
<td>192.94</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 2

## LEADERSHIP SCHEMA

Qualifications and Acceptance Profiles Based Upon Ratings Means

**QUALIFIED LEADER** (n = 116)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Achievement</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Relations</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.28</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.18768</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>43.78</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.60</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>.00002</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>64.59</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.34</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.26023</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>83.16</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACCEPTED LEADER** (n = 116)

| -                    | -    | -         | 21.14 |       |         |      |
| P                    | -    | -         | 31.21 | 8.71  | .00000  | *****|
| -                    | -    | R         | 35.08 | 3.35  | .01967  | *    |
| P                    | -    | R         | 45.90 | 9.35  | .00000  | *****|
| -                    | T    | -         | 47.16 | 1.09  | .44022  | N.S. |
| P                    | T    | -         | 59.59 | 10.75 | .00000  | *****|
| -                    | T    | R         | 65.93 | 5.48  | .00018  | ***  |
| P                    | T    | R         | 80.20 | 12.33 | .00000  | *****|

*** p < .001  
**** p < .0001  
****** p < .00001
### TABLE 3

Test of Cell Means
Personal Achievement X Task Orientation Interaction
Qualified Ratings

#### Personal Achievement Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Orientation</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>36.03</td>
<td>.29.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>57.59</td>
<td>74.75</td>
<td>66.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>40.53</td>
<td>55.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Test of Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means 1</th>
<th>Means 2</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>36.03</td>
<td>9.566</td>
<td>&lt; .00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.59</td>
<td>74.75</td>
<td>13.080</td>
<td>&lt; .00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>57.59</td>
<td>26.000</td>
<td>&lt; .00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.03</td>
<td>74.75</td>
<td>29.513</td>
<td>&lt; .00001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4

LEADERSHIP SCHEMA
Qualifications and Acceptance Profiles
Based Upon Rank Orderings

QUALIFIED LEADER \( (n = 116) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Achievement</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Relations</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Rank Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>197.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>307.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>328.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>489.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>545.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>705.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>718.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>884.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance: \( r = 0.69759 \)

ACCEPTED LEADER \( (n = 116) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Relations</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Rank Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>216.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>312.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>374.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>496.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>511.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>669.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>726.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>870.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance: \( r = 0.60937 \)
TABLE 5

LEADERSHIP SCHEMA

Low and High Achievement Orientation Profiles
Qualified and Accepted Ratings

Low Achievement Profiles (n = 116)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| High Achievement Profiles (n = 116)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**** p < .00001
TABLE 6

Test of Cell Means
Task Orientation X Relationship Orientation Interaction
Acceptance Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Orientation</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>40.49</td>
<td>43.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>53.37</td>
<td>73.06</td>
<td>63.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>39.77</td>
<td>56.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test of Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means 1</th>
<th>Means 2</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>40.49</td>
<td>12.843</td>
<td>&lt; .00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.37</td>
<td>73.06</td>
<td>17.659</td>
<td>&lt; .00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>53.37</td>
<td>24.395</td>
<td>&lt; .00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.49</td>
<td>73.06</td>
<td>29.211</td>
<td>&lt; .00001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 7

### QUALIFICATIONS AND ACCEPTANCE SCHEMA

**High Achievers/Moderate Task Difficulty**  
*n = 30*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>06174</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>2.748</td>
<td>.06174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.53155</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>44.90</td>
<td>7.398</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.23</td>
<td>3.234</td>
<td>.02972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>57.57</td>
<td>2.356</td>
<td>.10654</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.67</td>
<td>1.809</td>
<td>.21106</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>82.33</td>
<td>9.114</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.43</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.23</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>.31561</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>43.97</td>
<td>6.481</td>
<td>.00008</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.93</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>.00509</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.87</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td>.29811</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>82.37</td>
<td>8.712</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05  
** ** p < .01  
**** **** p < .0001  
***** ***** p < .00001
## TABLE 8

**QUALIFICATIONS AND ACCEPTANCE SCHEMA**

**Low Achievers/Moderate Task Difficulty**

*n = 29*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- -</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P -</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>3.983</td>
<td>.00880</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- R</td>
<td>33.59</td>
<td>2.728</td>
<td>.06394</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P R</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>4.355</td>
<td>.00461</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- T</td>
<td>49.97</td>
<td>3.092</td>
<td>.03733</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P T R</td>
<td>68.62</td>
<td>8.479</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- T R</td>
<td>69.38</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P T R</td>
<td>83.55</td>
<td>6.442</td>
<td>.00009</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- -</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P -</td>
<td>32.41</td>
<td>5.337</td>
<td>.00077</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- R</td>
<td>38.55</td>
<td>2.693</td>
<td>.06723</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P R</td>
<td>46.14</td>
<td>3.329</td>
<td>.02584</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- T</td>
<td>50.55</td>
<td>1.934</td>
<td>.18232</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P T R</td>
<td>62.41</td>
<td>5.201</td>
<td>.00099</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- T R</td>
<td>71.66</td>
<td>4.052</td>
<td>.00782</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P T R</td>
<td>80.90</td>
<td>4.057</td>
<td>.00776</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
**** p < .0001
***** p < .00001
## TABLE 9

### QUALIFICATIONS AND ACCEPTANCE SCHEMA

**High Achievers/High Task Difficulty**

\( n = 28 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>( u )</th>
<th>( q )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P )</td>
<td>30.39</td>
<td>5.999</td>
<td>.00023</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( - )</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P )</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>4.243</td>
<td>.00575</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( - )</td>
<td>45.89</td>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>.15393</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P )</td>
<td>63.43</td>
<td>7.441</td>
<td>.00002</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( - )</td>
<td>63.46</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P )</td>
<td>78.75</td>
<td>6.487</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>( u )</th>
<th>( q )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( - )</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P )</td>
<td>33.57</td>
<td>5.083</td>
<td>.00128</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( - )</td>
<td>34.93</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.71423</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P )</td>
<td>40.89</td>
<td>2.293</td>
<td>.11648</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( - )</td>
<td>44.07</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>.39451</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P )</td>
<td>58.36</td>
<td>5.499</td>
<td>.00059</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( - )</td>
<td>63.68</td>
<td>2.047</td>
<td>.15925</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P )</td>
<td>74.61</td>
<td>4.206</td>
<td>.00612</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Sig.**

- ** p < .01
- *** p < .001
- **** p < .0001
TABLE 10

QUALIFICATIONS AND ACCEPTANCE SCHEMA

Low Achievers/High Task Difficulty
n = 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>9.560</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P</td>
<td>28.69</td>
<td>9.294</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P R</td>
<td>45.93</td>
<td>4.530</td>
<td>.00337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P T</td>
<td>71.69</td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>.17489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P T R</td>
<td>87.90</td>
<td>8.989</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>8.555</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>35.69</td>
<td>2.505</td>
<td>.08737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- T</td>
<td>49.07</td>
<td>5.533</td>
<td>.00053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P T</td>
<td>61.69</td>
<td>5.553</td>
<td>.00053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P T R</td>
<td>68.66</td>
<td>4.187</td>
<td>.00619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P T R</td>
<td>82.66</td>
<td>8.411</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
*** p < .001
**** p < .0001
***** p < .00001
TABLE 11

LEADERSHIP SCHEMA

High and Low Achievers
Qualified Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Relations</th>
<th>$u$</th>
<th>$q$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.17</td>
<td>6.094</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.5648</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.02</td>
<td>8.190</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>3.731</td>
<td>.0107</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>60.41</td>
<td>6.819</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.52</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>.3692</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>80.60</td>
<td>10.968</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          |      |           | 15.14 |         |      |      |
| P        |      |           | 28.38 | 9.312   | .0000 |      |
|          | R    |           | 31.14 | 1.941   | .1752 | N.S. |
| P        | R    |           | 44.55 | 9.431   | .0000 |      |
|          | T    | -         | 52.03 | 5.261   | .0046 |      |
|          | T    | R         | 68.76 | 11.766  | .0000 |      |
| P        | T    | -         | 70.16 | .985    | .4891 | N.S. |
| P        | T    | R         | 85.72 | 10.943  | .0000 |      |

* $p < .05$
*** $p < .001$
**** $p < .0001$
***** $p < .00001$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Achievement</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Relations</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.36</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.0095</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.3203</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>42.48</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>44.52</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.4329</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>61.71</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.0822</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>78.62</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Achievers (n = 58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
**** p < .0001
***** p < .00001
**TABLE 13**

Tests of Cell Means
Task Orientation x Achievement Interaction
Qualified Scores

Subject Achievement Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Orientation</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>29.81</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>29.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>68.92</td>
<td>63.18</td>
<td>65.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>49.37</td>
<td>46.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test of Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means 1</th>
<th>Means 2</th>
<th>q</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.81</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.92</td>
<td>63.18</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>.03042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.81</td>
<td>68.92</td>
<td>21.125</td>
<td>&lt; .00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>63.18</td>
<td>18.079</td>
<td>&lt; .00001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14

PR Interaction Under Varied Task Difficulty and Subject Achievement Conditions Qualifications and Acceptance Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification Ratings</th>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D₁  A₁</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.4589</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D₁  A₂</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2509.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>.0001***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D₂  A₁</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.7818</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D₂  A₂</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>143.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.3222</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance Ratings</th>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D₁  A₁</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>188.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.3132</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D₁  A₂</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2754.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>.0001***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D₂  A₁</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.9638</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D₂  A₂</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>393.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.0859</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001
**TABLE 15**

**LEADERSHIP SCHEMA**

High and Moderate Task Difficulty Conditions  
Qualified Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Task Difficulty (n = 57)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Task Difficulty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.77</td>
<td>10.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43.51</td>
<td>9.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>50.07</td>
<td>4.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>65.84</td>
<td>10.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>67.63</td>
<td>1.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>83.40</td>
<td>10.545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderate Task Difficulty (n = 59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01**

****** p < .0001**

******* p < .00001**
TABLE 16

LEADERSHIP SCHEMA

High and Moderate Task Difficulty Conditions
Acceptance Ratings

**High Task Difficulty (n = 57)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34.65</td>
<td>9.051</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>37.44</td>
<td>1.838</td>
<td>.1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46.61</td>
<td>6.040</td>
<td>.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>46.79</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60.05</td>
<td>8.734</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>66.21</td>
<td>4.058</td>
<td>.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>78.70</td>
<td>8.227</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moderate Task Difficulty (n = 59)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>3.796</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>32.80</td>
<td>2.864</td>
<td>.0474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>45.03</td>
<td>7.120</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47.69</td>
<td>1.549</td>
<td>.2780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59.15</td>
<td>6.672</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>65.66</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>.0095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>81.64</td>
<td>9.303</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05
** ** p < .01
**** ** p < .0001
***** ** p < .00001
TABLE 17

Correlation Coefficients
Self-Qualifications Scores with Achievement Scores and Ratings for Candidates with Same Achievement Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Achievers (n = 58)</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Ratings with Qualified</td>
<td>.2054</td>
<td>.0422</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.6447</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Ratings with Accepted</td>
<td>.3451</td>
<td>.1191</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td>.1184</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Ratings with Achievement Scores</td>
<td>.0702</td>
<td>.0049</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.5879</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Achievers (n = 58)</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Ratings with Qualified</td>
<td>.2411</td>
<td>.0581</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.5195</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Ratings with Accepted</td>
<td>.2570</td>
<td>.0660</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.4498</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Ratings with Achievement Scores</td>
<td>.4150</td>
<td>.1722</td>
<td>11.650</td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $p < .01$
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CHAPTER FIVE

Analysis, Conclusions, Recommendations

I. Schema Structure and Leader Emergence

The purpose of this study was to investigate the content of the perceptual schema for emergent leader, and to determine whether level of task difficulty and the achievement orientation of the perceiver moderate the necessary and sufficient conditions for such a perception to be formed. Definitionally, minimal standards were established in this study for leader emergence: In order for a candidate to emerge, the candidate must be perceived as minimally qualified and minimally acceptable as leader. This study has identified separate schema for qualified leader and acceptable leader. Of these, the schema for leader acceptance is more stringent.

Individuals who are perceived as qualified leaders demonstrate a high rating for task orientation. This perception is strengthened by the presence of a high personal achievement or relationships orientation. These factors are supplements to task orientation and enhance the perceived qualifications of the candidate. Individually, each supplemental factor has approximately the same power to enhance ratings. The three factors combined form the strongest perception of a qualified leader.
The schema for leader acceptance is more demanding than the leader qualifications schema. Although task dominates this schema as well, relationships orientation is an important attribute to leader acceptance, yielding significantly higher acceptance ratings than achievement orientation.

The dependent measures of perceived leadership assess separate constructs. The qualifications measure asks subjects to indicate "To what degree is this candidate qualified to successfully lead your group?" The acceptance measure asks, "If this person became the leader, to what extent would this candidate be personally accepted by you?" While both measures are operationalized using the same three variables, the objective is to assess separate evaluative dimensions of the candidate profile formed by these factors. No definition was provided to subjects of the two measures. Indeed, the objective of the study was to discern the implicit definitions of "qualified leader" and "acceptable leader" as represented by the schema employed to make these judgments.

The dominance of task orientation as a core characteristic of leadership should not be surprising. Leadership research by Stogdill\textsuperscript{1} and Likert\textsuperscript{2} and others

\textsuperscript{1}Ralph M. Stogdill, \textit{Leadership and Structures of Personal Interaction}, (Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1957).

identified equivalents of task orientation and relationships orientation as critical leadership constructs. Recent evidence supports task orientation as dominant over other leadership factors, including relationships orientation. In these recent studies, Fiedler's LPC scale was employed to measure personality characteristics of emerging leaders. In both studies, low LPC (high task oriented) individuals emerged as leaders and received higher ratings as preferred leader in goal-directed groups.

The fact that task orientation alone is sufficient to form the perception of qualified leader in goal-directed situations is of interest. Neither personal achievement orientation nor relationships orientation are necessary to form the perception, although they do strengthen it.

Of even greater interest is the finding that the schema for leader acceptance is more rigorous than the schema for qualified leader, requiring relationships orientation or personal achievement orientation to be perceived as an acceptable leader. Given the definition of an emergent leader as one who is both qualified and accepted, prospective leaders should take note of these findings. The implication is that acceptance by other members of the group is a more important factor than perceived qualifications for

---

leader emergence from the group. This finding substantiates one of the implicit assumptions undergirding this study, namely, that groups allow members to emerge as leaders. It is action by the group rather than action by the prospective leader which enables leaders to emerge.

The finding that personal achievement interacts with task for qualifications ratings, while relationships orientation interacts with task for acceptance ratings aligns with the established associations of achievement orientation with goal-directed behavior, and relationships orientation with group acceptance. The theoretical basis for these associations and the interactions found is readily apparent. The interaction between personal achievement and task orientation is most likely due to the shared goal orientation of these constructs. It is reasonable to anticipate that the perceived qualifications of a task oriented leader would be enhanced by a personal orientation toward success and the achievement of clear goals with tangible rewards. Similarly, the interaction between task and relationships orientation and their joint influence on leader acceptance ratings is also understandable. The perceived acceptability of a task oriented leader should be enhanced by relationships oriented behaviors which are

---

supportive of group members and bond the infrastructure of the group together.\(^5\)

Is the cognitive schema for qualified leader which forms the basis of perceived leadership significantly influenced by contingency variables? Prior research on the susceptibility of leadership schemata to influence by moderating variables is mixed. Two hypotheses pertain, each of which has received some support. The first suggests that cognitive schemata are broad social constructs not easily influenced by individual difference variables.\(^6\) The second suggests that schemata are organization, job, and individual specific and can be influenced by intervening variables.\(^7\)

The findings of this study tend to support the earlier findings of Weiss and Adler that leadership is a social construct not easily influenced by contingency variables. While some interactions were formed with moderator variables, the actual impact of the moderators on the ordering structure of the schemata was minimal.

This is an important point. Task difficulty and the perceiver's achievement orientation did interact with


profile variables in the determination of candidate ratings. Therefore, it must be acknowledged that they do influence leadership ratings. However, the influence associated with the interactions is minimal. This conclusion is based upon an examination of the schema structures themselves. In only one case was the ordering of a schema changed due to the influence of moderator variables. In all other cases, the influence was insufficient to alter the structure of the schema. Any influence associated with the interactions was absorbed in the numerical range differences between candidate profile scores which provided structure to the schema.

The stability of these cognitive schemata also corresponds with Weiss and Adler's findings that the factor structure of leadership schemata is not influenced by individual difference variables such as cognitive complexity. The stability of the schemata in this study may be due to the power of each of the leadership factors employed. Each demonstrated extraordinarily high significance levels as main effects, indicating strong operationalization in the design.

All of this suggests that the three leadership factors employed are core constructs for cognitive schemata associated with leadership. The centrality of the constructs may preclude any significant inducible influence by moderating variables. The magnitude of the F statistics associated with these factors suggests as much. Perhaps in
additional tests using other supplemental variables with less centrality, the influence of moderators may be more significant. Additional qualities of the task and other individual difference variables may be more influenced by moderators. As future investigations move more toward the boundaries of the schema, the possible influence of moderators becomes more plausible.

Although these schemata are not notably influenced by situational moderators, actual ratings for qualified and acceptable leader are. The influence of moderators on leader ratings will be reviewed shortly.

While the findings of this study appear to be in direct opposition to the current stream of research on contingency leadership, this may not be so. Rather, different constructs are serving as the dependent measures. Contemporary leadership theories and research findings document situational constructs as powerful variables influencing leader performance and task group effectiveness. While most leadership research has employed leader performance ratings as the dependent measure, this study is working with the perceptual measure of leader qualifications. Subjects in this study were asked to evaluate the qualifications of candidates for leadership, not their specific performances on a leader task. The fact that the statements used to operationalize the leadership factors were framed to reflect prior behavior of the
candidate does not really matter. The study is measuring perceived qualifications, not actual performance.

Seeking the boundaries of leadership schema was one of the objectives of this study. Closer to the boundaries of a schema, the schema becomes more ill-defined. In this regard, the personal achievement x relationships x task difficulty (PRD) and personal achievement x relationships x task difficulty x achievement motivation (PRDA) interactions are of particular interest. These interactions were significant for both qualifications and acceptance ratings. In most cases, the interactions were traceable to high achievers evaluating personal achievement x relationships (PR) profiles under moderate task difficulty conditions. No ready explanation is available in the research to clarify the importance of this finding.

With one exception, the only interactions involving moderator variables engaged supplemental leadership factors and not task orientation, the dominant characteristic. These interactions suggest that as one moves away from the core of the schema, supplemental factors of the schema are more susceptible to influence by moderators. Such a pattern of interactions would support the theorized fuzziness at the edge of the schema. Clarity of perception is a characteristic reserved for core factors of the schema.

These observations suggest a hierarchy of leadership factors within the schema with task orientation as the core characteristic and the supplemental characteristics moving
outward towards the boundaries of the schema. As additional leadership factors are integrated into the schema it will become more complex and the perception of leadership may be more influenced by moderating variables.

The presence of a hierarchy suggests that particular forms of cognitive activity may be operating. When subjects are assessing leader dimensions, do they cognitively process leader variables hierarchically or simultaneously? A hierarchical structure suggests that, across situations, subjects use constant weights for the leadership factors. The hierarchy is stable. Alternatively, the weights may change depending upon the situation, suggesting simultaneous processing which accounts for situational variances. Further research is needed to clarify the cognitive processes engaged in leader perception formation.

II. The Influence of Moderating Variables

A. Task Difficulty

Construction of the task difficulty statement for use in this study incorporated the dimensions of Fiedler's situational favorability, as well as additional variables to amplify the scope and understanding of the task. Task difficulty, as operationalized, was broadly equivalent to Fiedler's situational favorability, a central concept in
contingency theories of leadership. It is therefore surprising to find very few significant effects for task difficulty in this research. The only indication that task difficulty may have moderating effects is its presence in the PRD and PRDA interactions.

The selection of dependent measures may be the reason for the lack of strong confirmatory results. In the Fiedler studies, the dependent measure of leader effectiveness was group performance. In this study, the dependent measures were perceived qualifications and leader acceptance. While task difficulty may moderate the relationship between leader behavior and group performance, it has limited effect in moderating perceptions of candidates in the leader selection process. In leadership research, the moderating effects of task difficulty appear to be associated more with real-time leader effectiveness than with leader selection.

The implication is that level of task difficulty is either discounted in leader perception processes, or the difficulty of the task is assimilated into the general schema for leadership. One possible conclusion is that those responsible for the selection of leaders seek the same characteristics in leaders regardless of the favorability of the task. While the perceived qualifications and acceptability of leaders is not strongly moderated by task difficulty, the actual effectiveness of leaders may be.

There are, of course, several considerations which mitigate so firm a conclusion. First, the actual
operationalization of the task difficulty construct may have been weak. This is plausible as no main effect was found for task difficulty even though subjects' evaluations of the difficulty level differences was statistically significant. Second, the study did not test a plentiful range of tasks. Only one specific task statement was employed, with two levels operationalized. Nothing was said nor can conclusions be drawn about similar tasks of considerable differences in difficulty, or about dissimilar tasks. In this study, the alteration in task statements was quite small, really, and was represented as highly difficult and moderately difficult. Third, the ecological validity of the task used is contextually specific to the sample employed. It was not a problem encountered by all leaders in all groups. Thus, the generalizability of these results is limited. In the narrowest sense, the least that can be said with certainty is that for this sample faced with this specific operationalized problem, differences in level of task difficulty were not meaningful. Of course, it can be argued that for any leader facing a contextually specific task, ecological validity can be inherent in the problem statement. Only when the problem statements themselves are most general can the contextual difficulty issue be circumvented.

The conclusion drawn is that the results found may be reasonably generalizable for task-oriented leadership within the professional group studied. It is anticipated that
difference schema may exist for task-oriented leadership in different professional groups, say accountants or ministers, or that the structure of the schema will change depending upon the leadership task presented. For example, were the task difficulty statement operationalized to indicate the dominant problem facing the leader to be rebuilding a strife-torn group where cooperative working arrangements had broken down, the schema generated might show relationships orientation as the dominant factor for leader emergence with task orientation as a supplemental characteristic.

B. Achievement Motivation

There is a significant difference in the leader acceptance ratings given by high and low achievers; and their ratings differences for leader qualifications approach significance. Additionally, subject achievement level forms a two-way interaction with one of the three leadership factors, suggesting that achievement motivation moderates leader acceptance ratings and perceived qualifications under limited, specified conditions. However, the impact on schema structure is negligible. In fact, there are no alterations in schema structure across achievement conditions, although ratings by high achievers are more conservative than those given by low achievers.

One finding of interest is the ratings differences by low achievers under varied task difficulty conditions.
Regardless of task difficulty level, relationships oriented candidates received significantly higher acceptance ratings. Although the differences were not statistically significant, under moderate task difficulty conditions low achievers rated the relationships oriented candidate as more qualified but preferred the achievement oriented candidate under high task difficulty conditions.

These findings are in accord with hypothesized outcomes. Low need achievers seek to avoid failure rather than achieve success. When placed in an achievement-oriented environment, they will seek to finish the task at the earliest possible moment. In the interim, they will require support from a leader to aid their continuing performance.\footnote{Atkinson and Feather (1966).} Misumi and Seki\footnote{Misumi and Seki (1971).} found that a high performance, high maintenance leadership style was most effective for generating satisfaction in low achievement groups. While a high performance style was most productive for groups of low achievers, it also generated the most hostility.

It seems that under high task difficulty conditions, low achievers in this study perceived high achievement oriented leaders as more qualified on the basis that they are the ones most likely to complete the task expeditiously, thereby reducing the exposure to risk. However, in the face of such risks, the relationships oriented leader is more
acceptable, presumably because of the personal support offered by this type of leader. These findings corroborate the results obtained by Misumi and Seki.10

They do not, however, correspond with other research evidence on failure-threatened personalities. For these individuals, the level of risk is maximized under moderate, not high, task difficulty conditions. The finding that the relationships oriented leader is perceived as more qualified under moderate task difficulty conditions does not correspond with established understandings of the preferences of failure-threatened personalities. Were the differences in scores statistically significant, this would warrant further examination.

The interaction between achievement level and task orientation is also of interest. For qualifications ratings, high task orientation was evaluated more positively by low achievers than high achievers, and the interaction between task orientation and achievement level was significant. The results suggest that achievement level moderates qualifications scores of task-oriented leader candidates, with low achievers preferring higher levels of task orientation. Task orientation is a significant factor in leader qualifications scores given by low achievers.

The nature of this interaction corroborates the finding that high achievers are more conservative in their ratings. It also supports earlier observations about the interaction

between task and achievement due to a shared goal orientation.

Generally, candidate ratings by high achievers are more stringent than ratings by low achievers. For acceptance ratings, the differences produce a significant main effect. In assessing task difficulty and the level of risk associated with a task, Touhey and Villemez observed that high achievers responded to effort cues and low achievers responded to ability cues. They conclude that high achievers infer their ability levels from the interaction between task outcomes and effort, while low achievers view their abilities as stable personal characteristics.¹¹ Atkinson and Feather also observe that high need achievers tend to evaluate their abilities more highly (and risk proportionally lower) than low achievers primarily due to an enriched personal experience base. High achievers have experienced success more often and therefore have greater self-confidence when accepting new tasks. Thus, the perceived level of risk is lower.¹²

When evaluating others, this enriched perspective on their own abilities may result in a diminished evaluation of the capabilities of others, resulting in lower scores for leader candidates. If this is true, it is possible that the


same effects are operating for low achievers but with the evaluations being biased in the opposite direction. Comparison of the ratings comprising the schemata of low and high achievers with the general schema suggests that more of the influence is associated with high achievers. The significant main effect for subject achievement level on leader acceptance ratings and its near-significance for qualifications ratings may be primarily attributable to the high achiever's bias in the evaluation of the job and candidate competence vis a vis the high achiever's own experience and the perceived level of task difficulty.

One other observation on the differences between high and low achievers is of interest. An analysis of variance with scores grouped by subject achievement level reveals numerous significant or near-significant interactions between the leadership factors for high achievers' qualifications and acceptance scores. For low achievers, only one interaction remotely approaches significance. While speculative, the implication is that the cognitive processes employed by high achievers evaluating leader candidates are more complex and integrated than those used by low achievers. Even so, the structures of the schemata mapped for high and low achievers are the same. These schema analyses correspond with the Weiss and Adler\textsuperscript{13} findings that cognitive complexity did not influence implicit theories, and further explain the stability of the

\textsuperscript{13}Weiss and Adler (1981).
schema across subjects and conditions. The evaluation processes employed by high achievers appear to be more complex, as the analysis of variance indicates, but has very limited influence on schema structure.

Achievement motivation does have some properties as a moderating variable. Overall, however, these differences in ratings do not influence the structure of perceptual schemata, only the magnitude of the ratings for selective parts of the profiles.

Combined, the limited influence of the hypothesized moderators on schema structure is one of the important findings of the study. Situational contingencies and individual difference variables have limited influence on cognitive schemata employed for the identification and labelling of persons as leaders. The apparent stability of leadership schema suggests that the concerns expressed by Lord14 and others about schema bias in leader ratings may be overstated.

III. Preferring Leaders Like Ourselves

High and low achievers' self-ratings of their qualifications to lead did not significantly correlate with ratings given to candidates of like achievement orientation. It is reasonable to conclude that preferences for leaders are not based on a matching between the achievement orientation of candidates and the subject's motive to achieve. As the schemata for high and low achievers reflect, the desired leader prototype is not influenced by achievement orientation of the perceiver.

The only significant correlation was between self-rated qualifications to lead and the achievement scores of low achievers. This correlation was not significant for high achievers. What is it about low achievers and high achievers which might account for these findings?

Perhaps the best understanding of this outcome is the distinction made between effort and ability requirements by high and low achievers respectively.\textsuperscript{15} High achievers' self-ratings would be susceptible to influence by the perceived degree of effort required for the given task. This perception would vary depending upon the task difficulty level assigned, adding variance to high achievers' self-rated qualifications scores. The self-ratings of low achievers, on the other hand, are based on

\textsuperscript{15}Touhey and Villemez (1975).
ability requirements, a stable personal characteristic, and less influenced by differences in task difficulty.

This is an extremely limited test of the matching hypothesis. The lack of support for the matching hypothesis is restricted to matching on the achievement variable alone. Only one test variable was employed whereas the principle suggests testing the alignment between the complete characteristics profile of the candidate and the full leadership schemas of the decision maker. The complexity of such tests would truly constitute a separate study. For this reason only the achievement variable was operationalized. Further, the operationalization of the matching principle is suspect. The test conducted assessed whether decision-makers prefer candidates who are like themselves. This is one version of the matching principle, but it is not the interpretation operating in the model. The model does not suggest that decision-makers prefer candidates who are like themselves, but that they prefer candidates whose characteristics most closely align with the contents of their implicit leadership theories, represented by the cognitive schemata mapped in this study. For these reasons, the matching principle is retained in the model.

IV. Revisions to Model

Based upon the findings of this study, certain modifications to the proposed model are necessary. The presence of a job specific schema is questionable. The
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schema for leader appears to be a broader social construct, not specific to the task. Therefore, the job specific definition of task difficulty employed is modified to reflect a more generalized conception of this construct. This reconceptualization suggests that qualities of the task-specific schema are absorbed in other aspects of a model. The characteristics and performance of prior officeholders, rather than being retained in a task-specific schema, are presumed to be integrated into the broad social construct for leader. Therefore, these factors can be regarded as part of the perceiver's general implicit theory, not a separate schema associated with a particular position.

Task difficulty is retained as a modifier variable in the model, with its influence on the leader schemata represented by dotted lines. The retention of task difficulty in the model is appropriate given its presence in significant interactions for qualified and acceptance ratings. The conceptual limitations of task difficulty discussed elsewhere also argue against the rejection of the variable from the model. Stronger tests of the task difficulty variable are needed.

Personal qualities and prior performance remain as important attributes of leader candidates. Both were operationalized in the profiles, candidate behavior having been described in terms of prior performance in work groups.
Achievement motivation was found to be a significant moderating variable for the acceptance schema and to have moderating effects in the boundary conditions of leader qualification ratings. The main effect for achievement is reflected in the revised model by a solid line, while its indirect effect on leader qualifications ratings is reflected by the dotted line connecting achievement orientation of the perceiver with the qualifications schema.

The implicit theory of leadership held by the perceiver is shown to incorporate two schemas, leader qualifications and leader acceptance. Other schemata may be incorporated as well. Each schema is shown to be partitioned into leadership factors, with task orientation being the core characteristic, and personal achievement orientation and relationships orientation being supplementary. The personal qualities and prior performance of leader candidates are matched against this implicit theory, yielding a perception of emergent leader for those candidates having the qualities which sufficiently match with the schemata for leader.

V. Limitations of the Study

The primary limitation of the study is associated with the tightly-focused examination of the content of implicit theories of leadership as represented in the leadership schemata. The ability is lost to say concretely how leaders emerge. The most that can be said is that more is known of how candidates are perceived as leaders, and those
attributes which are necessary and sufficient to form such perceptions.

The second limitation of the study is the number of variables which can be included in any one design. The range of variables germane to this study is extensive. However, the number of leadership factors which could be considered was limited to three personal characteristic variables. The choices made reflect a personal interest in achievement motivation and the established position of task and relationships behavior as core leadership constructs. It remains for future research to test many additional variables for their importance in leadership schemata.

The limited significance associated with task difficulty was surprising. In contingency theories of leadership, task difficulty is a significant variable. This suggests that the third limitation of the study may be the operationalization of task difficulty; the statements may not have been sufficiently different. However, as each candidate only saw one statement, the differences would not be readily apparent. Too, there is an inherent problem in attempting to differentiate a statement of task difficulty while still retaining the same essential task. The statements cannot describe two different tasks; rather, they must describe the same task with two levels of difficulty. Were two different tasks used, it is likely that greater effects for task difficulty would have been found.
Fourth, operationalization of the matching principle presented some difficulties. A fuller test of this hypothesis would present test requirements beyond the scope of this study.

In conclusion, some clarification of the model has been attained, notably the content of the leadership schemata, which was the most important objective of this study. Other aspects of the model have been investigated, but it remains for further research to establish more fully the operating mechanisms employed in the perception formation process.

VI. Recommendations for Further Research

This study has firmly established the centrality of achievement, task and relationships orientations as core constructs in perceptual schemata for task-oriented leadership. Each is a significant personal characteristic in defining leaders perceptually. As the complex interactions suggest, future research should focus on defining the boundaries of leadership schemata. Additional variables need to be tested to determine their importance to perceived leadership.

While this study found that leadership is a broad social construct, future studies of boundary conditions may demonstrate otherwise. As additional variables are tested, more significant moderator effects may be identified. This certainly would be a reasonable hypothesis given the findings of this study. Greater interactions plausibly may
occur between additional supplemental characteristics and factors specific to particular tasks or organizations. Research on the boundary conditions of schemata may establish this to be true.

Exploration of the boundaries of the schema will also further an understanding of the hierarchy which appears among the leadership factors in this study. If task is the dominant leader characteristic and achievement and relationships orientations are supplemental, what position will be held by other definitional variables as they are added to the hierarchy? Will they make a significant difference in the structure of these leadership schemata? It is anticipated that the hierarchy will expand toward the boundaries of the schema and that situational variables will have greater influence on the perceptual evaluation of leaders.

Further consideration must be given to task difficulty as a moderator. While this study found minor effects for changes in the level of difficulty for the same task, it may be that significant effects would be found for different tasks, one easy and one difficult. Different schema may exist for such tasks.

Results so far suggest that schemata are not strongly influenced by individual difference variables, even though a main effect and interactions were found for achievement orientation. Considering the research on sex differences and achievement, the investigation of possible differences
in leadership schemata between men and women would be of interest.

Possible schematic differences may be associated with career level as well. Approximately twenty percent of the subjects in this study were direct service delivery personnel. The others held supervisory or executive level positions. Therefore, these schemata represent the cognitions of a predominantly managerial group. Considering the recent interest in transactional leadership and the influence of group members on leader behavior, the exploration of distinctive leadership schemata associated with differences in career level would be fruitful. The identification of separate schemata would help explain differences in leader-member expectations, work group conflict, and differences in leader performance ratings between group members and the leader's supervisor.

Another avenue for further research is exploration of ethnic and cultural differences in the structures of leader schemata. Ninety percent of the subjects used in this study were caucasian, five percent were black, and the remaining five percent were of Spanish or oriental extraction. As an example, the current interest in Japanese management styles with an emphasis on group participation and performance suggests that the schemata mapped in this study may be culture-bound. Would personal achievement orientation be a strong supplemental characteristic in the schemata of Japanese workers and management? Quite likely,
relationships orientation would dominate personal achievement in assessing leader qualifications in a Japanese firm. It is plausible that other factors may be important in the leadership schemata of different cultures and ethnic groups.

The Adjective Check List is a rich source of individual difference variables. In this study, only the measure for achievement motivation was used. Other measures, especially affiliation, dominance, and power, are associated with leadership phenomena and may influence perceptual schema. Replications of this study employing these individual difference variables would further an understanding of schema structure and variations.

Finally, this study is founded on the assumption that leader emergence is a function primarily of group members' perceptual schemata for leadership rather than the qualities of leader candidates. This assumption corresponds with Stein's and others research on leader emergence processes. This study can therefore be viewed as contributing additional understanding to the transactional school of leadership. Candidates emerge as leaders because group members perceive them to be such. The influence processes at work in leader selection are driven by group members from the bottom up, rather than by prospective leaders from the top down. Regardless of whatever influence mechanisms are

employed by prospective leaders, they will not be perceived as qualified and will not be accepted as a leader unless they have the personal characteristics and prior performance attributes associated with leadership as defined by group members' cognitive schemata.

Considerable research can be done to test the truth of such an assumption, much of which would take the form of further verification of the matching hypothesis.


Chemers, Martin M. "The Social, Organizational, and Cultural Context of Effective Leadership." in Barbara
Covington, Martin V. and Carol L. Omelich. "Are Causal
Attributions Causal? A Path Analysis of the Cognitive
Model of Achievement Motivation." *Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology* 9 (September, 1979):
1487-1504.

Csoka, Louis S. "Relationship Between Organizational
Climate and the Situational Favorableness Dimension of
Fiedler's Contingency Model." *Journal of Applied
Psychology* 60 (April, 1975): 273-277.

---------, Louis S., and Paul M. Bons. "Manipulating the
Situation to Fit the Leader's Style: Two Validation
Studies of Leader Match." *Journal of Applied

---------, Louis S., and Fred E. Fiedler. "Leadership and
Intelligence: A Contingency Model Analysis." *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American

Dansereau, Jr., Fred, George Graen and William J. Haqa. "A
Vertical Dyad Linkage Approach to Leadership Within
Formal Organizations." *Organizational Behavior and

Davis, James H., Patrick R. Laughlin, and Samuel S.
Komorita. "The Social Psychology of Small Groups:
Cooperative and Mixed-Motive Interaction." *Annual
Review of Psychology*, eds. Mark R. Rosenzweig and Lyman

deCharms, Richard. "Thoughts, Action and Achievement
Motivation." Chapter 6 *Personal Causation*. New York:

Dobbins, Gregory, Earl C. Pence, Joseph A. Orban, and Joseph
A. Sgro. "The Effects of Sex of the Leader and Sex of
the Subordinate on the Use of Organizational Control
Policy." *Organizational Behavior and Human


Hunt, James G. "Organizational Leadership: The Contingency Paradigm and Its Challenges." Leadership:


Pfeffer, Jeffrey. "Management As Symbolic Action: The Creation and Maintenance of Organizational Paradigms." In L. L. Cummings and Barry M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in..."


Sashkin, Marshall, and Howard Garland. "Laboratory and Field Research on Leadership: Integrating Divergent


Stogdill, Ralph M. *Leadership and Structures of Personal Interaction*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1957.


Appendices

a. Pretest Task Difficulty Rating Form

b. Testing packet
Pretest Task Description Rating Form
Task Description Rating

For the assignment description you have just read, please evaluate its level of difficulty on each of the scales provided. Circle the number which best approximates your evaluation.

1) How severe is the problem the group must solve?
   not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely severe

2) How supportive is the institution of the group's work?
   not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely supportive

3) How much experience will the group need to successfully complete the assignment?
   a great amount 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 no experience

4) What is the quality of relationships among group members?
   not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely harmonious

5) What kind of time pressure does the group face?
   extreme 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 no time pressure

6) How significant is the group's assignment?
   extremely 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 not at all significant

7) How much freedom will the group have to pursue its goal?
   no freedom 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 great freedom

8) Initially, how clear is the group's assignment?
   not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely clear

9) Overall, how difficult an assignment will this be for the leader of the group?
   not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely difficult

Your assistance in this pilot study is greatly appreciated. Please return this rating sheet by campus mail to Carol Kavanaugh, Assistant Dean, 111 Newcomb Hall, no later than Monday, July 8. Thank you very much.

7/1/85
Test Packet
Thank you for your participation in this study. There are three steps you will need to complete at your own pace.

1) Complete the Leader Rating Problem.

2) Complete the Adjective Check List.

3) Complete the Personal Information Sheet.

Instructions for each step are included in your testing packet. If you have questions, please ask the supervisor in your testing room. Take as much time as you need. When you have finished, please place all of your materials in the envelope and return it to the supervisor as you exit.

Thank you.
Leader Rating Problem

In this section, you are asked to do two things:

1) Read carefully the description of the assignment and answer the questions which follow.

2) Read the General Instructions and rate each of the candidates.

To answer the questions and rate the candidates, you will use two types of scales. The first is a seven point scale on which you will need to circle the number which best approximates your response to the question.

EXAMPLE: In your opinion, how likeable are the cartoon characters at Disneyland?

Not at all 1  2  3  4  5  6  7 Extremely likeable

The second type of scale is a one hundred point continuous scale. To record your response, place a slash across the line at the point which best approximates your response.

EXAMPLE: How fast does Peter Pan fly?

0  25  50  75  100

Extremely slow \/. Extremely fast
The President of your institution has just appointed you to a group of faculty and staff which has been given a special assignment. You have received the description of the assignment which follows. Please read this description now and answer the two questions which follow.
The President of your institution has appointed you to a special group to address a problem he sees becoming important within the next year. Enrollment figures for the past year have been finalized and, fortunately, it remained stable, having dropped only a few students. However, your President notes that if your institution dropped 35 students, one percent of its enrollment, this would translate into $175,000 in lost tuition revenue. It also appears that the institution is losing a few of its better students who are transferring after one year.

The assignment given to the group is to develop a comprehensive enrollment management program which will focus on both recruitment and retention. The assignment is complex, but well defined, and the group has received much initial encouragement from the President.

Membership of the group is comprised of faculty and other professional staff who are broadly representative of the institution, and who know their jobs fairly well or have other qualities which will contribute positively to the work of the group. You have worked well with each of these individuals in the past. They will be a cohesive group who will work well together.

The President, as well as other members of the executive staff, have recognized the comprehensive nature of the assignment and the organizational implications of its possible solutions, and have agreed the group will function with great freedom from intervention. You may call upon other personnel within the organization for any information necessary to the work of the project group. Fortunately, the group will have the full year to conduct its analysis and formulate its recommendations for action.

The basic charge to the group is to identify a sound conceptual approach for enrollment management, develop action plans, and formulate a budget sufficient to fully implement the plan. The President intends to present the group's comprehensive enrollment management plan to the Board of Trustees at its last meeting of the year, ten months from now, if there is space on the agenda.

Questions

1) Overall, how difficult an assignment will this be for the leader of the group?

Not at all difficult 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely difficult

2) Personally, how qualified are you to successfully lead this group?

0 25 50 75 100

Absolutely not qualified Qualified Absolutely qualified
The President of your institution has appointed you to a special group to address a major crisis which is threatening the financial well-being of your institution. Enrollment figures for the past year have been finalized and your institution dropped 350 students, a surprising ten percent of its enrollment. This translates into $1,750,000 in lost tuition revenue. It also appears that the institution is losing most of its better students who are transferring after one year.

The assignment given to the group is to develop a comprehensive enrollment management program which will focus on both recruitment and retention. The assignment is complex, and initially quite ill-defined. The President has provided the group with little initial encouragement.

The membership of the group is comprised of faculty and other professional staff broadly representative of your institution, and includes several seasoned veterans. However, a significant number of the individuals are new to their positions. You have never worked before with some of them. There is also animosity between some of the individuals, who blame each other for the current crisis.

The President, as well as other members of the executive staff, will be watching the work of the group quite closely and undoubtedly will choose to participate in the deliberations from time to time. You may call upon some other personnel within the institution for part of the information necessary to the work of the project group. Unfortunately, time is short and the amount of analysis and reasoned deliberation which can be done is limited.

The basic charge to the group is to identify a sound conceptual approach for enrollment management, develop action plans, and formulate a budget sufficient to fully implement the plan. The President must present the group's comprehensive enrollment management plan to the Board of Trustees at their next meeting, six weeks from now.

Questions

1) Overall, how difficult an assignment will this be for the leader of the group?

| Not at all difficult | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Extremely difficult |

2) Personally, how qualified are you to successfully lead this group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely not qualified</td>
<td>Not qualified</td>
<td>Minimally qualified</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>Absolutely qualified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Instructions (2)

In order to assure the independence of the group and to encourage creative thinking, the group has been asked to choose its own leader. You have received the enclosed descriptions of each of the other members of the group. Realizing that you do not have full knowledge of each of the candidates or as much information on the assignment as you might like, please rate each of these eight members of the group on 1) the qualifications of each to successfully lead your group; and 2) the extent to which each would be accepted personally by you as the leader of your group.
CANDIDATE C.B.

Those who have worked with this candidate indicate that this person is highly supportive of others, and demonstrates a genuine concern for the welfare of co-workers. Maintaining positive relationships with colleagues is very important to this individual. In working with others, this person provides the group with direction and often pushes the group to finish its work. Getting the job done is very important. As an individual, this candidate is strongly oriented toward personal success and strives hard to achieve individual goals. This person prefers assignments which are challenging, but not impossible, and which provide the opportunity to attain personal recognition.

To what degree is this candidate qualified to successfully lead your group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely not qualified</td>
<td>Not qualified</td>
<td>Minimally qualified</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>Absolutely qualified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If this person became the leader, to what extent would this candidate be personally accepted by you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely unacceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Minimally acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Absolutely acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CANDIDATE K.M.

Those who know this individual say this candidate is strongly oriented toward individual success and strives hard to achieve personal goals. This person prefers assignments which are challenging, but not impossible, and which provide the type of opportunity where personal recognition can be attained. Those who have worked with the candidate indicate that, in working with others, this person provides the group with focus and direction and often organizes the work of others. Getting the job done is very important. Often, this is accomplished at the expense of others, who sometimes feel that this person is insensitive, uncaring, and not concerned about developing positive relationships with colleagues.

To what degree is this candidate qualified to successfully lead your group?

0  25  50  75  100

Absolutely not qualified  Minimally qualified  Qualified  Absolutely qualified

If this person became the leader, to what extent would this candidate be personally accepted by you?

0  25  50  75  100

Absolutely unacceptable  Minimally acceptable  Absolutely unacceptable
CANDIDATE G.F.

Those who have worked with this candidate indicate that this person is not very helpful to others. Co-workers sometimes feel that this individual is insensitive, uncaring, and not concerned about developing positive relationships with colleagues. This candidate is also seen as erratic. When required to do something, this person will select activities which are very simple or extraordinarily difficult. The candidate almost never volunteers. In working with others, this person seems to lack direction and is not greatly concerned with the group accomplishing its work. If the work gets done, it gets done.

To what degree is this candidate qualified to successfully lead your group?

0  25  50  75  100
__________|__________|__________|__________|__________|
Absolutely not qualified  Not qualified  Minimally qualified  Qualified  Absolutely qualified

If this person became the leader, to what extent would this candidate be personally accepted by you?

0  25  50  75  100
__________|__________|__________|__________|
Absolutely unacceptable  Minimally acceptable  Absolutely unacceptable  Absolutely acceptable
CANDIDATE L.E.

Those who have worked with this candidate indicate that, when working in a group, this person often appears unfocused and not greatly concerned with the group accomplishing its work. If the work gets done, it gets done. They also report that this person is not very helpful to co-workers, who sometimes feel that this individual is insensitive, uncaring, and not concerned about developing positive relationships with colleagues. Those who know the candidate personally report that this individual is oriented toward personal success and strives hard to achieve individual goals. This candidate prefers assignments which are challenging, but not impossible, and which provide the opportunity to attain personal recognition.

To what degree is this candidate qualified to successfully lead your group?

0  25  50  75  100

|________________________|________________________|

Absolutely not qualified  Not qualified  Minimally qualified  Qualified  Absolutely qualified

If this person became the leader, to what extent would this candidate be personally accepted by you?

0  25  50  75  100

|________________________|________________________|

Absolutely unacceptable  Minimally acceptable  Acceptable  Absolutely acceptable
CANDIDATE G.H.

Those who know this candidate personally say this individual
is strongly oriented toward personal success and strives hard to
achieve individual goals. This candidate prefers assignments
which are challenging, but not impossible, and which provide the
opportunity to attain personal recognition. However, when
working in a group, this person often appears to lack direction
and is not greatly concerned with the group accomplishing its
work. If the work gets done, it gets done. Co-workers say this
person values relationships with colleagues, demonstrates a
genuine concern for their welfare, and works to maintain the
spirit of the group.

To what degree is this candidate qualified to successfully
lead your group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely Not</td>
<td>Minimally Qualified</td>
<td>Absolutely qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not qualified</td>
<td>qualified</td>
<td>qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If this person became the leader, to what extent would this
candidate be personally accepted by you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely Unacceptable</td>
<td>Minimally Acceptable</td>
<td>Absolutely acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unacceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CANDIDATE T.L.

Those who personally know this individual indicate that this candidate is often an erratic worker who rarely volunteers for assignments. When required to do something, this person will select activities which are very easy or quite difficult. Those who have worked with this individual indicate that, as a co-worker, the candidate is highly supportive of others and demonstrates a genuine concern for their welfare. Maintaining positive relationships with colleagues is very important. When working in a group, this person often appears unfocused and not greatly concerned with the group accomplishing its work. If the work gets done, it gets done.

To what degree is this candidate qualified to successfully lead your group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>Not qualified</td>
<td>Minimally qualified</td>
<td>Absolutely qualified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If this person became the leader, to what extent would this candidate be personally accepted by you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely unacceptable</td>
<td>Minimally acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Absolutely acceptable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CANDIDATE B.K.

Those who have worked with this candidate indicate that this individual provides the group with direction and often pushes the group to finish its work. Getting the job done is very important. As a person, this individual is often seen as erratic, and seldom volunteers for assignments. When required to do so, this candidate will select activities which are very easy or quite difficult. As a co-worker, this person is known to be highly supportive of others, and demonstrates a genuine concern for their welfare. Maintaining positive relationships with colleagues is very important.

To what degree is this candidate qualified to successfully lead your group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely not qualified</td>
<td>Not qualified</td>
<td>Minimally qualified</td>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>Absolutely qualified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If this person became the leader, to what extent would this candidate be personally accepted by you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely unacceptable</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Minimally acceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Absolutely acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CANDIDATE M.A.

Those who have worked with this candidate indicate that, in working with others, this person provides the group with focus and direction and often organizes the work of others. Getting the job done is very important. Often, this is accomplished at the expense of others, who sometimes feel that this individual is insensitive, uncaring, and not concerned about developing positive relationships with colleagues. Those who know this individual indicate that this candidate is often erratic. This person seldom volunteers for assignments. When required to do something, this person selects activities which are either very simple or extraordinarily difficult.

To what degree is this candidate qualified to successfully lead your group?

0  25  50  75  100

Absolutely not qualified

If this person became the leader, to what extent would this candidate be personally accepted by you?

0  25  50  75  100

Absolutely unacceptable

Unacceptable

Minimally acceptable

Absolutely acceptable
Thank you. Please continue by completing the Adjective Check List. The Adjective Check List is a separate test booklet contained in your testing packet.

Once you have completed the Adjective Check List, return to this page to continue on to the final section.
Personal Information Sheet

Age________________
Sex_________________

# Years full time professional experience
in Student Affairs or Higher Education _________

Ethnic Category
____White/Caucasian ______Mexican-American/Chicano
____Black/Negro/Afro-American ______Puerto Rican-American
____American Indian ______Other_________________
____Asian-American/Oriental

Occupational Grouping (check one only):
____Admissions ______Registration ______Financial Aid
____Housing Administration ______Career Planning/Placement
____Residence Life Programs/Residence Staff Development
____Counseling ______Security ______Recreation/Athletics
____Commuter Services ______International Student Affairs
____Campus Ministries ______Student Union Administration
____Minority Support Programs ______Student Activities
____Staff Assistant ______Dean of Students/Vice President
____President ______Other __________________________
Career Level (check one only):

____ direct service delivery (no supervisory responsibility)
____ first level supervisor (professional or student staff)
____ second level or higher supervisor

At any time during your professional experience, have you participated directly in the assessment of personnel, either for employment or for special assignment?

____ Yes        ____ No

ALL DATA GATHERED WILL BE KEPT IN STRICT CONFIDENCE AND REPORTED AS GROUPED DATA. RESPONSES ON THE PERSONAL INFORMATION SHEET ARE OPTIONAL, BUT PREFERRED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND FOR REPORTING SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS.
CONGRATULATIONS, YOU'RE DONE! Quietly place all materials in the envelope and turn in your packet at the door as you leave. You are free to depart as soon as you have finished all sections.

Thank you for participating in this study.
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