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Several researchers have studied and defined transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kouzes & Posner, 1988; Tichy & Devanna, 1990). The first one was Burns (1978) and after him this area has gained growing interest. In general terms, transformational leadership behaviour can be considered as causing high motivation and commitment among the subordinates. For example, Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) define also transactional leadership, which means getting subordinates motivated by rewards or sanctions. Naturally, this transactional leadership is not as effective as transformational. There are different paths, which are regarded as transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kouzes & Posner, 1988; Tichy & Devanna, 1990). Bass’(1985) definition of the relationship between transformational leader and subordinates includes charisma (or idealized influence), inspirational leadership, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Kouzes and Posner’s (1988) view is
based on trust. If a leader is reliable, the subordinates will participate to gain the vision. They discovered that executives who persuaded others to join them followed: the vision-involvement-persistence (VIP) model. The specific dynamics of this model consists of five parts: challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart (Kouzes & Posner, 1988). Tichy and Devanna’s (1990) definition of transformational leadership is concerned with change, innovation, and entrepreneurship. According to them, transformational leadership is processed through recognizing the need for revitalization, creating a new vision and institutionalizing change.

Transformational leadership has proved to have several positive outcomes. For example higher productivity, lower employee turnover rates, higher job satisfaction and motivation are due to transformational leadership more than transactional leadership or nontransformational leadership (e.g. Clover, 1990; Deluga, 1992; Marshall, Rosenbach, Deal & Peterson, 1992; Masi & Cooke, 2000; Medley & Larochelle, 1995; Sparks & Schenk, 2001).

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

Several indicators of personality are possible when considering to study of leadership behaviour. These are for example, the Five-Factor Model or — Big Five” (FFM), the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), Cattell’s Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (16PF) and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The MBTI has dynamic and positive approach towards personality. Due to its usefulness and comprehensible approach, it has become a common method of studying leadership (see e.g. Gallén, 1997; Koskinen, 2005; Osborn & Osborn, 1992; McCarthy & Garavan, 1999; Walck, 1997) and thus it is used in this study as well.

The MBTI is based on Jung’s work on psychological types (1921) and has been further developed by Briggs and Myers. Jung (1921) developed three dimensions to explore an individual’s psychological type, namely orientation of energy, process of perception and process of judging. Briggs and Myers added a fourth dimension: attitude dealing with the outside world. Thus, the MBTI is based on eight different preferences, which encompass different orientations of energy (extraversion, E and introversion, I), processes of perception (sensing, S and intuition, N), processes of judging (thinking, T and feeling, F) and attitudes towards dealing with the outside world (perceiving, P and judging, J). These preferences result in sixteen different personality types e.g. ISTJ (introversion-sensing-thinking-judging), ENTP (extraversion-intuition-thinking-perceiving) (McCaulley, 1990; Myers & Myers, 1990). In Appendix I, the short descriptions of each of the 16 types are presented.