Center for Leadership Studies

Adding to Leader-Follower Transactions: The Augmenting Effect of Charismatic Leadership

David A. Waldman, Bernard M. Bass, and Francis J. Yammarino

ONR-TR-3

Report Series

Binghamton
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

(4)

Adding to Leader-Follower Transactions: The Augmenting Effect of Charismatic Leadership

David A. Waldman, Bernard M. Bass,
and Francis J. Yammarino

ONR-TR-3

December 1, 1988

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified	1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS: N. A.
2a SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY: N. A.	3 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT: Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE: N. A.	
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S): ONR-TR-3 (Technical Report 3)	5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S): Same
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION: Center for Leadership Studies, SUNY at Binghamton; 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable):	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION: Office of Naval Research
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code): Binghamton, NY 13901	7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code): 800 N. Quincy Street, Arlington, VA 22217-5000
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION: Office of Naval Technology; 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable): Code 222	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER: N00014-87-K-0434
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code): 800 N. Quincy Street, Arlington, VA 22217-5000	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS: PROGRAM ELEMENT NO: 62233N; PROJECT NO.: RM33M20; TASK NO: ; WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO:

11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)

ADDING TO LEADER-FOLLOWER TRANSACTIONS: THE AUGMENTING EFFECT OF CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP (U)

12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)

David A. Waldman, Bernard M. Bass, and Francis J. Yammarino

13a. TYPE OF REPORT	13b. TIME COVERED	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day)	15. PAGE COUNT
Technical	FROM 87/04/01 TO 89/03/31	12/1/88	24

16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION

Supported by the Office of the Chief of Naval Research Manpower, Personnelm and Training R & D Program.

17 COSATI CODES		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP

18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

Transformational leadership; charisma, transactional leadership; contingent reward behavior, effectiveness; performance; early promotion; ~~U.S. Navy officers;~~ (over)

19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

The hypothesis that transformational/charismatic leadership predicts unique variance in leader effectiveness beyond that of transactional/contingent reward leadership was tested for a sample of U.S. Navy Officers. The 186 officers were rated by their 793 immediate subordinates on charismatic and contingent reward leadership and effectiveness, and by their superiors on performance evaluation and early promotion potential. Results from hierarchical regression analyses indicated that charisma augmented the predictive power of contingent reward behavior for determining subordinate-rated effectiveness of focal leaders and superior-rated effectiveness and early promotion recommendation for focal leaders.

20 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT: ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT ☐ DTIC USERS	21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified
22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL: John J. O'Hare	22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code): (202) 696-4502; 22c OFFICE SYMBOL: Code 1142PS

DD Form 1473, JUN 86 *Previous editions are obsolete.* SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

Cont.

18. hierarchical regression; leader-follower relationships; augmentation effects; Multifactor Officer Questionnaire; fitness reports, Naval [illegible]

ADDING TO LEADER-FOLLOWER TRANSACTIONS:

THE AUGMENTING EFFECT OF CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP

DAVID A. WALDMAN, BERNARD M. BASS, and FRANCIS J. YAMMARINO

School of Management and Center for Leadership Studies

State University of New York at Binghamton

Binghamton, New York 13901

(607) 777-3007

This manuscript was prepared under the Navy Manpower, Personnel, and Training R&D Program of the Office of the Chief of Naval Research under Contract N0001487K0434 to B. M. Bass and F. J. Yammarino, Co-Principal Investigators. The views expressed are those of the authors. We thank David Atwater, Jose Florendo, Sheeler Kowalewski, Scott Meyers, Idell Neumann, and Anne Wahrenbock for their assistance on this project.

ADDING TO LEADER-FOLLOWER TRANSACTIONS: THE AUGMENTING EFFECT OF CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP

Burns (1978) drew attention to how some leaders attempt to satisfy the current needs of followers by focusing attention on transactions or exchanges, while other leaders attempt to raise the needs of followers and promote the transformation of individuals, groups, and organizations. Different theorists have proposed competing propositions about the interplay of transactional and transformational leadership. Burns (1978), for example, claimed that transactional and transformational leadership are at opposite ends of the same continuum. That is, a leader could be either transactional or transformational, but not both. Besides making a distinction between transactional and transformational leadership, other theorists have proposed that they are somewhat complementary and both can potentially be displayed by the same leader (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Kouzes & Posner, 1988; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). For example, Conger and Kanungo (1988) proposed that both contingent reward behavior (transactional leadership) and charisma (transformational leadership) could have the effect of empowerment on individual followers. Compatible with these views, transactional leadership was seen by Bass (1985) as being augmented by transformational leadership in its effects on effort and performance. This latter proposition was investigated in the present study.

A Conceptual Leadership Distinction

A transaction or exchange process is the basis of a commonly employed paradigm for the study of leadership (Evans, 1974; House & Mitchell, 1974; Graen & Cashman, 1975). The transactional leader recognizes follower needs and desires and then clarifies how those needs and desires will be met in

exchange for enactment of the follower's work role. Such leaders are instrumental in providing rewards to followers contingent on their performance, thus strengthening the performance-outcome relationship. The clarification of task requirements also may contribute to subordinates' confidence that, with some degree of effort, they can succeed in accomplishing their assignments and fulfilling their roles.

Transactional leadership is compatible with path-goal theory (Evans, 1974; House, 1971; House & Mitchell, 1974). Similarly, the leader-member exchange model of leadership emphasizes role development of organizational members and the exchange of both tangibles and intangibles (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Graen & Cashman, 1975; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). As such, a lower-order transaction involves the exchange of such tangibles as pay increases for goal accomplishment. A higher-order transaction involves the exchange of intangibles between leader and follower such as loyalty, affect, and trust (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987).

The potential for transactional/contingent reward leadership to affect work performance has been shown by a number of researchers (Komaki, 1986; Luthans, Paul, & Baker, 1981; Podsakoff, Todor, & Skov, 1982). For example, Podsakoff et al. (1982) found that contingent reward behavior was more successful at predicting follower performance than was contingent punishment.

A conceptually different paradigm of leadership behavior was proposed by Burns (1978). Instead of responding to the immediate self-interests of both himself/herself and of followers, the transformational leader was conceived to arouse heightened awareness and interests in the group or organization, to increase confidence, and to gradually move followers from concerns for existence to concerns for achievement and growth. Bass (1985) focused the

concept of transformational leadership on organizational settings. Transformational leaders were described as showing individualized consideration for subordinates, sharing their concerns, and encouraging subordinate development. Bass (1985) also proposed that transformational leaders intellectually stimulate their subordinates' ideas and values. New ways are provided for looking at old problems or beliefs which may be hindering progress and change in the organization.

The transformational leadership dimensions of individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation proposed by Bass (1985) may be somewhat akin to the higher-order "currencies of exchange" described by Dienesch and Liden (1986). That is, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation behavior may only be shown to followers when the leader receives affect, stimulation, and/or commitment in return. Conversely, a third dimension of transformational leadership identified by Bass (1985), charisma, may not be exchange-based. Charismatic leadership has been described as involving the articulation of an inspiring vision, engaging in exemplary acts which subordinates interpret as involving great personal risk and sacrifice, and instilling intense feelings and confidence in subordinates (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Trice & Beyer, 1986). Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) proposed that such leaders have deeply held value systems (including values such as honesty or strong work ethic) that are not used as currency of exchange. Instead charismatic leaders are able to influence and inspire followers on the basis of these values.

The Augmenting Effect of Charismatic Leadership

Two aspects of leadership which can affect leader effectiveness, contingent reward behavior and charisma, were examined in the present study.

Contingent reward behavior was chosen because of its demonstrated association with leader effectiveness in prior research (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 1982). Charisma was chosen because of its theoretical distinction from exchange-based contingent rewards and to examine the extent to which charisma added to the power of contingent rewards in predicting effectiveness in organizational settings. Although conceptually distinct, contingent reward and charismatic leadership both may be displayed to some degree by the same individual leader; and therefore, are expected to be related (Conger & Kanungo, 1988).

It was predicted in this study that charismatic leadership augments contingent reward leadership. That is, transactions or exchanges form the basis of a leader-follower relationship. Once this basis is established, transformational leadership in the form of charisma is required for a heightened leadership influence on a work group. Thus, compatible with the work of Conger and Kanungo (1988) and Kuhnert and Lewis (1987), it was hypothesized that the most effective leaders are both transactional and charismatic with charismatic leadership adding to transactional effects. More specifically, the focus was to test the following hypothesis: charismatic leadership will predict unique variance in leader effectiveness beyond that of contingent reward leadership. That is, charisma will augment the accuracy of the prediction of effectiveness beyond contingent reward behavior.

METHOD

Participants

The focal leaders for this study were United States Navy officers who were graduates of the U.S. Naval Academy on active duty assigned to the surface warfare fleet. Originally, 330 officers were randomly selected by

members of the Naval Academy and Navy Personnel Research and Development Center to participate in the study. Of these, 54 officers were not reachable due to transferred assignments. From the remaining sample of 276 officers, 186 participated, yielding a response rate of about 67 percent. The focal officers held the ranks of either Lieutenant Junior Grade or Lieutenant. All but one of the officers were male, and the average age was 29.36.

In addition to gathering performance information from superior officers about these focal officers, six immediate subordinates of each officer were randomly selected to provide leadership and performance information about their respective officers. For officers who had less than six subordinates, all of their immediate subordinates were asked to provide leadership information. In all, 793 subordinates of the focal officers participated, yielding an average of 4.26 subordinates per officer. Ninety-eight officers (53 percent) had five or six subordinates, 58 officers (31 percent) had three or four subordinates, and 30 officers (16 percent) had one or two subordinates.

Measures and Data Collection

Leadership measures. The leadership data were collected by mail survey from the focal officers' subordinates using a modified version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-Form 11R) (Bass & Avolio, in press). This version of the MLQ had been previously tested using 318 senior officers attending the Naval War College who described the leadership of their most recent immediate superiors. The modified scales in general displayed adequate reliability, and the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the scales followed the same pattern as in a variety

of other industrial and military studies which used the MLQ (Bass, 1985; Hater & Bass, in press; Waldman, Bass, & Einstein, 1987).

Respondents completing the surveys in the current study indicated how frequently they observed behaviors of the focal officers and also reactions to the focal officers on a five-point scale ranging from 0 = "not at all" to 4 = "frequently, if not always." For each scale, items were summed and divided by the appropriate number of items forming a scale score that ranged from zero to four.

Contingent rewards included items which dealt with the extent to which the leader communicates about the connection between goal accomplishment and personal outcomes for subordinates, as well as items which involve the actual giving of rewards in exchange for effective subordinate performance. Charisma included items which evaluated the extent to which subordinates have confidence and faith in their leader and perceive that leader to be a special individual. Listed below are the number of items per scale, alpha coefficients, and example items for both of the leadership measures.

Contingent rewards (6 items; α = .86) -- "points out what I will receive if I do what needs to be done;" "personally pays me a compliment when I do good work."

Charisma (6 items; α = .94) -- "I am ready to trust him/her to overcome any obstacle;" "makes me proud to be associated with him/her."

Leader effectiveness. As part of the survey, participants were asked four questions developed by Bass, Valenzi, Farrow, and Solomon (1975) regarding the effectiveness of their work units and how effective their superior was in meeting job-related needs of subordinates and the

requirements of the organization. Items were slightly reworded to refer to "officers" rather than "superiors." Five-point scaling was used with anchors ranging from "not effective" to "extremely effective." Examples of effectiveness items included the following: "the overall effectiveness of the unit for which this officer is in charge can be classified as" and "how effective is this officer in meeting the requirements of the command." The four-item scale, subordinate-rated effectiveness, had a alpha of .89.

In addition to collecting leader performance data from respective subordinates, performance data were collected annually from the time of an officer's commission to 1988 by the United States Navy. This information was provided by the various superiors of the focal officers since their time of commission and has been made available to the researchers by the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center. Superiors evaluated each focal officer each year since time of commission on a nine-point scale. The evaluation assesses "the officer's performance with regard to contributions to the unit's mission, including effective integration of personnel and the mission and completion of assigned tasks." The number of times an officer was given the highest rating on this scale was divided by the total number of evaluations he/she had received over the past several years from various superiors to produce an average superior performance evaluation. This cumulative average score could range from .00 to 1.00. As a part of the evaluation procedure each year, focal officers are either recommended or not recommended for early promotion. The number of times that an officer was recommended was divided by the total number of evaluations to produce an average superior-recommended early promotion score. This score could range from .00 to 1.00.

Analyses

For each leadership measure and subordinate-rated effectiveness, a one-way ANOVA was employed to compare within-leader variance to between-leader variance (c.f., Katz & Allen, 1985; Sheridan & Vredenburgh, 1978). Bartlett's M-test was also used to examine the homogeneity of within-leader variance. Each measure passed both tests in that between-leader variance was highly significant and intra-leader variance was homogeneous. These tests provided support for combining subordinates' perceptions to produce averaged, aggregated scores for respective focal leaders.

Hierarchical regression analyses (Cohen & Cohen, 1975) were conducted to test the hypothesis that charisma adds to contingent reward leadership in the prediction of leader effectiveness. Hierarchical regression was used to initially enter contingent rewards into a regression equation. Then, charismatic leadership was added separately to the equation. This was done to determine whether charismatic leadership added significant, unique variance to account for the effectiveness measures. The two-step hierarchical regressions were performed on each of the three outcome measures.

As noted by Cohen and Cohen (1975), a particular advantage of this hierarchical approach is that it overcomes some of the problems due to the multicollinearity among independent variables. Specifically, the interpretation of the amount of unique, semipartial variance attributable to leadership factors is facilited because the a priori ordering of contingent rewards followed by charisma infers a theoretical structure which accounts for intercorrelations between these variables. That is, contingent reward behavior which theoretically forms the basis of effective leadership was

allowed to enter regression equations first. To the extent that charisma is uncorrelated with contingent rewards, charisma would then have a chance to add additional unique variance beyond contingent rewards.

RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations among the measures are displayed in Table 1. Consistent with previous literature (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1988), contingent rewards was positively correlated with charisma. Two consistent patterns of correlations between leadership scales and effectiveness measures can also be seen in Table 1. First, the leadership scales are most highly correlated with subordinate-rated effectiveness, and may reflect common methods bias. Second, although both leadership scales are significantly correlated with each effectiveness measure, the lowest relationships are with contingent rewards. It should be noted that the effectiveness measures showed some degree of convergent validity in that subordinate-rated effectiveness significantly correlated .38 with superior-rated early promotion and .37 with superior performance evaluation. Thus, subordinates and superiors showed some degree of agreement regarding the effectiveness of the focal officers.

Insert Table 1 about here

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to test the hypothesis that charismatic leadership adds to the effects of contingent rewards leadership. As can be seen in Table 2, for each effectiveness measure, contingent rewards accounted for significant variance. More importantly and as predicted, charisma added unique variance to the prediction of each

effectiveness measure. Thus, charisma appears to augment the accuracy of the prediction of effectiveness beyond contingent rewards alone.

Insert Table 2 about here

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study confirmed the hypothesis that a theoretically important component of transformational leadership, charisma, goes beyond transactional/contingent rewards behavior in the prediction of leader effectiveness. These findings are consistent with other research recently conducted in industrial settings which has demonstrated the importance of transformational leadership behavior (Hater & Bass, in press; Waldman et al., 1987). The practical interpretation of the current results is that effective leadership goes beyond transactions or exchanges in an attempt to influence follower effort and group effectiveness. The act of helping to define follower objectives and associated rewards may be a basis for effective leadership but is not sufficient to ensure maximum effort and performance. Additional leadership which generates confidence and inspiration may result in heightened outcomes.

Future research is necessary to test the extent to which the augmenting effect of charismatic leadership demonstrated in the current study is present at various management levels of an organization. Both Lundberg (1986) and Tichy and Ulrich (1984) have stated that charismatic leadership is only of importance at the highest management levels. Their contentions are based on the notion that at these levels there is the greatest need for change and transformation. Presumably, lower level managers implement the

decisions of the higher level transformational leaders in a transactional manner. Furthermore, Katz and Kahn (1978) presented a model suggesting that charisma is the most important "affective" skill for top level executives. Empirically, Bass (1985) and Bass, Waldman, Avolio, and Bebb (1987) have found some tendency for more charisma to be shown at higher management levels. Despite such findings, the data presented here suggests that some degree of charismatic leadership may be important at lower management levels as well as at higher levels. The leaders who were the focus of this research were middle-level officers in the U. S. Navy.

As a note of caution, interpretation of some of the reported relationships may be threatened due to the potential for common methods variance and the aggregation procedures which were used. Measures of leadership and one of the measures of effectiveness were provided by subordinates. Some of the covariation between contingent rewards and charisma may be due to common methods bias. However, at least some degree of covariation was theoretically expected between these leadership measures. Relationships between subordinate-rated leadership behavior and subordinate-rated effectiveness were high, due at least in part to the use of common methods. Nevertheless, the same pattern of findings were obtained using criterion data supplied independently by superiors of the focal officers. It is also encouraging that subordinate-rated effectiveness was positively correlated w.th superior evaluations of effectiveness and potential for early promotion. These issues including a more rigorous test of the appropriateness of aggregating subordinates' reports about focal officers (see Dansereau, Alutto, & Yammarino, 1984) could be the subject for future research.

REFERENCES

Bass, B. M. 1985. Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. in press. The multifactor leadership profile. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bass, B. M., Valenzi, E. R., Farrow, D. L., & Solomon, R. J. 1975. Management styles associated with organizational task, personal and interpersonal contingencies. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60: 720-729.

Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., Avolio, B. J., & Bebb, M. 1987. Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. Group and Organization Studies, 12: 73-87.

Burns, J. M. 1978. Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. 1975. Applied multiple regression/correlational analysis for the behavioral sciences. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. 1987. Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. Academy of Management Review, 12: 637-647.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. 1988. The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice, Academy of Management Review, 13: 471-482.

Dansereau, F., Alutto, J. A., & Yammarino, F. J. 1984. Theory testing in organizational behavior: The varient approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. 1986. Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. Academy of Managment Review, 11: 618-634.

Evans, M. G. 1974. Extensions of the path-goal theory of motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59: 172-178.

Graen, G., & Cashman, J. F. 1975. A role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Ed.) Leadership frontiers. Carbondale, Ill: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. 1988. Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, in press.

House, R. J. 1971. A path-goal theory of leadership effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16: 321-338.

House, R. J. 1977. A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson (Eds.) Leadership: The cutting edge. Carbondale, Ill: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. 1974. Path-goal theory of leadership. Journal of Contemporary Business, 5: 81-97.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. 1978. The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Katz, R., & Allen, T. J. 1985. Project performance and the locus of influence in the R&D matrix. Academy of Management Journal, 28: 67-87.

Komaki, J. L. 1986. Toward effective supervision: An operant analysis and comparison of managers at work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71: 270-279.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. 1988. The leadership challenge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. 1987. Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. Academy of Management Review, 12: 648-657.

Lundberg, C. C. 1986. The dynamic organizational contexts of executive succession: Considerations and challenges. Human Resource Management, 5: 287-303.

Luthans, F., Paul, R., & Baker, D. 1981. An experimental analysis of the impact of contingent reinforcement on salespersons' performance behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 66: 314-323.

Podsakoff, P. M., Todor, W. D., & Skov, R. 1982. Effects of leader ccntingent satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 25: 810-821.

Sheridan, J. E., & Vredenburgh, D. J. 1978. Predicting leadership behavior in a hospital organization. Academy of Management Journal, 21: 679-689.

Tichy, N. M. & Ulrich, D. O. 1984. The leadership challenge--A call for the transformational leader. Sloan Management Review, 26: 59-68.

Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. 1986. Charisma and its routinization in two social organizations. Research in Organizational Behavior, 8: 113-164.

Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., & Einstein, W. O. 1987. Leadership and outcomes of performance appraisal processes. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 60: 177-186.

TABLE 1

Intercorrelations among Leadership and Effectiveness Measures (N=186)

Measures	M	SD	(CR)	(CH)	(SRE)	(SPE)	(SREP)
Leadership							
Contingent Rewards (CR)	2.00	.91	--				
Charisma (CH)	2.40	1.16	.74	--			
Effectiveness							
Subordinate-Rated Effectiveness (SRE)	2.75	.94	.64	.87	--		
Superior Performance Evaluation (SPE)	.32	.34	.21	.38	.37	--	
Superior-Recommended Early Promotion (SREP)	.46	.35	.23	.37	.38	.65	--

NOTE: Scores for contingent rewards, charisma, and subordinate-rated effectiveness represent average scores across subordinates for each respective focal leader.

$r > .13$, $p < .05$, $r > .18$, $p < .01$

TABLE 2

Hierarchical Regressions of Contingent Rewards and Charismatic Leadership (N=186)

Effectiveness	R^2 generated by Contingent Rewards	R^2 generated by Contingent Rewards + Charisma	ΔR^2
Subordinate-Rated Effectiveness	.41**	.75**	.34**
Superior Performance Evaluation	.04*	.16**	.12**
Superior-Recommended Early Promotion	.05*	.14**	.09**

NOTE: Contingent rewards was entered in the first regression step. Charisma was added to equations in the second regression step.

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

MANPOWER, PERSONNEL, AND TRAINING R&D PROGRAM
DISTRIBUTION LIST

Director Research Programs
Office of Naval Research (Code 11)
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Chairman, MPT R&D Committee
Office of the Chief of Naval Research
Code 222
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Mathematics (Code 1111MA)
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Director, Life Sciences (Code 114)
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Director, Cognitive & Neural Sciences
(Code 1142)
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Cognitive Science (Code 1142CS)
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Perceptual Science (Code 1142PS)
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Biological Intelligence (Code 1142BI)
Office of Naval Research
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Defense Technical Information Center
(12 copies)*
DTIC/DDA-2
Cameron Station, Bldg. 5
Alexandria, VA 22314

Science & Technology Div.
Library of Congress
Washington, DC 20540

Commanding Officer
Naval Research Laboratory
Code 2627
Washington, DC 20375

Office of the Deputy Asst.Sec.
of the Navy (Manpower & Reserve Affairs)
5D800, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350-1000

Assistant for Long Range Requirements
CNO Executive Panel (Op-OOK)
4401 Ford Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22302-0268

Head, Manpower, Personnel &
Training Branch
Office of the CNO (Op-813)
4A478, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350-1000

Assistant for Manpower & Training
Office the CNO (Op-987H)
5D772, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350

Assistant for Planning &
Technology Development
Office of the DCNO(MPT) (Op-01B2)
Dept.of the Navy
Washington, DC 20350-2000

Deputy Director Total Force
Training & Education Division
Office of the DCNO(MPT) (Op-11B)
Dept.of the Navy
Washington, DC 20370-2000

Deputy Director Military Personnel
Policy Div.
Office of the DCNO(MPT) (Op-13B)
Dept.of the Navy
Washington, DC 20370-2000

Head, Military Compensation Policy Branch
Office of the DCNO(MPT) (Op-134)
Dept.of the Navy
Washington DC 20370-2000

Director, Navy Family Support Program
Office of the DCNO(MPT) (Op-156)
Room 828
1300 Wilson Blvd
Arlington, VA 22209

Headquarters U.S.Marine Corp.
Code MA
Washington, DC 20380-0001

Head, Leadership Branch
Naval Military Personnel Command
Attn: LCDR E.Marits, NMPC-621
Department of the Navy
Washington, DC 20370-5620

Director, Recreational Services Dept.
Naval Military Personnel Command
(N-651C)
Room 932
1300 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22209

Deputy Director Manpower, Personnel
& Training Division
Naval Sea Systems Command
Attn: Code CEL-MP63
Washington, DC 20362

Director, Research & Analysis Division
Navy Recruiting Command (Code 223)
4015 Wilson Blvd, Room 215
Arlington, VA 22203-1991

Naval School of Health Sciences
Att: CDR J.M.LaRocco
National Naval Medical Center (Bldg.141)
Washington, DC 20814-5033

Technical Director
Naval Health Research Center
P.O. Box 85122
San Diego, CA 92138-9174

Capt. T. Jones, MSC,USN
Aviation Medicine & Human Performance
NMDRC Code 404
National Capital Region
Bethesda, MD 21814-5044

Dr. Al Smode
Naval Training System Center
(Code 07A)
1235 Research Parkway
Orlando, FL 32826

Head, Human Factors Laboratory
Naval Training Systems Center
(Code 71)
1235 Research Parkway
Orlando, FL 32826

Dr. Eduardo Salas
Human Factors Div.(Code 712)
Naval Training Systems Center
1235 Research Parkway
Orlando, FL 32826

Commanding Officer
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Technical Director
NPRDC (Code 01)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Head, Fleet Liaison Dept.
NPRDC (Code 31)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Head, Training Technology
Department
NPRDC (Code 51)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Head, Training Systems Dept.
NPRDC (Code 52)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Head, Manpower Systems Dept.
NPRDC (Code 61)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Head, Personnel Systems Dept.
NPRDC (Code 62)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Head, Testing Systems Dept.
NPRDC (Code 63)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Mr. Jeffrey Grossman
NOSC (Code 4403)
Bldg. 334
San Diego, CA 92152

Chairman, Dept.of Administrative
Sciences
(Code 54)
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93943-5100

Chairman, Dept.of Operations
Research (Code 55)
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93943-5100

Dir., Instruction Development
& Educational
Program Support Department
Naval Education & Training Program
Mgmt Support Activity (NETPMSA)
Pensacola, FL 32509

Academic Programs & Research Branch
Naval Technical Training Command
Code N-625
NAS Memphis (75)
Millington, TN 38504

Asst.for Training & Personnel Technology
Office of the Under Secretary of Defense
for Research & Enginerring
3D129, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-3080

Director, Defense Personnel Security
Research & Education Center
Suite E, Bldg. 455
99 Pacific Street
Monterey, CA 93940-2481

Personnel Analysis Division
AF/DPXA
5C360, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330

Technical Dir.,U.S.Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral & Social Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Director, Manpower Program
Center for Naval Analyses
4401 Ford Avenue
P.O. Box 16268
Alexandria, VA 22302-0268

Technical Director
Air Force Resources Laboratory
Brooks Air Force Base, TX 78236-5601

Library
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Library
Naval War College
Newport, RI 02940

Chief, Survey & Market Analysis Division
Defense Manpower Data Center
1600 Wilson Blvd., #400
Arlington, VA 22209

Program Director
Manpower Research & Advisory Services
Smithsonian Institution
Suite 120, 801 North Pitt St.
Alexandria, VA 22314-1713

Dr. Meg Gerrard
Psychology Dept.
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke
FMC Central Engineering Labs
Box 580
Santa Clara, CA 95052

Dr. T. Govindaraj
School of Industrial & Systems Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technoloy
Atlanta, GA 30332-0205

Prof. David W. Johnson
Cooperative Learning Center
University of Minnesota
150 Pillsbury Dr., S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Walter Schneider
Learning Research & Develoment Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15620

Prof. George A. Miller
Dept.of Psychology
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544

Dr. Jeffrey L. Kennington
School of Engineering & Applied Science
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, TX 75275-0335

Prof. Clark Glymour
Dept. of Philosophy
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Prof. Kent E. Williams
Inst.for Simulation & Training
University of Central Florida
PO. Box 25000
Orlando, FL 32816-0544

Dr. Paul Feltovich
So. Illinois University
School of Medicine
PO Box 3926
Springfield, IL 62708

Prof. Thomas G. Bever
Dept.of Psychology
The University of Rochester
River Station
Rochester, NY 14627

Dr. Lawrence J. Stricker
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Prof. Michael Levine
Dept.of Educational Psychology
University of Illinois
506 South Wright St.
Urbana, IL 61801

Prof. Patricia A. Carpenter
Psychology Department
Carniegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. William B. Johnson
Search Technology, Inc.
4725 Peachtree Corners Circle
Norcross, GA 30092