

## 3.6: The Trait Approach to Leadership

### Learning Objectives

1. What are the trait perspectives on leadership?

Ancient Greek, Roman, Egyptian, and Chinese scholars were keenly interested in leaders and leadership. Their writings portray leaders as heroes. Homer, in his poem *The Odyssey*, portrays Odysseus during and after the Trojan War as a great leader who had vision and self-confidence. His son Telemachus, under the tutelage of Mentor, developed his father's courage and leadership skills (Kramer, 1992). Out of such stories emerged the “great man” theory of leadership and a starting point for the contemporary study of leadership.

The **great man theory of leadership** states that some people are born with the necessary attributes to be great leaders. Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Joan of Arc, Catherine the Great, Napoleon, and Mahatma Gandhi are cited as naturally great leaders, born with a set of personal qualities that made them effective leaders. Even today, the belief that truly great leaders are born is common. For example, Kenneth Labich, writer for Fortune Magazine, commented that “the best leaders seem to possess a God-given spark” (Labich, 1988).

During the early 1900s, scholars endeavored to understand leaders and leadership. They wanted to know, from an organizational perspective, what characteristics leaders hold in common in the hope that people with these characteristics could be identified, recruited, and placed in key organizational positions. This gave rise to early research efforts and to what is referred to as the *trait approach to leadership*. Prompted by the great man theory of leadership and the emerging interest in understanding what leadership is, researchers focused on the leader—Who is a leader? What are the distinguishing characteristics of the great and effective leaders? The great man theory of leadership holds that some people are born with a set of personal qualities that make truly great leaders. Mahatma Gandhi is often cited as a naturally great leader.

### Leader Trait Research

Ralph Stogdill (1948), while on the faculty at The Ohio State University, pioneered our modern (late 20th century) study of leadership. Scholars taking the trait approach attempted to identify physiological (appearance, height, and weight), demographic (age, education, and socioeconomic background), personality (dominance, self-confidence, and aggressiveness), intellectual (intelligence, decisiveness, judgment, and knowledge), task-related (achievement drive, initiative, and persistence), and social characteristics (sociability and cooperativeness) with leader emergence and leader effectiveness. After reviewing several hundred studies of leader traits, Stogdill in 1974 described the successful leader this way:

The [successful] leader is characterized by a strong drive for responsibility and task completion, vigor and persistence in pursuit of goals, venturesomeness and originality in problem solving, drive to exercise initiative in social situations, self-confidence and sense of personal identity, willingness to accept consequences of decision and action, readiness to absorb interpersonal stress, willingness to tolerate frustration and delay, ability to influence other person's behavior, and capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at hand (Stogdill, 1948).

The last three decades of the 20th century witnessed continued exploration of the relationship between traits and leader emergence and effectiveness. Edwin Locke from the University of Maryland and a number of his research associates, in their recent review of the trait research, observed that successful leaders possess a set of core characteristics different from those of other people (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Locke, 1991). Although these core traits do not solely determine whether a person will be a leader—or a successful leader—they are seen as preconditions that endow people with leadership potential. According to Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991), the core traits identified are:

- **Drive**—a high level of effort, including a strong desire for achievement, as well as high levels of ambition, energy, tenacity, and initiative
- **Leadership motivation**—an intense desire to lead others
- **Honesty and integrity**—a commitment to the truth, where word and deed correspond
- **Self-confidence**—an assurance in one's self, one's ideas, and one's ability
- **Cognitive ability**—conceptually skilled, capable of exercising good judgment, having strong analytical abilities, possessing the capacity to think strategically and multidimensionally
- **Knowledge of the business**—a high degree of understanding of the company, industry, and technical matters

- **Other traits**—charisma, creativity/originality, and flexibility/adaptiveness

While leaders may be “people with the right stuff,” effective leadership requires more than simply possessing the correct set of motives and traits. Knowledge, skills, ability, vision, strategy, and effective vision implementation are all necessary for the person who has the “right stuff” to realize their leadership potential (Locke et al., 1991; Stewart, 1999). According to Locke, people endowed with these traits engage in behaviors associated with leadership. As followers, people are attracted to and inclined to follow individuals who display, for example, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, and the motivation to lead.

Personality psychologists remind us that behavior is a result of an interaction between the person and the situation—that is,  $\text{Behavior} = f[(\text{Person}) (\text{Situation})]$ . To this, psychologist Walter Mischel (1973) adds the important observation that personality tends to be expressed through an individual’s behavior in “weak” situations and to be suppressed in “strong” situations. A strong situation has strong behavioral norms and rules, strong incentives, clear expectations, and rewards for a particular behavior. Our characterization of the mechanistic organization with its well-defined hierarchy of authority, jobs, and standard operating procedures exemplifies a strong situation. The organic social system exemplifies a weak situation. From a leadership perspective, a person’s traits play a stronger role in their leadership behavior and, ultimately, leader effectiveness when the situation permits the expression of their disposition. Thus, personality traits prominently shape leader behavior in weak situations.

Finally, regarding the validity of the “great person approach to leadership,” evidence accumulated to date does not provide a strong base of support for the notion that leaders are born. Yet, the study of twins at the University of Minnesota leaves open the possibility that part of the answer might be found in our genes. Many personality traits and vocational interests (which might be related to one’s interest in assuming responsibility for others and the motivation to lead) have been found to be related to our “genetic dispositions” as well as to our life experiences (House & Aditya, 1997; Bouchard, Jr. et al., 1990). Each core trait recently identified by Locke and his associates traces a significant part of its existence to life experiences. Thus, a person is not born with self-confidence. Self-confidence is developed, honesty and integrity are a matter of personal choice, motivation to lead comes from within the individual and is within his control, and knowledge of the business can be acquired. While cognitive ability does in part find its origin in the genes, it still needs to be developed. Finally, drive, as a dispositional trait, may also have a genetic component, but it too can be self- and other-encouraged. It goes without saying that none of these ingredients are acquired overnight.

## Other Leader Traits

Sex and gender, disposition, and self-monitoring also play an important role in leader emergence and leader style.

### Sex and Gender Role

Much research has gone into understanding the role of sex and gender in leadership (Helgesen, 1990). Two major avenues have been explored: sex and gender roles in relation to leader emergence and whether style differences exist across the sexes.

Evidence supports the observation that men emerge as leaders more frequently than women (Chapman, 1975; Fagenson, 1990). Throughout history, few women have been in positions where they could develop or exercise leadership behaviors. In contemporary society, being perceived as experts appears to play an important role in the emergence of women as leaders. Yet, gender role is more predictive than sex. Individuals with “masculine” (for example, assertive, aggressive, competitive, willing to take a stand) as opposed to “feminine” (cheerful, affectionate, sympathetic, gentle) characteristics are more likely to emerge in leadership roles (Kent & Moss, 1994). In our society, males are frequently socialized to possess masculine characteristics, whereas females are more frequently socialized to possess feminine characteristics.

Recent evidence, however, suggests that individuals who are androgynous (that is, who simultaneously possess both masculine and feminine characteristics) are as likely to emerge in leadership roles as individuals with only masculine characteristics. This suggests that possessing feminine qualities does not distract from the attractiveness of the individual as a leader (Kent & Moss, 1994).

Regarding leadership style, researchers have looked to see if male-female differences exist in task and interpersonal styles and whether or not differences exist in how autocratic or democratic men and women are. The answer is that differences between men and women appear to be marginal when it comes to interpersonal versus task orientation. Women are somewhat more concerned with meeting the group’s interpersonal needs, whereas men are somewhat more concerned with meeting the group’s task needs. Big differences emerge in terms of democratic versus autocratic leadership styles. Men tend to be more autocratic or directive, whereas women are more likely to adopt a more democratic/participative leadership style (Early & Johnson, 1990). In fact, it may be because men are more directive that they are seen as key to goal attainment and they are turned to more often as leaders (Dobbins et al., 1990).

## Dispositional Trait

Psychologists often use the terms disposition and mood to describe and differentiate people. Individuals characterized by a positive affective state exhibit a mood that is active, strong, excited, enthusiastic, peppy, and elated. A leader with this mood state exudes confidence and optimism and is seen as enjoying work-related activities.

Recent work conducted at the University of California-Berkeley demonstrates that leaders (managers) with positive affectivity (a positive mood state) tend to be more competent interpersonally, contribute more to group activities, and be able to function more effectively in their leadership role (Staw & Barsade, 1993). Their enthusiasm and high energy levels appear to be infectious, transferring from leader to followers. Thus, such leaders promote group cohesiveness and productivity. This mood state is also associated with low levels of group turnover and is positively associated with followers who engage in acts of good group citizenship (George & Bollenhausen, 1990).

## Self-Monitoring

Self-monitoring as a personality trait refers to the strength of an individual's ability and willingness to read verbal and nonverbal cues and to alter one's behavior so as to manage the presentation of the self and the images that others form of the individual. "High self-monitors" are particularly astute at reading social cues and regulating their self-presentation to fit a particular situation. "Low self-monitors" are less sensitive to social cues; they may lack either the motivation or the ability to manage how they come across to others.

Some evidence supports the position that high self-monitors emerge more often as leaders. In addition, they appear to exert more influence on group decisions and initiate more structure than low self-monitors. Perhaps high self-monitors emerge as leaders because in group interaction they are the individuals who attempt to organize the group and provide it with the structure needed to move the group toward goal attainment (Dobbins et al., 1990).

### ? Concept Check

1. What are the trait perspectives on leadership?

---

This page titled [3.6: The Trait Approach to Leadership](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by [Karen Calendo](#) via [source content](#) that was edited to the style and standards of the LibreTexts platform.

- **13.5: The Trait Approach to Leadership** by OpenStax is licensed [CC BY 4.0](#). Original source: <https://openstax.org/details/books/principles-management>.