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Abstract

In the context of a ‘distant’ leader-follower relationship, this study explores how followers’ personality and positive or negative affect influence their perception of transformational leadership, and how the level of followers’ affective commitment to the organization moderates the relationship. Through a web-based survey, we found that (a) followers’ positive affect increased their perception of transformational leadership, even after controlling for the effect of follower personality, and that (b) follower’s affective organizational commitment moderated the relationship between negative affect and perception of transformational leadership. Our study sheds light on the process of social construction of leadership with an emphasis on followers’ affect as an important factor in understanding distant leadership.
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I. Introduction

For over thirty years, leadership has been one of the most actively debated topics in the field of management for both academicians and practitioners. Despite an enduring interest in the topic of leadership, most leadership research has taken a perspective of leaders rather than that of followers (Weick, 1993). For example, understanding the characteristics (i.e., traits or abilities) of effective leaders from the leaders’ standpoint has been a major research topic in the leadership literature. However, recently people begun to think of leadership as a social product constructed by both leaders and followers rather than leaders alone (Hollander, 1992; Lord & Maher, 1991). This shift aroused academic attention to the followers’ perspectives and perceptions of leadership (Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985).

The notion of ‘social construction of leadership’ originates from the follower-centric perspective (Meindl, 1995). The point is that leadership is socially constructed by followers, so the followers’ individual differences and their social contexts are crucial in conceptualizing and perceiving the image of their leaders. Meindl (1995) suggested that both situational and individual differences influenced the social construction of leadership. For instance, social contexts such as crisis (Bligh et al., 2005) and situational performance shape followers’ perception of leadership (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999). Also, individual differences including personality (Felfe, 2005), level of self-identity (Lord, Brouwn & Freiberg 1999) and risk-taking (Ehrhart & Klein, 2001), need for structure (Collinson, 2006; Felfe & Schyns 2006) influence followers’ social construction of leadership.

In particular, while studies examined the impact of individual differences on followers’ social construction of leadership with a focus on followers’ dispositional characteristics such as personality and self-identity (Felfe, 2005; Lord, Brouwn, & Freiberg 1999), they have put little emphasis on the impact of followers’ emotion or affect on their
leadership perception. Individuals’ emotions or affect offers explanations about fundamental mechanisms pertaining attitude, behavior, and performance of individuals (Clore & Schnall, 2005; Lazarus, 1991; Staw & Barsade, 1993). Also, discrete emotions or affect facilitate individuals’ thought processes such as decision making, perception (Isen, 2000; Salovey & Mayer, 1990), or leadership perception in our case.

More specifically, followers’ emotion or affect can have a larger impact on leadership perception when the distance between a leader and followers is far such as relations between a CEO and ordinary employees or between a university president and students, for instance. In this case, followers lack information about their distant leaders to evaluate them realistically (Katz & Kahn, 1978), and do not have explicit exchange with them. Therefore, when the relationship between a leader and followers is distant, followers are more likely to perceive leadership in a more affective and symbolic way, rather than an evidence-based and concrete way (Collinson, 2005; Shamir, 1995). In this case, followers’ emotions or affect can have a significant influence on how they perceive leadership.

In this study, we explore the impact of followers’ affect, above and beyond the impact of followers’ personality, on their perception of transformational leadership in the context of a university president as a distant leader and the university students as followers. Transformational leadership emphasizes leaders’ capability to transform followers’ goals and beliefs, induce followers’ intrinsic motivation, and facilitate emotional arousal of followers to achieve a vision, (Sherulnik, Donley, Wiewel, & Miller, 2001). Hence, transformational leadership is based on emotional processes, (George, 2000). Thus, followers’ affective state can have a larger impact on their perception of transformational leadership than on the perception of other types of leadership.
In addition, we examine how followers’ affective commitment to the organization can moderate the relationship between followers’ affect and their perception of transformational leadership. Because leadership is a symbolic entity that represents the organization that the leader represents (Pfeffer, 1981), followers’ perception of leadership can be highly associated with the followers’ general relationship with the organization such as the level of organizational commitment. For the followers highly committed to the organization, what leaders say, how they behave, or what type of leadership style the leaders exhibit, may have significant importance. Therefore, the relationship between followers’ affect and leadership perception may vary depending on the level of followers’ organizational commitment.

By exploring the impact of followers’ affect on their leadership perception, with a focus on ‘distant’ leadership, we hope to contribute to a better understanding of how distant leadership is socially constructed by his or her followers. Our focus on followers’ affect as an antecedent of distant leaders’ transformational leadership perception addresses the call for studying followers’ individual differences as an important mechanism of understanding leadership (Meindl, 1995). Also, this study complements previous research that focused on followers’ dispositions or personalities as the main antecedents of leadership perception. Finally, by studying the moderating effect of organizational commitment on the relationship between followers’ affect and their leadership perception, we suggest a more customized understanding of the process of social construction of leadership in the context of distant leadership.

II. Literature Review and Hypotheses

Social Construction of Leadership
Meindl, Ehrlich, and Dukerich (1985) suggested a follower-centric approach of understanding leadership, which is to view leadership as a social construction of followers. Followers tend to simplify complex phenomena related to their organization, and often attribute the causes and outcomes of the organizational phenomena to leadership. Through this process, followers gain psychological benefits such as reduced cognitive burden and uncertainty and a sense of comfort and security (Meindl, 2004). More importantly, the attribution process enables followers to construct an image and impression of their leader, thus facilitating their social construction of leadership. Research findings show that the psychological benefits that accrue to followers through the attribution process are likely to create positive images of the leaders (Awamleh, 2003; Gardner, 2003; Meindl, 1990).

Followers attribute blame and credit to leaders with varying degrees. For example, Gibson and Schroeder (2003) tested the effect of leaders’ hierarchical position on attribution, and showed that upper level position received more blame than credit. Interestingly, Shamir (1995) proposed that perception of ‘distant’ charismatic leaders will be more idealized than perceptions of close charismatic leaders. Given our research context of a university president as a leader and the university students as followers, the process of social construction of leadership is likely to be more active.

**Personality and Social Construction of Leadership**

Among several dispositional characteristics of followers, personality is considered one of the most important factors that influence perception of leadership. This is because personality, in general, tends to have a stable impact on individuals’ belief, attitudes, behaviors (Felfe & Schyns, 2006), and the social construction of leadership in our case.

Shamir, House and Arthur (1993) and Keller (1999) argue that individuals tend to believe that they are similar to other people. This illusion of similarity occurs because being
similar to other people confirms individuals’ self-concept and congruence with others. Thus, when followers believe that they have similar personalities with their leader, the followers are likely to evaluate the leader more positively or think of the leader as more transformational (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Schyns & Felfe, 2006). Hence, follower personalities can impact their perception of the transformational leadership.

Followers with high extrovert and openness are likely to perceive leadership as transformational. Extroverts enjoy being with others, and are full of energy, and people open to new experiences are characterized by imaginativeness and creativity. Followers with either personality may perceive their leader as more transformational because both are common personalities of transformational leaders (Judge & Bono, 2000), thus enhancing followers’ similarity perception with their leaders. Followers with high agreeableness are likely to perceive leadership as transformational because highly agreeable people tend to view others in a positive light with pro-social orientation toward others (Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Hair, 1996). Agreeable people are cooperative, and emphasize social harmony and building positive relationships with others (Goldberg, 1993). On the contrary, neuroticism refers to the tendency to experience negative emotions such as anxiety, anger, and depression, and is highly correlated with pessimism (Boland & Cappeliez, 1997). Thus, people with high neuroticism are less likely to be motivated and idealized by transformational leadership. Moreover, neuroticism is known to have a negative relationship with the emergence of transformational leadership (Judge, Bono, et al., 2002). Therefore, we hypothesized as below.

Hypothesis 1a. Followers with high extroversion will perceive their leader as more transformational.

Hypothesis 1b. Followers with high openness to experiences will perceive their leader as more transformational.
Hypothesis 1c. Followers with high agreeableness will perceive their leader as more transformational.

Hypothesis 1d. Followers with high neuroticism will perceive their leader as less transformational.

Affect and Social Construction of Leadership

While past research on affect and leadership has been mainly devoted to understanding leaders’ affect and its effect on leadership effectiveness (George, 2000; Palmer, Walls, et al., Humphrey, 2002), there is a growing interest in studying the impact of followers’ affect on their perception of leadership (Ashforth & Humphrey, 2005; Barsade & Gibson, 2007; Conger & Kanungo, 1987). Affect is considered a fundamental mechanism that explains why and how certain attitude, cognition, behaviors come to exist. In the same vein, followers’ positive or negative affect can influence their social construction of leadership or leader effectiveness. The impact of followers’ affect can be stronger in the perception of ‘distant’ leadership, in particular, because followers tend to perceive distant leadership based on affective, symbolic image of the leaders, rather than relying on concrete or specific evidence (Collinson, 2005; Shamir, 1995).

By positive affect, we mean a positive emotional state or the extent to which a person feels enthusiastic, active, and alert at the moment (Frijda, 1986). High arousal positive affect is a state of high energy, full concentration, and pleasurable engagement, whereas low arousal positive affect is a state of calmness and serenity (Watson & Clark, 1988). By negative affect we refer to a general dimension of subjective distress and unpleasant engagement that subsumes variety of aversive mood states (Watson & Tellgen, 1985). High arousal negative affect includes anger, contempt, disgust, guilt, fear, and nervousness, whereas low arousal negative affect is characterized by sadness and lethargy.
Meindl (1995) suggested that followers’ level of emotional arousal can impact the extent to which they attribute the causes and outcomes of organizational phenomena to their leaders. More specifically, followers’ experience of high arousal positive affect increases the extent to which they perceive transformational leadership (Meindl, Mayo, & Pastor, 1994). This is because high emotional arousal tends to bound followers’ rationality (Kaufman, 1999), thus having the followers become susceptible to positivity bias which fosters positive perception of leader behavior (Wright & Dawson, 1988).

We propose that the effect of followers’ positive or negative affect remains even after controlling the effect of the followers’ personality in the case of the perception of ‘distant’ leadership. One of the major factors that shape social construction of leadership is individual differences in that followers’ different personality or affect can result in different perception of leadership (Meindl, 1995). Individual differences can be either (a) stable differences such as personality differences or (b) unstable, changing differences such as an emotional state (e.g., Rhee, 2007). To fully uncover the effect of individual differences on the social construction of distant leadership, it may be important to consider the impact of both stable and unstable individual differences. Hence, we hypothesize that followers’ positive and negative affect has an impact on their perception of transformational leadership, above and beyond the impact of followers’ personality.

Hypothesis 2. Followers’ positive and negative affect will influence their perception of transformational leadership, even after controlling for the effect of followers’ personality.

Several research findings show how followers’ positive and negative affect have different impact on their leadership perception. Dasborough and Askanasy (2002) found that followers experiencing positive affect interpreted leader behavior more favorably, and perceived the leadership as transformational, because positive mood was associated with
positive interpretation of leaders’ behavior. Additionally, Sinclair (1988) showed that people in positive moods tended to appraise others’ performance more positively. Thus, it is likely that people experiencing positive moods will appraise leaders’ performance as positive and transformational. Hence, we hypothesized as below.

*Hypothesis 3. Followers experiencing positive affect will perceive their leader as more transformational.*

The effect of followers’ negative affect is not clear, especially for the high arousal negative affect such as anger or fear. On the one hand, followers with high arousal affect, regardless of positive or negative, tend to perceive their leader as more transformational (Meindle et al., 1994). Thus, followers experiencing high arousal negative affect may think of the leader as transformational. On the other hand, individuals with negative affect tend to be more critical and skeptical in judgment and evaluation, or interpret things in a more pessimistic way (Staw & Barsade, 1993; Scheier, Weintraub & Carver, 1986). This argument suggests that followers experiencing negative affect may view their leader less favorably or less transformational. Because of the two different possibilities regarding the impact of follower negative affect on perception of transformational leadership, we set competing hypotheses as follow.

*Hypothesis 4a. Followers experiencing negative affect will perceive their leader as more transformational.*

*Hypothesis 4b. Followers experiencing negative affect will perceive their leader as less transformational.*

**Direct and Moderating Effects of Affective Organizational Commitment**
In the previous section, we proposed that followers’ affective state may influence their perception of transformational leadership. In this section, we suggest that the effect of follower affect can be moderated by an organization-related psychological factor such as followers’ affective commitment to the organization, and that their affective commitment can directly impact leadership perception as well. By affective organizational commitment, we refer to an affective bond with the organization (Jaros, Jermier, et al., 1993; Meyer & Allen, 1991; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986).

Organizational members’ high affective organizational commitment facilitates their identification with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1990), and the extent to which the members identify with the organization influences how they perceive things related to the organization such as leadership (Gautam, Van Dick, et al., 2004). Because followers tend to identify their leader with the organization (Pfeffer, 1981), followers with high affective commitment to the organization are likely to be affectively attached to their leader. Therefore, we predict that followers with high affective commitment to the organization will perceive their leader as more transformational.

*Hypothesis 5. Followers with high affective commitment to the organization will perceive their leader as more transformational.*

The more the followers are affectively committed to the organization, the more they become attentive to emotional information about leadership. This is because followers tend to identify leaders with the organization (Pfeffer, 1981). Leaders carry symbolic meanings and their identity tends to overlap with the organization’s identity (e.g., Pfeffer, 1981). Thus, when followers are affectively committed to the organization, the impact of their affect on leadership perception may be amplified. In other words, a positive feeling about leadership may become more positive because the quality of leadership matters for the followers who
are affectively committed to the organization. In the same vein, a negative feeling about leadership can become stronger with the followers with affective organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 6. The effect of followers’ positive and negative affect on their perception of transformational leadership will increase when the followers have a high level of affective organizational commitment.

Figure 1 depicts our theoretical model.

III. Method

Sample and Procedure

We conducted a web-based survey in December, 2007. As our respondents, we sought for undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in a large public university in Korea. Among the total 141 sample, 106 were males and 35 females, and 80 were undergraduate students and 61 graduate students. We assumed that all the respondents had similar amount of information about the president of the university, and that they had almost no previous interpersonal interaction with the president. As compensation, we gave e-money to the respondents.

Measurement

PANAS (Positive and Negative Affect Schedule)

The PANAS scale is one of the most well-known measures of emotional state, developed by Watson and Tellegen (1985). PANAS consists of 10 positive emotions
(interested, excited, strong, enthusiastic, proud, alert, inspired, determined, attentive, and active) and 10 negative emotions (distressed, upset, guilty, scared, hostile, irritable, ashamed, nervous, jittery, and afraid). We asked the participants to rate the items on a scale from 1 to 5, based on the strength of emotion where 1 = "very slightly or not at all," and 5 = "extremely". The internal validity of PA was .82, and NA was .80.

**MLQ (Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire)**

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) measures the extent to which a leader exhibits transformational and transactional leadership and the followers’ level of satisfaction with the leadership style. We used 20 items to measure transformational leadership, using a 5-point scale from. Internal validity of each variable was at a good or acceptable level: idealized influence (alpha = .76), inspirational motivation (alpha = .64), intellectual stimulation (alpha = .73), and individualized consideration (alpha = .71).

**NEO-PI-R (NEO Personality Inventory)**

To measure the participants’ personality, we used a short version of the revised self-rating NEO-PI-R, which contained 50 items. NEO-PI-R is the latest version of personality trait measurement, suggested by Costa and McCrae (1992). We measured each personality variable with 10 items, using a 5-point scale. Chronbach alpha coefficients were good or acceptable: neuroticism (alpha = .83), extroversion (alpha = .76), openness (alpha = .68), and agreeableness (alpha = .80).

**Affective organizational commitment**

We measured students’ level of affective commitment to the university using four items suggested by Nora and Albert (1993). We used a 5-point Likert scale, and Chronbach alpha coefficient was .81.
IV. Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 presents means, standard deviations, and correlations between the variables. Because some of the personality variables had significant correlations higher than .30, we checked for multi-collinearity problems and found that there was no multi-collinearity problem between the variables (Tolerance > 0.1, VIF(Variance Inflation) < 10, Eigenvalue > 0.01, Index< 100).

Hypotheses Test

Effects of individual differences (personality and PA/NA)

Model 2 in Table 3 illustrates regression results examining the relationship between personality and perception transformational leadership. Hypothesis 1c, which predicted that followers with high agreeableness would perceive transformational leadership stronger than people with low agreeableness, was supported (β = .24, p ≤ .01). Also, followers’ neuroticism had a negative relationship with the perception of transformational leadership with a marginal significance (β = -.16, p ≤ .10), thus marginally supporting Hypothesis 1d. Followers’ extroversion and openness did not have a significant influence on leadership perception, thus rejecting Hypotheses 1a and 1b.

Next, to test the effect of followers’ positive and negative affect after controlling for the effect of personality, we regressed personality, PA and NA altogether on the perception of transformational leadership. We found that followers’ PA, but not NA, had a significant effect on the leadership perception even after controlling for the effect of follower personality.
Model 3 in Table 3, thus partially supporting Hypothesis 2. Model 3 in Table 3 also shows that followers’ PA increases their perception of transformational leadership ($\beta = .27$, $p \leq .01$), thus supporting Hypothesis 3. Because followers’ NA did not either increase or decrease their perception of transformational leadership with significance, Hypotheses 4a and 4b were not supported.

Effect of affective organizational commitment

In Model 2 in Table 3, there is a direct positive relationship between followers’ affective organizational commitment and perception of transformational leadership ($\beta = .18$, $p \leq .05$). Thus, Hypothesis 5 was supported. However, when interaction terms are added in the model (Model 3 in Table 3), the significant positive relationship disappears and a moderating effect appears. To test the moderating effect of affective organizational commitment, we regressed the perception of transformational leadership on the followers’ PA and NA, affective organizational commitment, and interaction terms of PA/NA and affective organizational commitment. Model 3 in Table 3 shows that a coefficient of the interaction term is significant only for the interaction between negative affect and affective organizational commitment ($\beta = -.47$, $p \leq .10$) but not for the interaction between positive affect and affective organizational commitment. Hence, Hypothesis 5 was partially supported, which predicted that the relationship between followers’ positive and negative affect and their leadership perception would be amplified with the followers having high affective commitment to the organization. The moderating effect is depicted in Figure 2.
Insert Table 3 and Figure 2 about here
V. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this paper is to enlighten the effect of followers’ affect on their social construction of distant leadership. Followers’ affect has important implications for understanding their perception of ‘distant’ leadership in particular, because followers tend to rely on affective or symbolic image of distant leaders when evaluating leadership effectiveness. Corroborating previous findings, followers with high agreeableness perceived leaders as more transformational (Schyns & Sanders, 2006), and those with neuroticism perceived leaders as less transformational with marginal significance. Moreover, even after controlling for the effect of follower personality, there was a significant effect of followers’ positive affect on their perception of transformational leadership. This indicates that for the perception of distant leaders’ transformational leadership, followers’ positive affect may matter above and beyond the impact of followers’ personality. Finally, followers’ affective organizational commitment enhanced their perception of transformational leadership, and amplified the negative impact of negative affect on the perception of transformational leadership.

Our hypotheses on the relationship between followers’ extroversion and perceived transformational leadership, and on the relationship between followers’ openness and perceived transformational leadership were not supported. Past research found that followers viewed leaders more positively when they shared similar characteristics with each other (Keller, 1999; Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). It is probable that followers may not perceive leaders as always extrovert or open to new experiences. So the similarity argument can be limited depending on how extrovert or open leaders are. In contrast, agreeableness and neuroticism seem to show stable effects such that agreeable people view others in a more positive light and that people with high neuroticism tend to view others negatively (e.g.,
Hence, followers’ agreeableness and neuroticism may have shown a more stable effect on the perception of leadership than followers’ extroversion and openness.

Most of our hypotheses related to followers’ negative affect were not supported, except for the moderating effect of affective organizational commitment on the relationship between negative affect and leadership perception. It may be that the degree and variance of the university students’ negative affect were not big enough to produce significant effects. However, when combined with the effect of affective commitment, students’ negative affect significantly reduced their perception of transformational leadership. The more the students were affectively committed to the university, the less they perceived the university president as transformational when the president was associated with negative feelings. For the university students with high affective commitment to the university, negative feelings about the university president may have meant unsatisfactory performance of the president, thus resulting in the perception of the president as less transformational.

We believe this study contributes to three areas of discussion. First, we attempted to contribute to the follower-centric view of leadership research. Our understanding is that a leader-centric viewpoint is still dominant in leadership literature despite a growing interest in the notion of social construction of leadership. Leadership effectiveness is determined not only by what and how leaders do, but also by how followers perceive the leadership (Hollander, 1992). A more vigorous attempt to understand the follower-centric perspective of leadership may enable us to fully uncover the mechanism of transformational leadership.

Second, by a focus on followers’ perception of ‘distant’ leadership, we applied the argument of social construction of leadership to the context of a distant leader-follower relationship. Followers use different types of information when forming impressions of their leaders, depending on how approachable or distant the leaders are (Collinson, 2005; Shamir,
By parsing out the effect of follower affect as an important mechanism of social construction of ‘distant’ leadership, we suggest future research opportunities in the arena of perception of distant leadership.

Finally, given the importance of follower affect as a key source of distant leadership perception, we call for a fuller investigation of the impact that followers’ positive or negative affect may have on the social construction of leadership. Past research has mainly focused on the effect of dispositional aspects of followers including personality and self-concept (Felfe, 2005; Lord et al., 1999). However, there is evidence that followers’ affect influences the way they interpret leaders’ action and the way they view the style of leadership (i.e., Isen, 2000). This study showed that there is significant impact of followers’ positive affect on their transformational leadership perception, above and beyond the impact of the followers’ personality, thus suggesting the criticality of examining the effect of follower affect.

The present findings need to be considered in light of the research’s limitations. First, respondents to our questionnaire might have been those who were satisfied or dissatisfied with the current leadership more than others, producing a biased distribution of data and results. Second, generalizability is limited by the sample and the research context. We cannot eliminate the possibility that the findings were unique for the specific research context. Finally, we did not control for the influence of environmental factors such as media evaluation of the university president or recent positive or negative events occurred at the university, for example.

Future research may extend our study to a broader settings and contexts to increase the generalizability of the findings. Antecedents of leadership perception may vary depending on different research settings. For example, whether followers’ personality influences the perception of self-sacrifice leadership more so than the perception dictatorial leadership?
How different the impact of follower affect would be between the impact on the perception of distant leaders and the impact on the perception of close leaders? Future research may also look at whether there is a fit between certain personality and certain affect. For example, whether agreeable followers feeling positive affect would perceive leaders as more transformational than agreeable followers feeling negative affect would?

In conclusion, our research explores the importance of followers’ affect in understanding the process of social construction of leadership with a focus on the case of distant leadership. Followers’ positive affect has an impact on their perception of transformational leadership, above and beyond the impact of followers’ personality. We believe that it is a fertile ground to explore the impact of followers’ affect on the dynamic relationship between leaders and followers.
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Figure 1. Research Model
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Followers’ Affective Commitment to Organization

Followers’ Perception of Transformational Leadership
Figure 1. Moderating Effect of Affective Organizational Commitment on the Relationship Between Negative Affect and Perception of Transformational Leadership
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GRADE</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. MALE</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Neuroticism</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.332**</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.303**</td>
<td>-.293**</td>
<td>.569**</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-.267*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extroversion</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.332**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>.383**</td>
<td>.275**</td>
<td>-.181*</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Openness</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.270**</td>
<td>.248**</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Agreeableness</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.303**</td>
<td>.383**</td>
<td>.270**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.364**</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.299*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PA</td>
<td>28.59</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.293**</td>
<td>.275**</td>
<td>.248**</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.355*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. NA</td>
<td>24.64</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.569**</td>
<td>-.181*</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.364**</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>-.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Affective Commitment</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.187*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Perception of Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>60.61</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.267**</td>
<td>.203*</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.299**</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.187*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Perception of Transformational Leadership: Direct Effect of Follower Personality and Affect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16$^t$</td>
<td>.14$^t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.16$^t$</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.24$^{**}$</td>
<td>.26$^{**}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27$^{**}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16$^{**}$</td>
<td>.23$^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^t p \leq .10$

$^* p \leq .05$

$^{**} p \leq .01$
Table 3. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Perception of Transformational Leadership: Effect of Affective Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td><strong>.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>.14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td><strong>.34</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Organizational Commitment</td>
<td><strong>.18</strong></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Affective Organizational commitment) x PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Affective Organizational commitment) x NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.47†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²: 
- Model 1: .02
- Model 2: .18**
- Model 3: .20**

Adjusted R²:
- Model 1: .01
- Model 2: .15
- Model 3: .16

† p ≤ .10 
* p ≤ .05 
** p ≤ .01