Creative Leadership and the Dark Side of Leadership

Even though psychologists discern a lot concerning leadership, people who form choices on real leaders appear to disregard their build up wisdom. In an attempt to make past studies more available, pertinent, and interpretable to decision makers, it is wise to define leadership in terms of whom to assign, how to assess them and when to terminate them. Termination will actually come about when creativity leadership, turns out to be an alternative or cult. According to political science, the basic query in human associations regards to who shall rule. Psychologists who are less pervaded with the fortitude of political beliefs consider the query who must rule. This should be answered in the elections, when CEOs are restored, or during the retiring of the university president. The query concerns how to assess management prospective.

Devotion to this topic has seen creative leadership as one of the most significant subject in practical psychology. On the other hand, there is a tendency to center on barely defined issues based on the rules of psychological research. The opening amid what we know and what creative leadership decision formulators want to know may clarify the status of research by Davis, Skube, Hellervick, Gebelein and Sheard, (1992). Their work provides sensible recommendations on how to discover and assess leadership. To decrease the gap existing amid researches and the rest of the public, it is astute to focus on assessment of leaders based on creative leadership and what it entails.

Creative leadership

Various authors suggest that our history create both egoism in us and yet capable to discover with the wellbeing of our communal component -maybe because personal endurance sometimes relies a team survival. It is vital to distinguish between a person's temporary and lasting selfishness; deeds that endorse the group in addition provide and persons lasting wellbeing. Histories sadly propose, though, that devoid of an outside risk to their group, individuals largely follow their temporary benefits.

Creative leadership entails influencing other people to disregard for a time their personal issues and track a universal goal that is vital for the tasks and wellbeing of a group. This description is ethically unbiased. A Somali warlord in an attempt to amalgamate a crowd of clansmen to direct foodstuff provisions requires the same talents as Minister in Chicago who attempts to amalgamate a crowd of worshippers to assist the itinerant. Creative leadership is an affiliation, not command; persons who need others to do their request due to their control are not leaders. Creative leadership only happens when others freely take on, for a time, the objectives of a group. Therefore, creative leadership entails forming a consistent and goal leaning team as there is a fundamental and definitional connection between leadership and performance.

To begin with, studies in Ohio State in the 1940s and 1950s reveal proposition of numerous classifications of creative leadership manners have been, as well as those by Digman, (1990). They vary chiefly in terms of their attributes and the list is the broadest; it recognizes sorts of leader manners, counting preparation and organizing, solution to problem, expounding, recognizing, sustaining, administration, growth and mentoring, and appraising. Even though staffs from directors to CEOs need these measures, their relative significance varies by managerial stage. These classifications tell us about normal leaders' performance and a variety of commercially accessible multirater evaluation about the level to which a certain leader does these things. On the other hand, there is petite available research about what efficient leaders really do. Efficiency entails ruling on a leader's influence on an organization's base line (i.e., the productivity of a trade unit, the value of services offered, or trade share obtained). Measures of efficiency are frequently difficult to state and regularly influenced by issues beyond a leader's management. However, efficiency is the average judging measure; centering on standard behaviors and overlooking efficiency is an overarching crisis in management study.

Choosing leaders

Psychologists have indicated that measures of cognitive skill and standard individuality, planned interviews, model, and evaluation centers envisage leadership accomplishment realistically well (Foushee, etal 1988). However, many institutions appear either uninformed or unwilling to take benefit of these emotional varieties of services. Consequently, the topmost managers are frequently selected from the labor force based on their practical ability instead of leadership ability. Instances comprise of petty representative in the military, educational division chairs, sergeant in the defensive services, and supermarket managers in industrialized institutions. Classically, a worker who is superior at the action of the component is made a manager based on his or her expertise. Therefore, the association drop, for instance, a good intellectual or sailor and obtains a manager whose aptitude for management is unidentified.

We presume that center managers (e.g., educational deans) are frequently selected from the positions of fore-line managers based on favor and supposed aptitude to work with superior management. This, on the other hand, is conjecture; little data clarify the subject. Neither is there a large amount of data obtainable relating to how CEOs (e.g., college presidents) are selected. In numerous instances, a management research company considers a schedule of applicants, each of whom appears to suit the company customs and appear suitable to the key decision formulators. An investigation committee -frequently consisting of board with partial knowledge in the commerce of the association- interviews the contestants and makes a preference (Campbell, 1997).

Evaluation of creative leaders

Efficiency is recommended as the suitable way to gauge management of a team, assemblage, or organizational. This decisive factor will be infected at all times; unanticipated outside events can disturb the most excellent hard work of anybody. Jimmy Carter´s ruling was principally unfasten by an OPEC oil restriction and unrest in Iran, proceedings over which

Jimmy had no power. Nevertheless, we believe group performance should constantly be considered when one assesses person´s management ability. The writing on leadership efficiency can be structured in terms of five groupings of research. The foremost group entails evaluation of leaders in conditions of the real performance of their squad or managerial unit. Instances include research by Hamilton (1988)

In the next grouping, subsidiaries, or managers` scores are employed in assessing leaders. Cases comprise studies by Conger (1998), Davis (1992), Eibl-Ebesfeld (1989). One inference of this study is that subsidiary employees are frequently in a distinctive state to assess leadership efficiency Goldberg (1993) analysis of supervisory output found that efficient leadership and improved team output were a purpose of the relations the managers have with their junior workers. Guiford (1999) renowned that the assessment or a supervisor´s performance depends on the relations an individual has built with his or her junior workers. Hamilton (1988) established that campus division chairs enhanced their performance, based on subordinates judgments and evaluation with control partakers who got no assistant assessment. Equally, Borman (1993) found that managers where concerned in multirater review schemes got considerably elevated mean efficiency ratings than managers who had no subordinate response. Campbell (1997) evaluated the projecting legality of junior workers evaluations with measurement core ratings and noted that junior workers ratings were as efficient as evaluation core data in predicting supervisory performance six years afterward.

Research by Dawkins (1996), shows that a leader's reliability or honesty may be the sole major significant issue in junior worker's judgments of his or her efficiency. For instance, Hamilton asked subordinates (N=300) to assess their bosses (N = 50) with the use a 50- piece survey tool that evaluated growth against retardation, interpersonal aptitude, supervisory principles and practical aptitude. Subordinates in addition rated their bosses for general efficiency. Each director and his or her boss concluded a similar questionnaire. Junior employees

and bosses assessments of an aimed manager's performance were logically reliable. In addition, directors' personal-ratings had no correlation with other groups' ratings; this is reliable with the logical outcome of Guiford (1999). Possibly most significant, bosses ratings of a manager's general efficiency were mainly subjective by considerations of his or her practical capability (e.g., Manager is an intuitive crisis solver) while junior staff score of a supervisor's general efficiency were mainly inclined by considerations of honesty (e.g., my manager is trustworthy).

Therefore, even though junior workers and bosses are likely to concur in their assessment of a manager's general efficiency, they as well assess rather dissimilar features of that performance. Even though junior worker scores will be to some extent be infected by score errors, investigation depict that the scores also show several awareness of a person's real performance in a management position. For instance, Harris et al (1991), via data given by supervisors and their assistants from 69 components of a big hospital, indicated that junior workers scores of executive efficiency were connected (rs between .21 and .45) with directed values of output. These results offer a major support for the employment of assistants' assessment of executive efficiency.

Another grouping of research assesses the leader vessel prospects of guest based on their performance in dialogue, reproduction, appraisal core, or group discussions. Instances comprise studies by Hogan, et al (1990) and Ropp (1987). The group discussion study offer practically no information concerning efficiency; somewhat, it entails what a person should to be sensitive, as leader like. Nevertheless, evaluation center study frequently employs organizational progression as a decisive factor, and indicates the traits linked to progress in big, compound organizations. For instance, in the AT&T Executive Evaluation Scheme, evaluation core scores for need for progression, common intellectual aptitude, written statement skills, general skills, ingenuity, and classifying and arrangement (Van Velsor et al 2002), best envisaged succeeding administration stage.

Self-rating of management has in addition been employed as assessment decisive factor (Fleishman & Harris, 1999). The proof is obvious, but those self-ratings exhibit little concerning leader efficiency. Nevertheless, there is a type of boss who regularly over assess his or her performance, hence being linked with deprived leadership (Chidester, et al 2001).

In another category of study, efficiency is depicted by the little end of the range –by people whose occupations are in danger or who have wrecked. The truth that someone has been approved for promotion or sacked shows an assessment of his or her output in a unconstructive way. Early study on wrecking comprise studied supervisors whose occupations were in crisis, with a broad diversity of evaluation methods, such as multirater evaluation tools and mental examinations, to recognize dissimilar dangers and wreking features. This study discloses managerial ineptitude to be linked with dishonesty, over management, misuse, little management, petulance, disinclination to use order, and an incapability to make superior staffing trade decisions.

Flawed leaders

The 1992 presidential voting is a case of how significant leaders are frequently selected. A set of aspirants made open reports; the supporters assisted by the press, assessed the leadership ability of the aspirants and then selected one. The procedure entailed assessing the leadership traits of stranger. Borman, (1993) noted that of all the techniques obtainable in selecting superior managers, associations consider the hunt company selections, base checks, and consultation. The consistent and well-authenticated methods by psychologists are employed in merely a minute division of circumstances. It is believed that the fewer suitable techniques continued to be employed based on the motives cited earlier and because aspirants for managerial places regularly decline to present to mental evaluation. The 50% crash score amongst superior managers may be the consequence of these broadly employed though illogical choice processes. Again, the employment difficulty characteristically entails assessing the leadership prospective

strangers. There has been significant research on the traits of individuals who, in the deficiency of performance information, nevertheless appear as leader like. This study falls adequately into two groupings. These comprise (a) research of link between character and features of developing/emergent leadership, and (b) studies on implied leadership theory.

Emergent Leadership

Studies on developing/emergent leadership recognizes the features linked with someone being alleged as leader like, when there is merely limit's data concerning that person's real performance; this study characteristically comprise chief less discussion groups. Bennis & Nanus (1985) analyzed study on character and emergent leadership in an assortment of formless groups. He found that actions of supremacy, extraversion, friendliness, objective or attainment, liability, honesty, self-assurance, negotiation, and supportive were certainly linked to emergent leadership.

The character descriptors recognized in Bennis & Nanus's (1985) review simply plot on the five-mold character composition authorized by numerous current traits psychologists (Avolio et al 1999). This mold indicate that individuality, from the observer's sight can be portrayed in dimensions such as assurgency, cordiality, meticulousness, mental steadiness and offers a universal language for explaining the consequences of individuality study. In the past, this study was frequently difficult to understand since dissimilar research employed diverse terminology. For instance, the meticulousness measurement was referred as conventionality (Bass, 1991), caution (Barron 1995), check (Dawkins, 1996) .

Returning to Bennis & Nanus's (1985) review, supremacy, extraversion, and friendliness depict assurgency; liability, attainment, and honesty fall into the meticulousness measurement; self-assurance, frame of mind and mental control are fraction of mental steadiness; and mediation and cooperativeness look like friendliness. Ellis (1999) reviewed 29 researches on the link between individuality and spectator scores of emergent leadership in undersized sets and fundamentally simulated Bennis & Nanus's (1985) ´s findings.

Additional new studies of individuality and leadership appearance attained the same similar conclusion (Farth, 1989; Fleishman, 1999, Foushee & Helmreich 1988).   Farth for instance accounted that the supremacy, capacity for rank, friendliness, societal presence (i.e., assurgency), personal-acceptance, attainment via self-determination (i.e., mental stability), and sympathy (i.e., friendliness) levels.

Looking into numerous managers less discussion groups, Gough (1994) found that between 49% and 80% of the variation in leadership appearance grading was due to individuality. His study indicated that the capability to manage one's significant manners is certainly linked to leadership appearance. Evaluation centers and recruitment interviews are frequently employed to assess the leadership capability of strangers; information is occasionally collected to establish the strength of these assessments. Research indicates that evaluation of center information is a sensibly valid interpreter of one's promotion record. The performance proportions recognizes in the AT & T executive evaluation scheme need for progression, actions flexibility, ingenuity, classifying, and development, match up to the magnitude of assurgency, meticulousness, mental stability, and intelligence.

These outcomes propose that the five molds offer a suitable way to sum up both manager less group discussions and evaluation core study. The outcomes also propose that actions of assurgency, friendliness, meticulousness, and mental steadiness can be employed to envisage the management prospective of strangers.

Individuality and Leader Efficiency

Evidence indicates that particular individuality magnitude is constantly connected to leadership efficiency. The foremost confirmation comes from Bennis and Nanus's (1985) review. They found that assurgency (i.e., supremacy, boldness, power or action stage, talking glibness, friendliness and communal participation), mental steadiness (i.e., mental equilibrium, freedom, and self-assurance), meticulousness (i.e., liability, attainment, proposal, individual

honesty, and moral conduct), and friendliness (i.e., sociability, communal proximity, and support) were certainly linked to efficiency. The two researchers did not organize their findings; nevertheless, their results hold up the consideration that there is a link between individuality and leadership.

Briggs et al (1996) reported parallel results from Bennis and Nanus's research on decision-making selection at Sears. With the use of the individuality record model, Briggs (, 1996) noted that managers endorsed to the uppermost stage at Sears were eloquent and dynamic (i.e., assurgency), self-governing, self-assured and mentally unbiased (i.e., mental steadiness), and dependable (i.e., meticulousness). The multiple correlation's between this scope and junior worker scores of in service competence, individual connections, approval, monetary rewards, and work situations were about R = .51 (Briggs, et al 1996). Briggs (, 1996) reported similar correlation amid these individuality features and leaders reimbursement, instant and second-stage better scores and status, and peer cluster grading of efficiency over a 20 year time.

Individuality and Performance

Two classes of research depict the connection between individuality and group performance. The foremost entails charismatic leadership. Zaccaro et al (2000) employed biographical substances to recognize three subjects in the occupations of charismatic leaders. First, they have a dream that others discover convincing; second, they have ability to employ a collection of people who divide that dream, hence resembling a team; and third, by asset of the connection vessel, they build up with the group members, the leaders are capable of influencing them to work and hold up the dream.

Compelling leadership can be rather efficient; relative to non-compelling leader, they have considerably senior endorsement approvals or performance evaluation scores from seniors. They also have contentment, confidence, or endorsement scores from junior workers. They also have scores of magnitude; or stages of group performance (Driskell, J.E., Hogan, R., & Salas, E.

1978). Digman (1988) noted that charismatic presidents have major requirements for authority and elevated power stages and they are generally self-confident (these subjects resemble assurgency) and attainment leaning (i.e., meticulousness). Employing self-score from the Adjective list (Eden, 1975) and junior worker ratings for personality, Eibl-Ebesfeld. (1989) noted that personality scores are certainly linked with self-assurance and individual adjustment (i.e., mental steadiness), female characteristics and nurturance (i.e., friendliness), and the call for transformation (i.e., intelligence).

Studies on the individuality procedures indicate a high effect on group performance in this situation, the performance of flight crew (Farth, & Doobins 1989). This study is significant because a crash in a group performance is the main source, of accidents in transport air. Farth and Doobins indicated that air travel performance distinctive in provisions of the number and strictness of the faults by the crew is considerably linked with the individuality of the chief. A team with captains who were affectionate, welcoming, self-assured, and capable of sustaining the pressure (i.e., friendliness and mental steadiness) made the smallest number of mistakes. On the other hand, the tams with captains who were conceited, antagonistic, arrogant, narcissistic, inert, violent, or tyrannical made the most mistakes. In spite of these findings, individuality is not taken into consideration in the procedure of airline pilot choice.

Dark side of leadership

Leaders become unsuccessful for a diversity of reasons -invention outline or longer attention clientele, services are no longer need and firms rearrange and cut back. All the same, a number of leaders fail for individual rather than configuration or financial reasons. They may have experience a certain field, such as sociology, engineering, or sales. They become unsuccessful, as they can no longer depend exclusively on their personal ability and hard work: that is, they have been endorsed into places that need them to be victorious. Since they are

incapable of building a team, their organization occupations stops. Derailment is inquisitively understudied given the regularity with it happens.

Eibl-Ebesfeld (1989) fundamentally founded contemporary derailment study while examining the links of supervisory performance. He noted that in the midst of the persons with the suitable traits (i.e., aptitude, self-assurance, aspiration), a division was botched. Eibl-Ebesfeld catalogued the subjects linked with disappointment (e.g., politics, sulkiness, deceit) and fulfilled that the unsuccessful managers had a superseding individuality imperfection or personality fault that separated their junior workers and stopped them from making a team. Study on managerial ineffectiveness has made alike conclusion; several managers who are brilliant, diligent motivated and strictly capable fail since they are alleged as conceited, malicious, unreliable, self-centered, poignant, obsessive, unfeeling, rough, unfriendly, too determined, or unable to entrust or make decisions (Digman, 1990).

The five molds show the "clear side" of individuality. Efficiency involves both the existence of these affirmative traits and the lack of dark side traits –exasperating propensities that isolate junior workers and intrusion with person's aptitude to create a team. Studies indicate that these dark side traits are harmfully linked to ratings of group's performance and that junior workers are nearly conscious of them (Bernardin &Klatt 1992). Nevertheless, they are difficult to notice using consultation, evaluation centers, or inventories of standard individuality since they coexist with elevated stages of self-worth and superior societal talents (Bernardin &Klatt 1992). Since managers with dark side propensities frequently perform in processes that assesses the tendencies possible of misbehaving, their counterproductive propensities will be obvious only after they have been on the work for some time.

The finest proof to describe if dark side traits can be changed comes from an assessment of the Personal Instruction for Efficiency program an exhaustive involvement that may last for an year. The program is meant for leaders whose occupations are in danger. Analyzing the results

for 380 contestants over a period of five years, Bernardin and Klatt (1992) noted that the most supervisors were capable of transforming from awful behaviors, and these changes were effective seven months following the training. Several of these contestants had earlier participated in a two- to six- day consistent leadership teaching programs, although the programs created petite behavioral change (Bray, Campbell, & Grant, 1994). These results entail that many executives who have inadequate performance can make the essential changes to preserve their occupations, but they require additional rigorous training than that got in most leadership development programs. During the year 1910, the Norwegians and the English exhibited a highly remarkable exposed contest to the South Pole. It was a heroic race, and the difference amid the presentation of the team from Norway led by Ronald Amundsen and the one from England led by Robert Falcon Scott offered an actual -life learning in management, leadership and team performance. Scott's ineptitude costs him the contest, existence, that of about four members of the team, while as frequently happens when advanced leadership fall short, the particulars were enclosed up for years

Psychologists, as investigators, are (appropriately) extra cynical; they frequently clarify dissimilarities in efficiency based on factors in the "surroundings" in which a team functions. Perhaps, since numerous aspects affect efficiency, there are only a few of studies assessing the influence of leadership on an institution´s base line. A number of the finest confirmation we have entails the performance of air Methodist ministers (Clark, 2000), U. S. President, and travel crews (Campbell, 1997). These researches depict a particular leader traits are linked with improving group performance –when the suitable measures of efficiency are calculated.

At the past stage, one may think of the terrible penalties of the leadership of Germany's Adolph Hitler in 1930s and 1940s and in Russia's Joseph Stalin in 1920s and 1940s. Millions of citizens were victimized and died as a result of ruthless vision of these blemished leaders and the vindictive penalty of their regulation, unrelenting even today.

Inquiring the beneficiaries of leadership (i.e., director's straight reports) is a method to make a decision whether creative leadership really matters. Numerous outlines of creative leadership manners are linked with subsidiary's performance and fulfillment (Conger, & Kanugo 1998). Equally, responses to incompetent leadership consist of income, defiance, developed disruption, and indolence Curphy, G. J., & Osten K.D (1993). This researchers renowned that organizational atmosphere research from 1950s to the current regularly indicate that 70% to 85% of the workers in some association –no matter when or where the study was concluded and no matter what work-related group was concerned- account that the most horrible or most traumatic feature of their work is the instant supervisor. High-quality leaders might place force on their people, although rude and inept management make billions of money a lost output every year. Hellevik et al (1992), offers an explicit and roughly terribly throbbing story of the penalty of awful leadership in the military. Responses to clumsy leadership can be tremendous. In the verge of 1990s, editorials in the New York Times, and the Washington Past renowned the deprived first-line management was connected with the loss of many postal employees over the past ten years.

To excite study on the subject of incompetent supervision, Norman (1990) projected that the bottom tempo for administrative ineptitude in America is between 61% and 76%. Norman in a charming short analysis anticipated that for the one decade, the breakdown tempo amongst senior's leaders in commercial America has been at slightest 51%. Data from 90 departments in a big hospice stated that the bottom rate for inept management in that institution was 62%. Stodgill, R. M. (1997), by means of date from a big aerospace association, anticipated a 52% bottom rate. He assembled serious events of managerial ineptitude, which he graded in terms of regularity. The most usual grievances for straight reports involved Executive reluctance to apply power (e.g., is unwilling to mange crisis and disagreement or is not a self-assured as others. This composed of 25% of the sample of 94 executives. Managers were found to oppress

their minors (e.g., manages his/her staffs too personally and considers workers as if they were unintelligent). This was composed of 17% of the sample. A rising body of confirmation sustain the ordinary intellect belief that creative leadership matter. Thus, psychologists require deciding how leadership influences organization efficiency and assist institutions select better leaders.

In conclusion, evaluation of leaders is prerequisite in management to measure the individual performance or that of their teams. Logically, the fact required to make this assessment are often hard to attain or poorly infected by exterior feature. Possibly the best option is to enquire from lower staff and the management to assess a manager. The observed literature recommends that these bases of information be connected; that the information providers are likely to center on a dissimilar feature of leader's production; and that, used as one, these assessments are fairly but considerably linked to group performance. Lastly, since lower workers, peers, or manager ratings entails decision concerning the occurrence of particular manners, studies normally find major connections between individuality and these scores than between individuality and aspects of efficiency. Creativity leadership can result in dark side of management in which leaders become ineffective, as they cannot rely totally on their individual capability and hard work. In summing up, this study discloses a consistent link between elevated rating on the magnitude of assurgency, friendliness and mental stability as the basis of managerial components.

References

Avolio, B.J., Waldman, D. A., & Einstein, W.O 1999. Transformational leadership in a management game simulation. *Group and Organizational Studies*. 13, 59-80.

Barron, F. 1995. *The Psychology of Creativity. In New Directions in Psychology II* (pp. 1-134). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Bass, B .M., Yammamarino, F. J., 1991. Congruence of self and others leadership ratings of naval officers for understanding successful performance. Applied Psychology: *An International Review*, 40, 437-454.

Bennis W.G., & Nanus, B (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row

Clark & M. B. Clark 2000 (Eds.), *Measures of Leadership* (pp. 131-143). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Bernardin H. J., & Klatt, L.A. 1992. Managerial appraisal system: Has practice caught up to the state of the art? *Personnel Administrator*. 30, 79-86.

Borman, W.C., & Brush D.H., 1993. More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performnace requirements. Human Performance, (6), pp.1-21.

Bray, D.W., Campbell, R.J., & Grant, D.L. 1994. *Formative years in business: A long term AT&T study of managerial lives*. New York: Wiley- Interscience.

Briggs, S.R., Cheek, J. M., & Buss, A.H. 1996. An analysis of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (38) pp. 679-686.

Campbell, J.P. 1997. *The cutting edge of leadership*: *An overview*. In J.G. Hunt & L.L Larson (Eds), Leadership: the cutting edge (pp 221-246) Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Chidester, T.R., Helmreich, R.L., Gregorich, S.E., & Geis, C.E. 2001. Pilot personality and crew coordination. International *Journal of aviation Psycology*. 20 (1) pp.34-56

Conger, J.A., & Kanugo, R.N., 1998. *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Curphy, G. J., & Osten K.D 1993. *Technical Manual for the Leadership Development Suvey* (Tech. Rep. No 93-14). Colorado Springs, CO: U.S Air force Academy.

Davis, B.L., Skube, C.J., Hellervick, L.W. , Gebelein, S.H., & Sheard, J.L. 1992. *Successful manager's handbook: Development suggestions for today's managers*. Minneapolis , MN: Personnel Decisions.

Dawkins, R. 1996. *The selfish gene*. New York: Oxford University Press.

De Vries, D.L. 1992. Executive selection: Advances but no progress. *Issues & Observations*, 12, 1-5.

Digman, J.M. 1988. *Classical theories of trait organization and the Big Five factors of personality*. Paper presented at the 96th Annual Convention on the American Psychological Association, Atlanta, GE.

Digman, J.M 1990. Personality structure. Emergence of the five factor model. *Annual Review of Paychology* (Vol. 41, pp. 417-440). Palo Alto, CA: Annual reviews.

Driskell, J.E., Hogan, R., & Salas, E. 1978. Personality and group performance, In C. Hendrick (Ed.). *Personality and Social Psychology review* (pp. 91-112). Bevery Hills, CA: Sage.

Eden, D., & Leviathan, U. 1975. Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure inderlying dupervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60,736-741.

Eibl-Ebesfeld. I. (1989). *Human Ethnology*. Chicago: Aldine.

Ellis, R.J 1999. Self- monitoring and leadership emergence in groups. *Personality and Social Psycologicy Bulleetin*, 14, 681-693.

Farth, J. L., & Doobins, G.H. 1989. Effects of self-esteem on tenincy bias in sel-resports of performance: A structural equation model. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 835-850.

Fleishman. E. A., & Harris, E.F 1999. Paterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 15, 43-56.

Foushee, H. C., & Helmreich, R. L. 1988. *Group Interaction and flight Crew Performance*. In E. L Weiner & D.C. Nagel (Eds.), *Human Factors in Aviation* (pp. 189-227). San Diego, CA: Academic Prees.

Goldberg, L. R. 1993. The structure of phenotypic personality traits. America Psychologist. 48, 26-34.

Gough, H. G. (1994). A managerial potential scale for the California Psychological Inventory. Journal of Applied Psychology. 69, 233- 240.

Guiford, J.P. (1999). Factors and factors of personality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 82, 802-814.

Hamilton, M.H. 1988. *Employing new tools to recruit workers*. Washington post, pp. H1, H3.

Harris, G., & Hogan, J. 1992. Perceptions and personality correlates of managerial effectiveness. Paper presented at the 13t[h] Annual Psychology in the Department of Defense Symposium, Colorado Springs, CO.

Hellevik, L.W., Hazucha, J.F., & Schneider, R.J. (1992). Behavioral change: models methods, and a review of the evidence. In M. D. Dunnette & L.M Hough (Eds.), Handbook of Industrial and organizational psychology (2nd ed,. Vol. 3). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting psychologists Press.

Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). *The dark side of charisma*. In K.E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 343-354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Norman W. T. (1990). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicate factor structures in peer nomination personality ratings. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 66, 574-573.

Ropp, K. 1987. *Restructuring Survival of The Fittest*. Personnel Administrator , pp. 45-47.

Schneider, B 1987. The people make the place. *Personal Psychology* 40, 437-453.

Stodgill, R. M. 1997. Personal factors associated with leadership: *A survey of the literature. Journal of Personality*. 25, 35-71.

Van Velsor, E., Taylor, S., & Leslie, J.B. 2002. *Self- rater Agreement, self-Awareness and Leadership Effectiveness*. Paper presented at the 100th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Zaccaro, S. J., Foti, R. J., & Kenny, D. A. 2000. Self-monitoring and trait-based variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 308-315.