Research Paper **Open** **Access**

Antecedents of the Motivation to Lead: What Type of Leader Wants to Step Up?

[1]James M. Dobbs,PhD, [2]Douglas R. Lindsay,PhD,[3]R. Jeffrey Jackson,PhD (†)
[1]*Dean of Academics& Associate ProfessorUnited States Air Force Academy Preparatory School*
[2]*Executive Editor at Center for Character and Leadership DevelopmentUnited States Air Force Academy*
[3]*ProfessorDepartment of Behavioral Sciences & LeadershipUnited States Air Force Academy*

*Corresponding Author:James M. Dobbs,
HQ USAFA/PSD, 5220 Cedar Drive, Suite 305USAF Academy, CO 80840(719) 333-7240

ABSTRACT: *Research on leaders and their effectiveness addresses the desired and necessary characteristics of individual leaders, often framed as optimal competencies—"what" qualities should a leader have. There is less research directly dealing with the motivation to lead as compared to studies addressing leadership competencies. Given the wide variety of the performance of leaders in terms of effectiveness, ethical behavior, and failure, why someone wants to lead is a crucial question. This study expanded upon Chan and Drasgow's (2001) motivation to lead construct by examining narrowing personality traits, the specific influence of locus of control and self-monitoring, and considered the influence of potential mediation of core self-evaluation. The analyses indicated that there are differential predictors for individuals regarding the motivation behind choosing to lead and the possible implications of that leadership.*

Keywords: *motivation;leadership; personality*

I.   INTRODUCTION

The majority of research on leaders and their effectiveness addresses the desired and necessary characteristics of individual leaders, often framed as optimal competencies—"what" qualities should a leader have. From the perspective of knowledge, skills, and other attributes, the typical evaluation of leaders flows from the question explicitly raised by Hogan and Kaiser (2005), "who should rule?" (p. 1). However, given the wide variety in the performance of leaders in terms of effectiveness and ethical behavior, perhaps the crucial question is "why" someone wants to lead.As compared to studies addressing leadership competencies, there is significantly less research directly dealing with the motivation to lead. This is interesting as motivation is often a driving force in behavior. From a hiring and evaluative perspective it is appropriate to consider who should lead, but from an internal and emerging leader perspective it is also relevant to understand the factors behind the question, "should I lead?"

A limitation in the current leadership research is the dearth of research examining both the broad and narrow characteristics of leaders and the motivational drivers for leadership. There are certainly models that are more competency based (e.g., Hogan and Kaiser, 2005; Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, and Jacobs, 2000),and there are a few frameworks that include motivation as a somewhat distal element of leadership (Chan and Drasgow, 2001; Zaccaro, 2007). However, the simultaneous examination of both leader competencies/characteristics and leader motivation may be absolutely necessary, as suggested by Chan and Drasgow (2001) and Zaccaro (2007), to truly develop a comprehensive understanding of leadership development and performance.

As noted, the overall literature explicitly addressing the motivation to lead is quite limited. Although existing research has been pioneering in terms of the construction of a measurement tool (Chan and Drasgow, 2001), validating the motivation to lead construct (Amit, Lisak, Popper, and Gal, 2007; Bobbio and Rattazzi, 2006), examining leadership at multiple levels (Chan and Drasgow, 2001; Clemmons and Fields, 2011), and considering cross-cultural applications (Mutalib and Ghani, 2013), there is still much work to be done. Clearly

there is an even greater opportunity to expand the nomological net regarding the motivation to lead, further evaluate the distal and proximal variables associated with the motivation to lead, and extend the research into other leadership populations. Additionally, and specifically related to this research, there is value in promoting coherence within the existing literature with work that both replicates and extends some of the foundational findings. In particular, the initial work by Chan and Drasgow (2001) focused on values and individual difference characteristics as antecedents of the motivation to lead. Subsequent research branched out into other areas (Oh, 2012), examined very narrow band values antecedents (Clemmons and Fields, 2011), or nudged research forward with useful propositions, but not with direct empirical contributions (Kark and Van Dijk, 2007).

The research reported here operates within the general boundaries of the Chan and Drasgow model (2001), expands and evaluates the influence of values on the motivation to lead, shifts from the antecedent role of the Big Five personality traits to the specific influence of locus of control and self-monitoring, and considers the influence and potential mediation of core self-evaluation rather than leadership self-efficacy on motivation. This model of research replicates prior research by examining personality and values as distal antecedents to the motivation to lead, but extends the nomological net by applying a values framework, including narrow personality traits, and assessing how core self-evaluation operates as a semi-distal mediator.

1.1 Motivation to Lead

Motivation is a driving force that not only provides initiative and stamina for a particular purpose, but one that also provides direction. It is an individual difference construct guiding individuals to select a particular direction, affecting the intensity of the pursuit, and similarly, impacting one's persistence.

The direction and intensity regarding the motivation to lead can essentially take four different pathways. The first pathway is a crucial decision point, to lead or not to lead. From there, Chan and Drasgow (2001) identify three different dimensions of the motivation to lead. The first of these, affective/identity motivation, is based on the person's inner desire to lead, a preference for leading, and a personal sense of fit between their disposition and the duties and responsibilities associated with leading. Fundamentally, this motive reflects a strong personal desire, "I want to lead." The second motive is social-normative, in which the motivation for leadership comes from a sense of duty, obligation, and perceived need for someone to step up to take on the leadership mantle. This motive is based in one's sense of responsibility to the community, arguably reflecting the sentiment and conclusion, "I should lead." Finally, the non-calculative motive for leadership that arises is more easily defined by the calculative end of this dimension. The calculating leader evaluates the costs and benefits associated with leadership, considers the sacrifices and gains, and considers the leadership role from an exchange basis. The non-calculative motive is not rooted in this transactional analysis with the essence of this motive captured in the statement, "I would lead, …" It is bounded on one end of the continuum with the general evaluation of one's availability and willingness and on the other end of the polarity by an assessment of the cost-benefit ratio.

The motivation to lead concept, measurement, and propositions have been supported in several studies. The original research by Chan and Drasgow (2001) supported the factor structure of the motivation to lead scale in a sample of military recruits and undergraduates, and this work was subsequently replicated with members of the Israeli Defense Force (Amit et al., 2007), and college students (Bobbio and Rattazzi, 2006). The three dimensions of motivation, affective identity, social normative, and non-calculative, were evident in research involving autonomous work teams (Oh, 2012), religious leaders in Malaysia (Mutalib and Ghani, 2013), and undergraduate students assuming leadership roles (Hendricks and Payne, 2007). Further, the literature indicates that the different types of motivation have different antecedents, with particular patterns of personality, values, and efficacy having somewhat unique, but also somewhat inconsistent relationships (Chan and Drasgow, 2001; Clemmons and Fields, 2011; Hendricks and Payne, 2007; Mutalib and Ghani, 2013; Oh, 2012). More broadly, this body of work also supports the model of leader development proposed by Chan and Drasgow (2001) in terms of both distal and proximal antecedents to the motivation to lead and the effect of motivation on leadership performance. Nonetheless, research on motivation to lead has been limited in scope as less than a dozen published studies specifically link to the original research, the research methods have varied (particularly in the instruments used), the results have been somewhat inconsistent, and correspondingly, the number of antecedent variables that have been examined has also been limited.

One distal antecedent for the motivation to lead is the personal values of the projected leader (Chan and Drasgow, 2001). Values, simply put, represent what are important to people and act as a motivational construct (Bardi and Schwartz, 2003). More specifically, they are representations of what is desirable, with these representations guiding how social actors select actions, evaluate others and events, and explain their actions and evaluations (Schwartz, 1996). As conceived by Schwartz (1996) they are trans-situational, and they follow a competing values framework—some values are incompatible with others (Ros, Schwartz, and Surkiss, 1999). The most commonly used model in value research is the circumflex framework of Schwartz and his associated Schwartz Values Survey (Lindeman and Verkasalo, 2005). In that framework, there are ten distinct types of

values—universalism, benevolence, conformity, tradition, security, power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, and self-direction—that guide and express motivational goals (Ros et al., 1999). The structure of the ten values within the quasi-circular model describes their relationships to one another; they can be compatible (e.g., universalism-benevolence), incompatible (e.g., universalism-power), or unrelated (e.g., universalism-conformity). The ten values are also defined by two higher order factors. The first bipolar dimension is bounded by openness to change on one end and conservation on the other, reflecting values emphasizing independent thought and action with a preference for change (self-direction and stimulation) as opposed to values promoting more submissiveness, self-restriction, stability, and preservation of traditions. The second dimension is represented by self-transcendence and self-enhancement. Self-transcendence draws from the values of universalism and benevolence, and emphasizes accepting others, viewing others as equals, and concern for their welfare. In contrast, self-enhancement is based on the values of power and achievement, highlighting the pursuit of one's personal success and dominance over others (Ros et al., 1999).

These higher order dimensions have conceptual and empirical connections to the motivation to lead. In their original research, Chan and Drasgow (2001) examined the relationship between sociocultural values and the motivation to lead. Their conceptualization of individualism and collectivism track to the Schwartz dimensions of self-enhancement and self-transcendence, with individualism and collectivism having different predictive patterns for the types of motivation to lead. Consistent with the theory, collectivism predicted non-calculative and social-normative motivation to lead, but not affective-identity. The data for individualism were mixed, but negatively predicted non-calculative motivation to lead while showing some relationship to affective identity. This pattern was generally supported in subsequent research conducted with an officer and enlisted military sample (Clemmons and Fields, 2011).

The second values dimension, change versus conservation, has not been directly examined in relation to the motivation to lead. However, Kark and Van Dijk (2007) have proposed that these values will also function as distal antecedents to the motivation to lead. Specifically, they suggest that change oriented values will predict affective/identity motivation to lead while conservation values will predict social-normative motivation. Some elements of these values were examined, not through the distal evaluation of values but through the study of learning goal orientation. Hendricks and Payne (2007) describe two styles of learning goal orientation in terms that overlap with the change and conservation values. A mastery based learning goal orientation is a leaning forward approach to take on new learning and development, with low regard for their relative performance. In contrast, a performance goal orientation, and particularly a performance-avoid goal orientation, is a much more cautious approach that, as the name would suggest, includes objectives that help avoid criticism and negative evaluation. Hence, they are conceptually connected to making changes and doing something different, even involving chance and risk, compared to conservation and keeping things status quo. Their research is partially consistent with the propositions raised by Kark and Van Dijk (2007); the mastery goal orientation as a possible index of the values for change was predictive of the affective/identity motivation to lead, but it was also predictive—contrary to Kark and Van Dijk (2007)—of the social-normative motivation to lead (Hendricks and Payne, 2007). Consequently, these results are inconclusive and require additional research.

Responding to the state of existing research, this study applies a values based measure that investigates both higher order dimensions—self-transcendence/self-enhancement and change and conservation—as distal antecedents to the motivation to lead. Consequently, the authors replicate work that has been done on self-transcendence/self-enhancement and extend the research by examining the relationship with change and conservation.

Personality
1.2. Locus of Control

Locus of control, originally conceived by Rotter (1966), is a personality trait regarding one's expectancies for desirable outcomes. Those who perceive themselves to be able to control or influence such outcomes are regarded as having an internal locus of control, whereas those who view outcomes as determined by external factors are appropriately described as externals. In a meta-analysis (Ng, Sorensen, & Eby, 2006), locus of control was argued to be a motivational trait associated with various aspects of job motivation. Similarly, research led by Judge found locus of control related to job performance (Judge and Bono, 2001) and modestly related to leadership (Judge et al, 2002—meta-analytic study of leadership). As a motivational characteristic related to these workplace dimensions, locus of control may also relate to motivation to lead dimensions. Those with an affective-identity motivation are conceptually prompted to lead by internal factors—they want to lead, with little explicit focus on external factors and high leadership self-efficacy. Leaders with calculative motives would be attentive to and concerned about outcomes of role occupancy as a leader, and hence, would probably not want to base those outcomes on external factors. Consequently, those with calculating motives would be expected to also have a high internal locus of control.
1.3. Self-Monitoring

As with locus of control, people vary in their behavior regarding external situations. With self-monitoring, there is a wide range in the degree to which people pay attention to and regulate their behavior to essentially manage their impressions and reputation. Self-monitoring is related to an assortment of workplace variables, including getting along with others, getting ahead, and making sense (Day and Schleicher, 2006; Day, Schleicher, Unckless, and Hiller, 2002) as well as leadership (Rueb, Erskine, and Foti, 2008). High self-monitors are considered to be social pragmatists who are concerned with status enhancement (Day and Schleicher, 2006). Given the attention the high self-monitor pays to potential benefits, this tendency should overlap with the orientation of the calculative motivation to lead. Accordingly, there should be an inverse relationship between self-monitoring and non-calculative motivation. This relationship should be different with leaders who have an affective-identity motive. Such leaders, like the low self-monitor, simply tend to be who they are—even with lower regard for situational demands. Therefore, a relationship would be expected between affective-identity motivation to lead and self-monitoring.

1.4. Core Self-Evaluation

Belief and confidence in one's ability to lead, leadership self-efficacy, is a semi-distal trait that predicts motivation to lead and partially mediates the impact of other distal traits such as personality and learning goal orientation (Chan and Drasgow, 2001; Hendricks and Payne, 2007). Since a specific self-evaluation of one's leadership-efficacy predicts motivation to lead, a more general self-evaluation may be similarly related to motivation to lead. General self-evaluations have been related to other workplace experiences, to include work motivation in general (Erez and Judge, 2001), job performance (Judge, 2009; Judge and Bono, 2001), and life and job satisfaction (Judge, Bono, Erez, and Locke, 2005). These findings aren't particularly surprising given that those with positive core self-evaluations tend to consistently evaluate themselves favorably and across situations, seeing themselves as capable, worthy, and in control (Judge, Van Vianen, and De Pater, 2004). Additionally, since core self-evaluations are a motivational trait (Judge et al., 2004), they should be linked to the different dimensions of motivation to lead. Prior research has found that leadership self-efficacy more strongly predicts affective/identity motivation than social-normative, and is unrelated to non-calculative motivation (Laura, 2010). The empirical results appear to line up only partially with theoretical arguments. Certainly the linkage between self-evaluation and affective-identity is clear, but those who are motivated to lead by a sense of duty and obligation might be less influenced by perceived capability if the stronger motivating force is one of duty. Similarly, those who calculate leadership possibilities might be inclined to factor in how their abilities relate to how they may perform and succeed in a leadership role. These direct relationships also require further evaluation.

Like leadership self-efficacy, core self-evaluations may mediate the relationship between the distal variables of personality and values and the motivation to lead. Chan and Drasgow (2001) reported that leadership self-efficacy did mediate the relationship between certain personality traits (extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness) and affective/identity and social-normative motivation to lead, but was not a mediator for values. Similarly, Hendricks and Payne (2007) identified leadership self-efficacy as a mediator for learning goal orientation and affective/identity and social-normative motivations to lead. Since core self-evaluation includes a self-efficacy component as part of a broader uni-dimensional construct (Judge et al., 2004), it is reasonable to expect that core self-evaluation will mediate the relationships between distal antecedents and the motivation to lead.

II.   STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

The state of research on motivation to lead is in a stage of early development that would benefit from additional research to expand and unify existing research. There is evidence that broad personality traits, specific values, and self-belief impacts motivation to lead (Ng, Ang, and Chan, 2008). However, the number of predictor variables has been limited. Consequently, there is value in examining narrow personality traits, expanding the values research with well-supported measures, and exploring the relationship between one's self-beliefs and distal antecedents and ultimately the motivation to lead.The current study addresses these gaps by testing the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: There are different pathways to the different motivation to lead styles; the antecedent variables will share little overlap with one another in predicting motivation to lead.
Hypothesis 2: Values will differentially predict each motivation to lead style. The value of self-enhancement predicts both the affective-identity and non-calculative styles of leadership whereas the competing value of self-transcendence predicts a social normative style of motivation. The value of a change orientation predicts affective-identity, whereas a conservation value will predict the social-normative style of the motivation to lead.
Hypothesis 3: Personality relates to the motivation to lead; specifically one's locus of control predicts affective-identity and non-calculative (inverse relationship) motivation. Self-monitoring will have a similar relationship,

but only predicts the affective-identity motivation.

Hypothesis 4: The distal antecedents of values and personality are mediated by one's core self-evaluation; so motivation to lead is influenced directly and indirectly by distal traits but also through their indirect effect on core self-evaluation.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sample

Participants were canvassed from a research subject pool that supported two academic courses in a military federal service academy: an introductory psychology course with freshman (first-year) cadets and an upper-level leadership course with juniors (third-year) cadets. Junior cadets typically occupy middle-management leadership roles, directly responsible for sophomore and freshman cadets in their squadron. Freshman cadets practice self-leadership and followership and operate largely in an individual contributor role. From the subject pool of 809 participants, 233 cadets completed the online surveys for extra credit and constituted the final sample size of this study, yielding a participation rate of just over 28% from the eligible subject pool. The majority (68%) were upper class cadets, and the majority were also male (77%), which is representative of this population.

3.2. Measures

Motivation to Lead. The 27-item instrument developed by Chan and Drasgow (2001) was used to assess the three types of motivation to lead, measured with a five-point Likert scale for each dimension, affective/identity ("I have a tendency to take charge in most groups or teams that I work in"), social-normative ("It is not right to decline leadership roles"), and non-calculative ("Leading others is really more of a dirty job than an honorable one"). Research supports the reliability and factor structure of this instrument ($\alpha = .84$; Amit et al., 2007; Chan and Drasgow, 2001).

Schwartz Values Survey. The Schwartz Values Survey is a widely used and validated survey that includes 56-items to assess ten distinct values (Schwartz, 1992). Participants rate the importance of each value on a nine-point scale ranging from "opposed to my values" to "of supreme importance." From this overall assessment, two higher-order dimensions were derived by combining specific values to create scales for self-transcendence (universalism, benevolence) versus self-enhancement (achievement, power) and openness to change (self-direction, stimulation) versus conservation (security, tradition, conformity). All four dimensions had satisfactory alpha reliability coefficients (all >.70).

Locus of Control. Rotter's (1966) twenty-nine item survey was used to determine internal or external style. This is a forced choice measure with participants selecting a response indicative of internally driven or externally influenced expectancies. As an example, participants select option A, "People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly" or option B, "There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you." High scores indicate an external locus of control. Although subsequent research has supported the reliability of this measure (>.70), the factor structure has not held up consistently as a uni-dimensional construct (Lange and Tiggemann, 1981).

Self-Monitoring Survey. The 18-item version of the Self-Monitoring Scale was used to measure self-monitoring disposition (Snyder and Gangestad, 1986). Participants respond to items with true-false choices, with higher scores indicating a greater tendency toward high self-monitoring. A sample item from this version is, "I am not always the person I appear to be." The 18-item version is supported by better reliability than the 25-item version (>.70) and has a more stable factor structure (Snyder and Gangestad, 1986).

Core Self-Evaluation Scale. Foundational beliefs about oneself were measured with the 12-item Core Self-Evaluations Scale (CSES; Judge et al., 2003). This instrument applies a five-point Likert scale (1 = disagree strongly to 5 = agree strongly). The CSES measures a single factor addressing issues related to self-esteem, locus of control, generalized self-efficacy, and emotional stability. A representative item is, "I am confident I get the success I deserve in life." This measure has shown strong internal consistency with all alpha coefficients greater than .80.

Control Variables. The initial research on the motivation to lead found that prior leadership experience had an effect on particular motives (Chan and Drasgow, 2001). Consequently, the authors control for leadership experience by entering cadet class as a control variable. Cadet class reflects leadership experience since junior level-cadets have had frontline and mid-level managerial responsibilities. Although gender has not previously been focused on as a predictor variable in the motivation to lead research, it is also included.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data and test the hypotheses in this study. Descriptive analyses include means and standard deviations for focal variables. Correlational analyses were used to determine the significance of association betweenpersonality traits on motivation to lead. Multiple

regressions analysis was used to model the specific personality traits of effect of locus of control and self-monitoring, and the influence and potential mediation of core self-evaluation on motivation. The control variables were gender and class year (i.e., years of attendance at the military service academy).

V. FINDINGS

Analyses of the bivariate relationships were generally as expected and consistent with some prior findings (see Table 1). Values were differentially predictive of the different types of leadership. There was congruence between values and leadership as self-transcendence values were correlated most strongly with the social-normative motivation to lead ($r = .38$, $p < .01$), and self-enhancement values correlated with affective/identity motivation ($r = .32$, $p < .01$). Turning to the other dimension of values, change versus conservatism, change values were correlated with both the social-normative ($r = .33$, $p < .01$) and affective/identity motivations to lead ($r = .27$, $p < .01$), whereas conservation values were correlated with social-normative ($r = .35$, $p < .01$) and non-calculative motives ($r = .25$, $p < .01$). It is curious that the social-normative type correlates with both change and stability. Perhaps this is due to the direction of the organization; one who feels and obligation and duty might be most inclined to follow the organization's values.

Just as values related to different dimensions of the motivation to lead, so did personality. Both locus of control and self-monitoring were significantly related to the affective/identity motivation to lead ($r = -.31$ and .27, $p < .01$, respectively), and they were related to affective/identity much more strongly than related to the other motives to lead. Consequently, a personal sense that one controls outcomes was related to a personal desire to lead. However, being a high self-monitor was also predictive of the affective/identity motive. Finally, core self-evaluation was related to each of the different motives, so a generally positive belief in oneself predicted a generally higher motive to lead.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations among the Study Variables (N=233)

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Affective/identity	3.41	.46									
2. Social-normative	3.81	.43	.39**								
3. Non-calculative	3.77	.53	.15*	.43**							
4. Self-transcendence	7.10	.82	.19**	.38**	.28**						
5. Self-enhancement	6.83	.79	.32**	.28**	.03	.31**					
6. Change	7.15	.88	.27**	.33**	.10*	.53**	.61**				
7. Conservation	7.01	.81	.15*	.35**	.25**	.65**	.38**	.34			
8. Locus of control	9.26	3.82	-.31	-.14	-.16	-.17	-.07	-.20	-.14		
9. Self-monitoring	9.69	3.16	.27**	.17*	.05	.01	.19**	.17*	-.03	-.06	
10. Core self-evaluation	3.76	.51	.29**	.31**	.23**	.18**	.11	.24**	.15*	-.50	.04

Correlations .14 and greater are significant at *$p < .05$; correlations .18 and greater are significant at **$p < .01$

While the bivariate relationships indicated some consistency with prior research as well as new and different findings, multivariate analyses identified more specific, unique, and independent patterns. The essential findings indicated that antecedent variables have particularly defined relationships with each of the motivation to lead dimensions (see Table 2). With affective/identity motivation, the value of self-enhancement ($\beta = .29$, $p < .01$) and both self-monitoring ($\beta = .18$, $p < .01$) and locus of control ($\beta = -.29$, $p < .01$) were the only variables that contributed significance and unique variance in predicting this motive. Core self-evaluation did not emerge as a significant predictor. Non-calculative leadership was also predicted by a value, but not by a distal personality variable. This style of leadership motivation was predicted by self-transcendence ($\beta = .22$, $p < .05$) and by core self-evaluation ($\beta = .22$, $p < .05$). Additionally, gender predicted the non-calculative motivation to lead ($\beta = -.16$, $p < .05$); females were more likely to respond to this motive for leading than were men although the mean scores were only slightly higher. Quite differently, neither of the distal personality constructs; locus of control and self-monitoring predicted the social normative motivation to lead. This motive style was predicted by the value of conservation ($\beta = .19$, $p < .05$), and was directly predicted by core-self-evaluation ($\beta = .25$, $p < .01$). Additionally, leadership experience was related to this type of motivation to lead ($\beta = -.15$, $p < .05$). The negative direction indicates that those with more leadership experience are less motivated to lead by a sense of duty.

Table 2. Regression Analyses For Predictor and Motivation to Lead Variables

Step and variable	Affective/identity β	SE	Social-normative β	SE	Non-calculative β	SE
1. Gender	.73**	.02	-.24**	.03	-.10**	.02
Class year	.02	.03	-.11**	.03	-.19**	.04
R^2		.55		.09		.06
2. Gender	.75**	.02	-.27**	.03	-.11**	.03
Class year	.03	.03	-.14**	.04	-.20**	.04
Self-transcendence						
Self-enhancement						
Change						
Conservation						
Locus of control						
Self-monitoring						
3. Gender						
Class year						
Self-transcendence						
Self-enhancment						
Change						
Conservatism						
Locus of control						
Self-monitoring						
Core self-evaluation	.06**	.01	-.12**	.02	-.05	.02
R^2		.55		.10		.06
ΔR^2		.00		.01		.00

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

Core self-evaluations in this study was framed as a semi-distal predictor. This suggests that one's core self-evaluation is subject to situational and external factors more so than constructs like personality and values. Consequently, it is possible that core self-evaluation mediates the relationship with distal predictors. Following Baron and Kenny's (1986) guidance, mediation is indicated when each of the predictor variables are related to one another, when they relate directly to the outcome variable, and when the mediating variable reduces the impact of the antecedent predictor variable. These conditions were not met for the affective identity of non-calculative motives. These conditions were met with the social-normative motive; core self-evaluation partially mediated the effect of self-transcendence. However, the Sobel analysis was non-significant, so core self-evaluation does not mediate the key relationships for any of the three motives to lead.

VI.   DISCUSSION

Arguably all leadership positions, formal and informal, are available to everyone. However, a person's motivation to lead influences their likelihood of entering leadership positions and the particular style of leadership they will enact. Although the limited literature on the motivation to lead is not yet a coherent field with fully conclusive results, research, to include this study, is beginning to identify particular patterns about the antecedents to the three different motive styles first identified by Chan and Drasgow (2001). More specifically, this research relates to prior studies and contributes to this developing area in several different ways. First, it replicates some earlier research by finding that distal individual characteristics, personality and values, differentially predict the motivation to lead. Second, it extends existing research by including similar and additional value dimensions, self-enhancement/self-transcendence and change/conservatism, different and narrow band personality traits, and a broader measure of self-evaluation as predictors of the motivation to lead. The inclusion of these variables expands the nomological net for the motivation to lead construct. Third, the sample includes emerging military leaders, a group that is different from other recruits (e.g., Amit et al, 2007, Chan and Drasgow, 2001).

The results support other research that the styles of motivation to lead are different from one another and are predicted by different antecedents. Personality—in terms of narrow-band traits—predicts only the affective identity style. If one is attracted to leading, their motivation could be affected by the belief in their ability to control the role and to present oneself as leader like. Values were the stronger predictor of the motivational styles, but the predictor variables have different patterns, providing some support for *Hypothesis 2*.

As might be expected, self-enhancement was associated with affective-identity; those who like to lead also like to get something out of it. This particular value, however, is unrelated to the non-calculative style. The potential leader who is calculating appears to not focus on how such a role would help them, however, the non-calculative leader tends to have a value of self-transcendence. Those that are inclined to focus on others rather than oneself do not calculate cost-benefit ratios, but instead appear to be motivated by the act of serving others and not outcomes. Finally, the third motivational style is predicted by a distinct value—each motivational style is in fact predicted by a different value. The social-normative style is predicted only by the value of conservation. For this sample, those who are attracted to leadership roles out of a sense of duty do so with the intent of maintaining status quo rather than leading change.

An important variable investigated earlier is the role of beliefs about oneself are predictive of the motivation to lead (Chan and Drasgow, 2001). They examined leadership self-efficacy, a narrow evaluation of efficacy, competency, and ability. Using core self-evaluations as a broader index of beliefs about oneself, the authors' results found that this broader trait was significantly related to the social-normative and non-calculative motives, but not with the affective-identity motivation. Further, one's general belief in oneself did not mediate the relationship between the distal characteristics and the motivation to lead.

VII.   IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study have several implications. First, the variations in the types of motivation and their antecedents are consistent with the assertion by Hogan and Kaiser, "Who you are is how you lead" (2005: 169). In this case, the personality, values, and self-evaluation measures and the motivation to lead comprise one's character in the tendency to lead a certain way. However, the motivation to lead lies at the intersection of internal drive and direction and the behavioral manifestation of leadership. Applied to the Chan and Drasgow (2001) model, motivation affects how one develops as a leader and ultimately their performance. Since the different motivational styles influence one's leadership behavior; knowing about one's motivation gives others, including recruiters, personnel decision-makers, and senior levels of administration,information about what to expect from others as well as possible feedback information.Training, development, and feedback processes can incorporate this knowledge into their processes to be able to target their objectives more effectively, and of course, motivation can be explored at each phase of the human resource perspective: attracting, recruiting, selecting, developing, and retaining.

Next, the application of these results appears to fit many organizations. As discussed,those applying for work will have varied motives that human resource specialists could consider in light of organizational objectives and culture. Research such as the one represented in the study can help shed some light on why people may or may not want to move into these critical positions (and their possible success based on their values and motives). Another critical point has to do with the value proposition of such administrative and leadership role. While few organizations can refute why it is important to have strong leaders in these positions, or even how development as leaders can help them professionally, few make the transition into these types of roles. In fact, many leaders can often be suspicious of someone who has a preference for such roles. Research such as the one conducted in this study can help organizations understand some of the dynamics that occur when leadership positions open up and who is likely to prefer to move into such positions. This is important because it not only can help indicate what type of leader the individual will be, but also larger personnel and workplace dynamics that can be expected.

A third implication has to do with developmental opportunities (and their subsequent success). Often, personnel are identified as high potentials and are routed into leadership tracks. Through this process, developmental opportunities are available (and sometimes mandatory). This forced choice process can have specific (negative) consequences if organizations fail to understand selectee's motivation regarding the programs. If personnel are pressured into these positions (through such inducements as higher compensation, perceived promotion opportunities, etc.), then it could impact the actual developmental benefits of the program that are gained. If people are allowed self-select into these programs, then there could be different motivational consequences for people who may gravitate toward such positions. In either case, an understanding of why people opt into (and in some cases opt out of) leadership positions can increase the likelihood of success for those leaders.

VIII.   LIMITATIONS TO THE STUDY

There are three specific limitations to this research. First, the population is highly specialized and there could be questions relating to the generalizability to other civilian/non-military populations. While further study on various populations will be beneficial, the results should not be so quickly dismissed. As found through other research studies examining cadets, there are actually more similarities than differences between service academy cadets and traditional college students (e.g., Holtom, Smith, Lindsay, & Burton, 2014). This is also displayed in the variance of responses that were given for the various types of motivation. Therefore, the issue

is not really about whether this type of sample reflects traditional student samples, but whether student samples are representative of non-student samples. This is a larger debate than can't be satisfied in this discussion. Of importance to this study is that the results (while specific to this sample) need to be further validated in different samples at different levels (i.e., junior leaders versus senior leaders). Second, since the survey was administered in its entirety to subjects, there is a potential problem of common method variance. To mitigate this somewhat, existing multi-item measures were used. Further research could be conducted to continue to clarify the results although, based on the type of information needed (i.e., individual motivation), self-report is the most appropriate method for data collection. Third, with an emphasis on the relationship between antecedents and predictors, the impact of an internal state—motivation—was not examined on expressed behavior. There is still a need to understand the relationship between a leadership motive and a leadership style to determine the extent to which a motive predicts behavior.

IX. CONCLUSION

If everybody wants to rule the world it is apparent that their motives—and resulting impact—would vary, but could be predicted by specific values and person traits. Of course, not everyone wants to rule, but those that do will seek and engage differently in leadership development efforts and their performance. Hogan and Kaiser (2005) note that not only does who you are effect how you lead, but how you lead determines the results achieved. To the extent leadership motives relate to leadership behavior, there may be a direct or indirect link between motive and performance. Consequently, there is real value in understanding a leader's motives, the organizational culture, and the combined use of this information to help leaders and their stakeholders.

REFERENCES

[1]. Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. (2005).What We Know About Leadership. Review of GeneralPsychology, 9,169–180.

[2]. Mumford, M., Zaccaro, S., Harding, F. & Jacobs, A. (2000). Leadership skills for a changingworld: Solving complex social problems.Leadership Quarterly, 11, 11-35.

[3]. Chan, K., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 481–498.

[4]. Zaccaro, S. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. American Psychologist, 62, 6–16.

[5]. Amit, K., Lisak, A., Popper, M., and Gal, R. (2007). Motivation to Lead: Research on the motives for undertaking leadership roles in the Israel Defense Forces (IDF). Military Psychology,19, 137-160.

[6]. Bobbio, A., & Rattazzi, A. (2006). A contribution to the validation of the Motivation to LeadScale (MTL): A research in the Italian context. Leadership, 2, 117-129. doi: 10.1177/1742715006057240

[7]. Clemmons, A., & Fields, D. (2011). Values as determinants of the motivation to lead. Military Psychology, 23, 587-600. doi:10.1080/08995605.2011.616787

[8]. Mutalib, M., & Ghani, A. (2013). Leadership traits, leadership behavior, and job autonomy of imans in peninsular Malaysia: A moderated mediation analysis. International Journal ofBusiness and Society, 14, 17-40.

[9]. Kark, R. & Van Dijk, D. (2007). Motivation to lead, motivation to follow: the role of the self-regulatory focus in leadership processes. Academy Management Review, 32, 500–528.

[10]. Hendricks, J. & Payne, S. (2007). Beyond the Big Five: Leader Goal Orientation as a Predictor of Leadership Effectiveness, Human Performance 20, 317–343.

[11]. Bardi, A., &Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29, 1207-1220.

[12]. Lindeman, M., & Verkasalo, M. (2005). Measuring values with the Short Schwartz's Value Survey. Journal of Personality Assessment, 85, 170-178.

[13]. Rotter, J. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80.

[14]. Ng, T., Sorensen, K., & Eby, L. (2006). Locus of control at work: A meta-analysis. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27, 1057-1087.

[15]. Judge, T., & Bono, J. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 80–92.

[16]. Day, D., & Schleicher, D. (2006). Self-monitoring at work: A motive-based perspective.Journal of Personality, 74, 685–713.

[17.]. Day, D., Schleicher, D., Unckless, A., & Hiller, N. (2002). Self-monitoring personality at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 390–401.

[18]. Rueb, J., Erskine, H., &Foti, R. (2008). Intelligence, dominance, masculinity, and self-monitoring:

Predicting leadership emergence in a military setting. MilitaryPsychology, 20, 237–252.

[19]. Judge, T. (2009). Core self-evaluations and work success. Current Directions in PsychologicalScience, 18, 58-62.

[20]. Judge, T., Bono, J., Erez, A., Locke, E., & Thoresen, C. (2002).The scientific merit of valid measures of general concepts: Personalityresearch and core self-evaluations. InJ. Brett & F. Drasgow (Eds.), Thepsychology of work: Theoretically based empirical research (pp. 55–77). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

[21]. Judge T., Erez, A., Bono J., & Thoresen C. (2003). The core self-evaluation scale: Development of a measure. Personnel Psychology, 56, 303–331

[22]. Schwartz, S. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in ExperimentalSocial Psychology, 25, (pp.1–65). New York: Academic Press.

[23]. Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). The nature of self-monitoring. Journalof Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 125–129.

[24]. Baron, R.& Kenny, D. (1986). The moderator-mediatorvariable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1173–1182.

[25]. Schwartz, S. (1996). Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), The Psychology of Values:The Ontario Symposium (pp. 1-24). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

[26]. Judge, T., Van Vianen, A., & De Pater, I. (2004). Emotional stability, coreself-evaluations, and job outcomes: a review of the evidence and an agenda for futureresearch. Human Performance, 17, 325-46.

[27]. Judge, T., Bono, J., Erez, A.,& Locke, E. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and lifesatisfaction: the role of self-concordance and goal attainment. Journal of AppliedPsychology, 90, 257-68.

[28]. Oh, S. (2012). Leadership emergence in autonomous work teams: Who is more willing to lead? Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal, 40, 1451-1464.

Corresponding Author: James M. Dobbs,
[1]Dean of Academics& Associate Professor United States Air Force Academy Preparatory School