

1-1-2003

A social/cognitive view of leaders with visible disabilities

George Adkins Jr.
adkins106@marshall.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://mds.marshall.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Adkins, George Jr., "A social/cognitive view of leaders with visible disabilities" (2003). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. Paper 63.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact zhangj@marshall.edu.

A social/cognitive view of leaders with visible disabilities.

**Thesis submitted to
The Graduate College of
Marshall University**

**In partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
Psychology**

by

George Adkins Jr.

**Dr. Christopher LeGrow, Committee Chairperson
Dr. Pamela Mulder
Dr. Grace Davis**

Marshall University

Summer 2003

ABSTRACT

A social/cognitive view of leaders with visible disabilities.

By George Adkins Jr.

The present investigation examined the influence applicant disability status has on perceptions of leadership style, leadership potential and leadership behavior. 165 (78 females and 73 males and 14 people choosing not to disclose their age) undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in Psychology courses were randomly assigned to one of three applicant disability status conditions (Non-Disabled, Visually Impaired, and Applicant Needing the use of a Wheelchair) and were asked to provide ratings that reflected their perceptions of the leadership style, leadership skills, and leadership behaviors likely to be exhibited by the applicant on the job. Participants used the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale, Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ –XII), and six other scales assessing dimensions of leadership drawn from the leadership literature (i.e., Efficiency, Intellectual Stimulation, Charisma, Communication Skills, Empathy, and Ability to Inspire) to evaluate applicant leadership qualities. It was predicted that the Non-Disabled applicant would be evaluated more positively than either the Visually Impaired applicant and/or the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair on the LPC scale, LBDQ scale, and the six dimensions of leadership. The results failed to support these predictions. The Visually Impaired applicant and the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair were rated more positively than the Non-Disabled applicant across all leadership scales and dimensions of leadership.

DEDICATION

The author wishes to dedicate this research article to Dr. Helen Linkey and Dr. Christopher LeGrow. Without their help and assistance and patience this research would not have occurred or have been finished. Thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge the contributions of the teaching assistants of the 2002-2003 academic year for allowing research to be conducted in their classes. Thank you Andrew Caswell, Nathel Lewis, Amanda Adams, Kevan Mock, Darlene Shannon, and Shelly LeMasters. Also, Dr. Davis is acknowledged for allowing her class to participate in the present research. Thank you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II - REVIEW OF LITERATURE	2
CHAPTER III - METHODS	19
CHAPTER IV - RESULTS	24
CHAPTER V - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	29
APPENDICES	42

CHAPTER I

Introduction

A social/cognitive view of leaders with visible disabilities.

Human beings are social creatures. Our behaviors are goal oriented. In many instances, the best way to achieve a goal is to work with others with the same or similar goals. When there is a group that has completion of a task as its goal there is usually a leader to direct action and see that the goal(s) is/are completed.

Leadership has long been studied in social psychology. How we influence others is one of the major topics of the discipline and a leader is usually the one person who has the most influence over others. But what is leadership? How do we choose who will be the leader of a group? Is it the person who can best serve the collective goal(s)? Or the only person who will do the job?

One aspect of leadership that many overlook is the first impression of a person. In that first few seconds that we look at a person, we have come to many decisions about the person. Judgments about appearance play a large role in how we interact with others. We categorize people instantly to save mental energy and afterwards we can say “S/he is” and fill in the blanks about the personality, history, and future of that person.

Leadership has been studied in social psychology. But one factor of leadership that has no research is how people view the physically disabled/handicapped as leaders. There is little to no research concerning the topics of leadership and people with disabilities, a population that has received little attention in leadership positions in the real world. A social cognitive perspective may be the best starting point for examining/conducting research in this area.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

Schemata

Schemata are our generalized mental representations of episodes, individuals or events. They are understood as being composed of highly correlated elements that are encountered through experience (Wofford, Goodwin, & Whittington, 1998). One could say that a schema is a generalization from past encounters. It is these generalizations that are the building blocks that are used to organize how the world is seen.

The concept of a mental representation can be called a schema (plural: schemata) but can also be called a prototype or exemplar, with varying degrees of abstraction going from a general representation (i.e. schema) to abstraction of a typical example (i.e. prototype) to specific episode, event, or person (i.e. exemplar). A prototype is an abstraction of patterns stored in long term memory (Solso, 2001) that includes notions of appearance, behavior, and quality. A prototype is a hypothetical, typical instance of a category. Recognizing objects deals with the matching of a prototype and even though the object in question may differ somewhat from our prototype, we can still recognize an object from its similarity to the prototype in our memory. Kenrick, Newberg, and Cialdini (1999), wrote that an exemplar is a mental representation of a specific episode, event or person. If a large percentage of exemplars shared similar characteristics then the resulting generalization of the common characteristics could be labeled as a schema or prototype and would contain those characteristics. For example, when one thinks of a leader certain people come to mind. The similar characteristics for those people can be summed up to one overall generalization of a leader.

Lord, Brown, Harvey, and Hall (2001) support the connectionist view and how it allows for multiple information sources to influence perceptions of leadership and allows many different understandings about leaders, situations, and followers. A schema, according to the connectionist view, is formed by many units. A unit is a particular characteristic or trait. When a person thinks of a leader, units that the person thinks are relevant to his/her perception of a leader are activated, creating a schema for that person to draw inferences from. Hanges, Lord, and Dickson (2000) wrote that the units in a connectionist network can be activated by environmental stimuli, by existing schemata, or other units in the schema network.

If a person continually experiences situations that are similar, then the same units will be activated each time. The continued activation of the same units in the connectionist network can lead to a stabilization of the schema (Hanges et al., 2000; Lord et al. 2001) and chances that his/her schema will change are highly unlikely. If the same schemata are continually activated and stabilized then they become more efficient and require less and less energy to activate and can become automatic and reinforcing. In an effort to save mental energy (Gilbert, Fiske, & Lindzey, 1998), a person may rely on these reinforcing and automatic processes to dictate behaviors, thoughts, and emotions. Only when the behaviors dictated by the automatic use of an old schema are seen to be inappropriate will a person realize that their understanding of things contained in the old schema needs to be revised.

The constant activation of certain units can lead to a stabilized schema that may not actually represent a fully developed idea due to a lack of various units/ideas that may be possible. A schema can thus be constructed of incomplete features that have occurred together and then viewed as a complete representation of a situation. An incomplete schema can cause a

skewed representation that the person may misunderstand as being complete. Since our thoughts can influence our actions, an incomplete representation can lead to actions that later may be seen as being unjustified if an accurate view of the world is then seen. Or when using an incomplete schema a person can ignore other characteristics that are present in the situation and focus only on the units present in the schema, thus ignoring other characteristics.

Many social scientists follow a school of thought that schemata are not permanently stored in long term memory but are generated anew when called upon (Hanges et al., 2000; Lord, 2000; Lord et al., 2001; Hogg, 2001) allowing for unique situational cues and internal values and beliefs to affect the schema that is regenerated. This may cause an incomplete representation but also allows for flexibility, so that a person may act differently in situations that appear similar or only differ slightly. If a situation does not provide enough information, then the newly generated schema can “fill-in-the-blanks” to create a complete view.

In the stabilized incomplete schema for leadership, for example, it is possible that the person’s idea may be lacking certain features (units) that may not allow the individual to allow for the concepts of being female, disabled, etc. If a person has had many experiences with leaders in the past that were not female or did not have a physical disability/handicap, do two units exist for female and disabled in the schema under the connectionist view in that person’s mind? A person with this type of incomplete schema may not be willing to admit females or disabled persons in his/her category of “leader.”

Stereotypes

One type of schema that can apply to the topic at hand is a stereotype. Greenberg and Baron offer their definition of a stereotype as a unique schema that categorizes people that share

traits or characteristics into one group (as cited by Lowenberg, Conrad, Dowhower, & Harness, 1998). Kenrick, Newberg, and Cialdini (1999) cite journalist Walter Lippman and his definition of a stereotype as a generalized belief about members of a group. Kenrick, Newberg, and Cialdini (1999) also offered a term called representative heuristic, which is related to a stereotype. They define representative heuristic as a mental shortcut that involves people classifying something as belonging to a certain category to the extent that it is similar to a typical case containing features from the stereotype of that category. Schemata were noted in the previous section as usually being inaccurate and incomplete. One reason that stereotypes are inaccurate is because many individuals lack any first-hand experience about those that are being stereotyped (Kenrick, Neuberg, & Cialdini, 1999). A stereotype is learned from both personal experiences with a very limited number of individuals (Kenrick, Neuberg, & Cialdini, 1999) and from a shared view from the culture.

A stereotype can be either positive, negative, or a combination of both. A stereotype about Asian students may be that they excel in math and science. To be thought of as superior in a subject is usually seen as being positive. A negative stereotype about Asian students may be that due to so much work being devoted to scholarly activities there may not be much of a “social life,” and they may appear withdrawn. The positive or negative aspect of a stereotype may be from an incomplete schema that is only formed from positive or negative units due to lack of information from little experience or a generalized belief from society.

When a person thinks of a leader or leadership there may exist both negative and positive aspects that come to mind. Negative aspects of leaders or leadership include constant pressure to keep the group coherent and when the goal is not achieved the leader is the one who takes the

blame. Some positive aspects of leaders and leadership are money, status, and power (Kenrick, Newberg, & Cialdini, 1999). Also, leaders may have the ability to command some degree of respect. It is these and many other positive leadership characteristics that many people enjoy when they are in the position of a leader.

Much like leadership, there exists positive characteristics of achievement. Achievement is usually a measurement of success or victories over obstacles or extent of improvement. Although there may be some negative aspects of being an overachiever, the positive characteristics may outweigh the negative ones. One positive characteristic is reliability, meaning dependability. If an individual is viewed as being an over-achiever, s/he may be regarded as one who approaches a task with a high degree of certainty that the desired goal will be achieved.

Throughout history, disabled people have had a negative image (Ward & Meyer, 1999). Stereotypes of the disabled have included aspects such as dependence and weakness. Disabled/handicapped people have been viewed as not being able to contribute to society. The disabled/handicapped have also been seen as burdens to those around them. This stereotype has hurt the disabled community. They are often overlooked or unintentionally left out. If one were to look at television programming, one would not see many, if any, disabled people.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, the 32nd President of the United States of America, served four terms and led the country to victory in World War II and through the Great Depression. With such credits one could consider President Roosevelt as both a leader and an overachiever. One thing that separates Roosevelt from many other former presidents is that shortly after beginning his political career, he was stricken by polio and became disabled. President Roosevelt may be

the exception to the rule by being a disabled/handicapped leader. In spite of his disability, he was able to become President of the United States. However, the public was not informed of his disability, so the negative aspects of being disabled were not attached to him.

A few examples of how stereotypes may affect how one thinks is provided by cases where two stereotypes are together in one person, event, or idea. Franklin D. Roosevelt may raise dissonant thoughts in an individual who observed him due to that individual's negative stereotype about disabled persons and the positive stereotype of his leadership abilities. Another person who is considered a great leader in a field is Stephen Hawking. His contributions to physics, astrophysics, and cosmology are unparalleled. He has a doctorate even though he is suffering from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, a disease of the nervous system, and is confined to a wheelchair. Stephen Hawking may also raise dissonant thoughts due to the negative stereotype about disabled people and the positive stereotype of intelligence and intelligent people. Another individual who is a leader and physically handicapped is Christopher Reeve. The former "Superman" was paralyzed from the neck down in an accident but has not let his disability stop him from accomplishing his goals, such as creating charity organizations. Many disabled individuals are now accomplishing their own goals by following his example.

Previous positive experience may cause one to think of the positive aspects from past experiences with a disabled/handicapped person who was very determined and competent, characteristics that are usually seen in a positive way. A person with a physical handicap may then be seen as fighting harder to get a job and succeeding by getting the job and accomplishing the task effectively. They may bring that work ethic that may be just second nature to him/her to other tasks or jobs and will complete them effectively and efficiently. If a person thinks that a

disabled/handicapped person can overcome and prevail over obstacles then the disabled person may be elected to lead because of the thought that if s/he can come this far with a disability then probably s/he can help the group achieve their goal by being in a leadership position.

Discrimination

If two equally qualified people are applying for the same job, one has a disability and the other does not, theoretically both should be on equal grounds to be hired based on the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. But the person with the disability may feel that s/he will not be judged equally. Rodriguez and Prezant (2002) wrote that many people had a difficult choice in disclosing that they had a disability or that they may require certain accommodations to do their job effectively. The possible financial savings of hiring an individual without a disability compared to one with a disability is one concern of the disabled. If two applicants for a job are equal in qualifications but one has back pain and requires a special chair to sit in to do the job, and again everything else is equal, the company would probably hire the person without the disability to save money. Fiscally, this is what is best for the company because it saves money. The result is that in the year 2003, discrimination against the disabled still abounds so much that the government will give tax credits to companies to hire people with disabilities (Raphael, 2002). In a sense, the government is providing incentives to companies to hire the disabled. Many employers feel that people with disabilities may be less productive and reliable, yet many other employers find that disabled people are more productive and reliable than other employees (Raphael, 2002). Hernandez (2000) reported that companies have positive views of people with disabilities or physical handicaps and have a willingness to hire them, but these actual hiring

practices lag far behind the positive views. Many of the reported 54 million people with disabilities report a strong willingness to work but are finding discrimination in hiring.

One possible explanation for the lack of a high disability demographic in the workplace may be the accommodations the company would have to make. Hernandez (2000) continued by writing that many studies have found a disability hierarchy in hiring. People with physical or sensory disabilities are viewed more positively than people with psychiatric or intellectual disabilities. This could be explained in monetary terms or with more in-depth stereotypes. A person who uses a wheelchair may not cost as much in insurance compared to a person who has had a history of depression that requires health insurance or treatment by a psychologist or psychiatrist. Or, a person that uses a wheelchair could be seen as more reliable and less of a threat to other workers or customers than a person with a history of schizophrenia.

In the arena of promotion, there again may be discrimination. Since so few people with disabilities are in the workplace, there are fewer images or examples of disabled people being supervisors, managers, and CEOs. If a promotion requires large amounts of contact with other companies, employers, or the public, stereotypes and schemata presenting a negative image about the disabled may be reflected or transferred from the person to the company. This reflection can worry a company, especially one in an individualistic society because in an individualistic society an ideal person is supposed to be strong and independent. Will a company or organization be willing to have a disabled spokesperson who physically displays weakness and dependence?

Leadership

Manz and Sims (1991) wrote that when people think of the word leader, the thought of a heroic powerful figure on a rearing white horse who is leading his men into battle comes to mind. The typical idea of strong leaders includes vigorous and physically powerful individuals. This observation is somewhat true. When the great leaders of the world come to mind such as George Washington, Alexander the Great, and Genghis Khan, they seem to have a quality or a powerful image that is ingrained in our memories and can bias one's view of what a leader should be. These images of leadership have been linked with history's great leaders (Horner, 1996).

There are many definitions of leaders and leadership. Yukl (1989) stated that leadership has been defined in terms of the perception of followers, role relations, individual traits, interaction patterns, and other terms. Others note that leadership is a power relationship between members of a group with power being thought of as the ability to influence others. One definition is from a quote by Harry Truman, "A leader is a man who has the ability to get other people to do what they don't want to do and like it" (as cited in Bass, 1999, p. 14).

Horner (1996) wrote about different forms of leadership. In his section on rational leadership, a few of the characteristics of leadership mentioned were; being organized, having the ability to form alternatives for outcomes, and the realization that there is more than one way to reach an outcome. It is these aspects of leadership abilities that are the focus of this paper, more specifically, the leadership qualities that are perceived in people with disabilities. Even though trait theories of leadership are no longer popular in social psychology, many people still look for certain traits when choosing a leader. Transformational leadership deals with the leader

changing the motivations, outlooks and behaviors of the followers so that the goal of the group is better achieved (Kenrick, Newberg, & Cialdini, 1999). Transformational leaders help the followers realize that the goal of the leader and group is their goal as well, in essence personalizing the group's objective for the followers. The aspect of inspiring followers is one attractive quality of transformational leadership that warrants more research. Christopher Reeve may be seen as a transformational leader. His persistence and courage to continue to work even with his paralysis inspires others with disabilities to strive to overcome obstacles in their paths. Christopher Reeve was already mentioned and exemplifies the qualities of transformational leadership by inspiring others. Others may see him as an example of "Where there is a will, there is a way."

Leadership Theories and Research

Lord (2000) offers the view that perceptions of leaders and leadership may be situated in the minds of followers as a function of the person and situation, and these perceptions should be studied. Lord continued by stating that a person's idea about leaders and leadership would be influenced by past histories with leaders. Lord, Brown, Harvey, and Hall (2001) discussed leadership categorization theory and wrote that in relation to the evaluation of a leader, one must compare a leader's characteristics to the pattern of a leader in that follower's memory to see if that leader in question fits the follower's schema for a leader. Hogg (2001) also noted that people have preconceptions about leaders and the situations in which they are involved. These stereotypes or preconceptions will play an important role in the present study. If a person has not had much or any past experience with a leader who had a disability, will their stereotype or preconception allow them to see this person with a disability as a potential leader?

Lowenberg, Conrad, Dowhower, and Harness (1998) wrote that the implicit leadership theory deals with the followers' implicit concept of a leader. According to this theory, people evaluate a current leader against these already established concepts and stereotypes to judge effectiveness and overall performance. Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984) noted that if a leader deviates from the expectations of the follower, an evaluation of the leader can be lowered. But the leaders can also be judged as better than expected if they perform in a manner that is recognizably superior to the expectations of the follower.

A few expectations due to stereotypes and past experiences that people may have about leaders are that they are tall or taller than followers, in better physical condition, and depending on the situation, leaders have a better dress appearance. The evidence gathered supports each of these expectations with low positive correlations (Bass, 1990). Leaders usually are also rated as having higher levels of attractiveness than followers (Goktepe & Schneier, 1989). Bass also wrote that leaders usually come from a higher socioeconomic status. This could affect physical conditioning and dress appearance because if a person has more money, status, or prestige then they can afford the time to work out and have money for more attractive and expensive clothes, depending on the situation. Expectations reflect what we think we know and how we think the future should be. These expectations can be flawed, in that the expectations may not contain all aspects of the situation, person, or idea and may be lacking important information. Such expectations are incomplete schemata. The situation in actuality could be much different than what is expected and people could realize this if they relied on facts and not the internal schemata. But what is perceived may be determined by the units contained in a schema.

Attributions accompany perceptions. An attribution is the outcome of one person inferring another person's motives by observing behavior and deciding if the cause of the behavior is dispositional or situational (Lefton, 1997). If someone sees a homeless person on the street, s/he may assume that the homeless person is unclean, lazy, and a drunk. If someone sees a blind person, s/he may assume that the blind person is slow in completing tasks and must rely on others to help him/her around because s/he can't see and needs help to navigate in the environment. These attributions can bias future thoughts and actions of the individual along with the incomplete schema.

People tend to think that personality traits lead to behavior and to outcomes. Charisma, a perceived leadership and personality trait to many, has been looked at extensively in leadership research. Charisma can be viewed as the ability for an individual to command respect, have a sense of mission and is seen as a symbol of success and accomplishment (Lievens, Van Geit, & Coetsier, 1997). In some instances, people with charisma were more likely to be chosen as leader and evaluated better. Taller, more physically fit, attractive individuals tend to be credited with charisma (Payne & Cangemi, 1998). A charismatic leader captures the imagination and devotion of followers and creates a commitment to the task by creating a vision or ideological goal (Lowenberg, Conrad, Dowhower, & Harness, 1998). If a charismatic leader is one who can inspire followers, then a person with a disability may be an excellent charismatic leader because of the opinion that this person has overcome so much, and has shown strong determination, and as a result could best serve the group as leader. Charisma is seen by some as being part of the theory of transformational leadership.

If asked, the average person may not be able to give an example of a leader with a physical disability/handicap. One exception to this may be Franklin D. Roosevelt. In many peoples' opinion, he was a great leader. His ability to lead and to inspire others are just a few qualities that many past and present Presidents admire. Because of his accomplishments, in many peoples' opinion, Mr. Roosevelt will be a President who will be remembered throughout American history as being a great leader. Yet he hid his disability from the public while he was President and even while he was in political office. If the public had known that he had polio would the American public have viewed him differently given that people with disabilities were usually not selected to lead due to the fact that those individuals did have a disability? Only scholars and historians can argue this point. It is very possible that if the people had known of his disability, he would not have gained political power early in his career and may not have become President of the United States. Also, if he had thought that he would be viewed as an adequate leader as a man in a wheelchair would he have hid the chair from the public?

Disabilities and leadership

There are certain problems people have when making judgments about people. One problem that we have when making decisions is our perceptual focus and attention. This limited amount of attention usually focuses on the differences between people. If we see someone who is physically disabled, we can focus on the disability as the main defining characteristic and may not see or think of other characteristics that could alter our perceptions in a different direction due to the construction of an incomplete schema with the main characteristic being the disability. Since people can focus on a limited amount of information, do people see, or focus on, the

person or the disability/handicap? This limited attentional span may not allow for a person to view a disabled individual as a leader because of the focus of attention on the disability.

Another problem is the tendency to look inward at what “we” represent and how that affects what we think everything and everyone else should be. A person may compare the actual situation to his/her own standards. If a person does not have a physical disability then they may look at his/her own schema of leadership (how they may lead or their views on themselves as leaders or his/her general view of leadership) and may judge a person with a disability as unlikely to be successful as a leader. With these tendencies of perceptual focus and looking inward for comparisons, it is surprising that anyone “different from the norm” is ever accepted. If something fits the norm then s/he or it can be labeled prototypical (Hogg, 2001).

Both leaders and followers are bound together in a social system or by category membership (Hogg, 2001). Hogg continues by discussing social categorization of others and how people can be divided into ingroup and outgroup prototypes. In relation to groups, it is natural for a group to see each individual member as being different from one another while they see outgroup members as being similar to each other. If the tendency is to see our ingroup members as unique and different, then any schema or prototype that a person has about someone with a disability could possibly be amplified by the tendency to view each person as an individual. But an individual without a disability may only view someone with a disability as being an outgroup member. An outgroup bias may be a downfall for a person with a disability because of the increased views of difference between the member of two or more groups. Then a person could rely on his/her self schema and augment with his/her view of leadership and push a person with a disability to the back of the line for the role of leadership.

The member of the group that is the most prototypical appears to have the ability to influence other members who may be less prototypical (Hogg, 2001). If a member of a group fits the prototype, first, for group membership (i.e. is the ideal member and fits in well with other members) and, second, for a certain role (i.e. a conflict manager, figure head to represent the group to others, leader, etc.) then that person will have more influence and potentially have more power than another member who may not fit a prototype for a certain role. Social minorities can find it difficult to assume a leadership role due to the fact that they are less prototypical than others in a group even if they fit the prototype for a certain role such as leader or “go-to person,” a person that others look to when they need something or have a question.

An interesting line of research examines cultural influences on leadership studies. Members of cultures vary in their desiring of particular leadership attributes when looking for a leader (Hanges et al., 2000; Lord et al., 2001). One culture’s members may wish their leaders to be formal and distant while another’s may desire more open and available leaders. The cultural differences could expand into appearance and leadership. Members of one culture may not be open to the idea of a leader with a disability, no matter the situation. Members of another culture may be more accepting, in certain situations, of the idea of a leader that has a disability. Since most cultural schemata are well defined and difficult to change, they can inhibit the ability to accept a new schema for a situation. In an individualistic society, the goals of the person outweigh those of the group. If the person sees a leader as one who will achieve his/her goals, then s/he will look for the best suited person to fulfill that role. American society still has issues with differences between people and this may perpetuate the lack of disabled leaders in the future.

A search of scientific research dealing with the perceptions of the leadership potential of people with disabilities has shown no studies have yet been conducted. Apparently, the disabled have also been overlooked in yet another field, the study of leadership. The focus of the present study deals with people's perceptions of outward appearances and how that can be applied to leadership and the disabled.

Research Hypotheses

Three research hypotheses will be examined in the present investigation. The first research hypothesis pertains to the influence of applicant disability status on the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale total score. The second research hypothesis pertains to the influence of applicant disability status on scale total scores for the six leadership dimensions of Efficiency, Intellectual Stimulation, Charisma, Communication Skills, Empathy, and the Ability to Inspire. The third research hypothesis pertains to the influence of applicant disability status on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII) scale total score.

Hypothesis #1: Participants will rate the non-disabled applicant as a "people-oriented" leader (High LPC Leader; LPC scale total score greater than 63) while the visually impaired applicant and the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair will be rated by participants as "task-oriented" leaders (Low LPC Leader; LPC scale total scores less than 57).

Hypothesis #2: Participants will rate the non-disabled applicant more positively than the visually impaired applicant and the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair on the scale total scores for the leadership dimensions of Efficiency, Intellectual Stimulation, Charisma, Communication Skills, Empathy, and the Ability to Inspire.

Hypothesis #3: Participants will rate the non-disabled applicant more positively than the visually impaired applicant and the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair on the scale total score for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII).

CHAPTER III

Methods

Participants

165 (78 females and 73 males and 14 choose not to disclose their age) undergraduate and Graduate students from a Mid-Atlantic university participated in the study. The average age of the participants was 19.5 years. Participants were enrolled in General Psychology courses, upper division psychology undergraduate courses, and Graduate-level courses. Participants volunteered to take part in the investigation and signed an informed consent form prior to the start of the investigation. Participants received experimental course credit in exchange for their participation.

Materials

Applicant and Application Materials. The main focus of the investigation involved the evaluation of leadership potential of an applicant applying for a leadership position in a library. Since neither the applicant nor the leadership position being evaluated in the investigation truly existed, a “bogus” applicant and application materials had to be created for participants to evaluate. To create the “bogus” applicant, the researcher took a photograph of an acquaintance who had given his consent to have his photograph used in the investigation. A “bogus” name (Gabriel Duffer) was then created for the applicant along with a “bogus” resume which identified the applicant’s address, phone number, education, qualifications, employment history, and honors earned by the applicant. Three versions of the applicant were then created by the researcher. Version 1 (Non-Disabled Applicant) contained the original picture of the applicant with no modifications. Version 2 (Visually Impaired Applicant) contained a picture of the

applicant holding a walking cane typical of those used by visually impaired individuals to help them navigate their environment and a pair of dark glasses. Version 3 (Applicant Needing the Use of a Wheelchair) contained a picture of the applicant seated in a wheelchair. To control for the presence of confounding variables, the applicant was wearing identical clothing and had the same general appearance in all three versions of the application materials. Furthermore, identical applicant resume format and information was used in all three versions of the application materials (See Appendix A).

Leadership Rating Instruments: To evaluate the leadership potential of the applicant, three rating instruments were used in the investigation. The first instrument was the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale created by Fiedler in 1967. The Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale contains 16 bipolar adjective items (e.g., Pleasant-Unpleasant; Rejecting-Accepting). Each of the 16 items is evaluated using an 8-point rating scale (e.g., Friendly 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Unfriendly). A scale total is then computed by summing responses across the 16 scale items. The LPC was originally used to determine whether and individual was a “people-oriented” or “task-oriented” leader by examining how they used the LPC items to evaluate a coworker/subordinate that the leader most disliked working with. LPC scale total scores greater than 63 indicated that a leader was a “people-oriented” leader while LPC scores below 57 indicated that a leader was a “task-oriented” leader. In the present investigation, the original 16 LPC items will be used, however, the purpose of the LPC scale will be modified. In the present investigation, participants will be asked to use the LPC scale items to express their first impressions of the leadership potential and personality characteristics of the applicant being evaluated in the investigation. In the present investigation, LPC scale total scores greater than 63

will indicate that the applicant being evaluated is perceived as a “people-oriented” leader while LPC scale total scores below 57 will indicate that the applicant being evaluated is perceived as a “task-oriented” leader (See Appendix B).

The second instrument used in the investigation to evaluate leadership potential was created by the researcher. Based on existing research on transformational leadership, a rating instrument was created which was designed to assess 6 important dimensions of leadership. The rating instrument contained a total of 38 items and assessed the leadership dimensions of; (1) Efficiency (6 items; “Do you think this applicant can find the most efficient way to accomplish our goals?”), (2) Intellectual Stimulation (5 items; “Do you think this applicant can connect many different ideas and view points?”), (3) Charisma (11 items; “Do you think this applicant can maintain high morale among the group?”), (4) Communication Skills (3 items; “Do you think this applicant is able to listen to all perspectives?”), (5) Empathy (6 items; “Do you think this applicant can deal with people in an honest, ethical and moral way?”), and (6) Inspiration (7 items; “Do you think this applicant can teach others to lead?”). A 6-point rating scale was used to evaluate each of the 38 items across the 6 leadership dimension scales (1 = Not at all; 6 = Extremely Likely) (See Appendix B).

The third and final instrument used in the investigation to evaluate leadership potential was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII) (Bass, 1990). The LBDQ contains 20 items originally designed to be used by subordinates to evaluate the behavior of their supervisor/leader. According to Lowenberg, Conrad, Dowhower, and Harness (1998), high LBDQ scores indicated that a leader was high in a factor labeled “consideration” (i.e., leader is friendly, approachable, and makes the group members feel at ease when talking to them). Low

LBDQ scores indicated that a leader was high in a factor labeled “initiating structure” (i.e., leader schedules work to be done and emphasizes the meeting of deadlines). A “considerate” leader develops relationships with group members. A leader who scores high on “initiating structure” is one who is thought of as a deadline and detail oriented. In the present investigation, participants will be asked to use the LBDQ items to express their first impressions of the leadership potential and leadership behavior likely to be exhibited by the applicant being evaluated in the present investigation. Each of the 20 items on the LBDQ (e.g., “Do you think this person can maintain definite standards of performance?”; “Do you think this person can schedule the work to be done?”; “Do you think this person can look out for the personal welfare of group members?”) is evaluated using a 6-point rating scale (1 = Not At All; 6 = Extremely Likely) (See Appendix B).

Procedure

To begin the investigation, participants were asked to sign an informed consent form to indicate that they were volunteering for the investigation and had been informed of their rights as research participants. After completing the informed consent form, participants were randomly assigned to one of the three experimental conditions created by the manipulation of applicant disability status (i.e., Non-Disabled, Visually Impaired, and Applicant Needing the Use of a Wheelchair). Each participant then received a packet of stimulus materials which contained; (1) the applicant photograph and resume, (2) the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale, (3) the six leadership dimension rating scales (i.e., Efficiency, Intellectual Stimulation, Charisma, Communication Skills, Empathy, and Ability to Inspire), (4) the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII), and (5) a series of demographic items assessing the participants’

gender, age, prior experience with a leader who had a disability and if so, what the specific disability was that the applicant was living with. After reading and evaluating all the applicant stimulus materials and providing the required ratings of leadership potential/behavior, participants were debriefed by the researcher and then received their experimental course credit in exchange for their participation in the investigation.

CHAPTER IV

Results

Prior to performing the statistical analyses, scale totals were computed for the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale (16 items; scale total range 16-128), the leadership dimension subscales assessing the dimensions of efficiency (6 items; scale total range 6-36), intellectual stimulation (5 items; scale total range 5-30), charisma (11 items; scale total range 11-66), communication skills (3 items; scale total range 3-18), empathy (6 items; scale total range 6-36), and ability to inspire (7 items; scale total range 7-42) and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII) scale (20 items; scale total range 20-120).

After computing the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale totals, LPC scores greater than 63 were coded as “High LPC Leaders,” LPC scores from 58-62 were coded as “Middle LPC Leaders,” and LPC scores less than 57 were coded as “Low LPC Leaders” following the accepted coding system commonly used for the LPC scale.

Hypothesis #1: Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) Scale Analysis

A single research hypothesis was proposed with respect to the analysis of the effect of applicant disability status on Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale total scores.

Hypothesis #1: Participants will rate the non-disabled applicant as a “people-oriented” leader (High LPC Leader; LPC scale total scores greater than 63) while the visually impaired applicant and the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair will be rated as “task oriented” leaders (Low LPC Leaders; LPC scale total scores less than 57).

A 3 x 3 Chi Square test of independence was conducted with applicant disability status (non-disabled, visually impaired, and the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair) and Leadership classification (High, Middle, Low LPC Leader) as the categorical variables. The results of the Chi Square analysis were non-significant ($\chi^2(4) = 7.45, p = .11$). An analysis of the response frequencies revealed that regardless of the applicant disability status (non-disabled, visually impaired or needing the use of a wheelchair), participants were more likely to rate the applicants as High LPC (“people-oriented”) Leaders than Middle LPC or Low LPC (“task-oriented”) Leaders. In fact, across the three applicant disability status groups, 118 out of 158 participants rated the applicant as a High LPC Leader. Specifically, 35 out of 52 participants rated the non-disabled applicant as a High LPC Leader, 36 out of 50 participants rated the visually impaired applicant as a High LPC Leader, and 47 out of 56 participants rated the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair as a High LPC Leader. Clearly, the results failed to support Hypothesis #1.

Hypothesis #2: Leadership Dimension Scale Total Analysis

A single research hypothesis was proposed with respect to the analysis of the effect of applicant disability status on the scale total scores for the leadership dimensions of efficiency, intellectual stimulation, charisma, communication skills, empathy, and ability to inspire.

Hypothesis #2: Participants will rate the non-disabled applicant more positively than the visually impaired applicant and the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair on the leadership dimensions of efficiency, intellectual stimulation, charisma, communication skills, empathy, and ability to inspire.

A MANOVA analysis with applicant disability status (non-disabled, visually impaired, and needing the use of a wheelchair) as the independent variable and the six leadership dimensions (efficiency, intellectual stimulation, charisma, communication skills, empathy, and ability to inspire) as the dependent variables was conducted. The results of the MANOVA analysis revealed a significant multivariate main effect for applicant disability status ($F(6,146) = 2.72, p = .00$). An analysis of the univariate results revealed significant differences between the disability status groups for all six leadership dimensions of efficiency ($F(2, 151) = 7.40, p = .00$), intellectual stimulation ($F(2, 151) = 13.65, p = .00$), charisma ($F(2, 151) = 11.44, p = .00$), communication skills ($F(2, 151) = 10.95, p = .00$), empathy ($F(2, 151) = 9.19, p = .00$) and ability to inspire ($F(2, 151) = 4.91, p = .00$).

Student-Newman-Keuls post-tests were conducted to examine the specific nature of the significant differences between the applicant disability status groups on the six leadership dimensions. Post-test results revealed an identical pattern of group differences across each of the six leadership dimensions. For each of the six leadership dimensions examined, the visually impaired applicant and the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair were rated significantly more positively than the non-disabled applicant. Specifically, the “disabled” applicants were rated as being more efficient ($M_{VI} = 30.53; M_{WC} = 29.62; M_{ND} = 27.57$), more able to intellectually stimulate subordinates ($M_{VI} = 24.84; M_{WC} = 24.27; M_{ND} = 21.39$), more charismatic ($M_{VI} = 49.57; M_{WC} = 48.54; M_{ND} = 42.57$), to have more effective communication skills ($M_{VI} = 15.06; M_{WC} = 14.37; M_{ND} = 13.10$), more empathetic ($M_{VI} = 28.47; M_{WC} = 27.58; M_{ND} = 24.78$), and more capable of inspiring one’s subordinates ($M_{VI} = 32.59; M_{WC} = 31.67; M_{ND} = 29.35$) than the non-disabled applicant. The consistency of the pattern of post-test results

is clearly a reflection of the fact that the correlations among the six leadership dimension ratings were significant in size and ranged from a low of $r = .545$ to a high of $r = .808$. The results provide evidence that perhaps a “halo effect: (i.e., global “positive impression/evaluation” of an applicant resulting in positive evaluate ratings across multiple independent rating dimensions) was influencing participants ratings in the investigation. Clearly, the results failed to support Hypothesis #2.

Hypothesis #3: Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII) Scale Total Analysis

A single research hypothesis was proposed with respect to that analysis of the effect of applicant disability status on scale total score for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII).

Hypothesis #3: Participants will rate the non-disabled applicant more positively than the visually impaired applicant and the applicant in need of a wheelchair on the scale total score for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII).

A one-way ANOVA analysis with applicant disability status (non-disabled, visually impaired, and needing the use of a wheelchair) as the independent variable and the scale total score for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII) as the dependent variable was conducted. The results of the ANOVA analysis revealed a significant main effect for applicant disability status ($F(2, 157) = 8.27$ $p = .00$).

A Student-Newman-Keuls post-test was then conducted to examine the specific nature of the significant difference between the applicant disability status groups on the scale total score for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII). The post-test results revealed that the visually impaired applicant and the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair were rated

significantly more positively on the LBDQ than the non-disabled applicant ($\underline{M}_{VI} = 93.38$; $\underline{M}_{WC} = 89.04$; $\underline{M}_{ND} = 84.02$). Clearly, the results failed to support Hypothesis #3.

CHAPTER V

Summary and Conclusion

Discussion

The results of the present study are interesting to say the least. It was predicted that the non-disabled applicant would be rated the most positive for the leadership position in the library followed by the “disabled” applicants; the visually impaired applicant and the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair. The results that were found were that the applicant needing the use of a wheelchair was rated the highest overall, the visually impaired applicant was rated second best, and the applicant without a disability was rated third best on all leadership measurement instruments. Both “positive” and “negative” possible explanations for the results of the study will be discussed.

“Positive” Explanations

An interesting media event linked with disabilities happened during the present study. One movie was released and another’s commercial was airing. The movie that was released and in the theaters at the time of data collection was Dare Devil, a movie based on a comic book series. The main character is a blind lawyer who fights crime as a masked super hero named Dare Devil. There may have been a carryover effect from the movie on participants’ leadership ratings when the participants viewed the picture of the visually impaired applicant in the experimental stimulus material. The movie and comic book character was a super hero and when one thinks of comic book super heroes, characteristics such as strength, perseverance, the ability to overcome obstacles, and always associated with goodness, justice and fighting for the right cause come to mind. If the participants who were randomly given the resume that feature

the visually impaired applicant had seen the movie or the advertisements there may have possibly been a transference of Dare Devil's characteristics of being a super hero and the traits that come with that perception to the individual in the picture. If the people had been exposed to a character or person with a disability (i.e., crime fighting super hero) then in the future the people may remember such a character/person and think that the person in real life with a disability may be able to do more than they had previously thought, perhaps not being a crime fighting super hero but more manageable tasks or jobs (i.e., a library technician supervisor).

A movie that was being advertised during data collection was X-Men 2: X-Men United. In that movie, a character named Professor Xavier is the leader of a group of individuals with special abilities. Professor Xavier uses a wheelchair due to paralysis. The character, in the movie and the comic books, is the world's most powerful psychic. Since this is a sequel there may have been previous exposure if the participants had seen the first movie. With such a powerful character in the media, transference may have again possibly occurred. Previous exposure may have caused an individual to reconsider their thoughts about people with disabilities. This may also create a modification of the schema concerning people with disabilities. Due to previous exposure to individuals, all-be-it extraordinary individuals from a fantasy genre, a person's schema could have included a unit for disabilities and when the schema was recreated and activated a person with a disability may have fit better in such a schema because of the "disability" unit being allowed to be included.

Another possible explanation for the positive leadership ratings for the disabled applicants may come from the fact that nearly one third of the participants did have previous experience with a leader who had a disability/handicap. Maybe past experience came to mind

while the participants were filling out the survey and influenced their thoughts about the individual in the picture. This past experience may have allowed for a new mental construct of leadership in the mind of the participant. If his/her schema was altered or changed by this past experience then by the constructionist view of leadership a new unit may have been formed and allowed to remain and be reactivated when the concept of leadership was thought of. When the schema was activated and reformed, the unit for having a disability/handicap entered as one of the many pieces that make up a “thought” of what a leader is. Then, when the participants saw the picture of either a visually impaired individual or an individual that uses a wheelchair the “disability/handicap” unit was activated. This may have allowed for the idea of a person with a disability/handicap to be a leader in the participants’ minds. Now the participants have a view of a leader and leadership with the inclusion of disabilities so that in the future, whenever confronted with someone in a leadership position with a disability/handicap, s/he will not be biased simply because of this individual having a disability/handicap. Also, the chances of cognitive dissonance will be diminished. If two incompatible thoughts appear at the same time then a form of mental distress appears. However, past experience has exposed an individual to a leader with a disability/handicap and though cognitive dissonance may have appeared at that first instance, the experience may have changed the thought of what a leader or leadership is or was. Now, the participants’ minds can allow a leader with a disability/handicap and it won’t be an obstacle for rating the potential leader on traits or characteristics.

At the campus where this study was conducted people with disabilities are enrolled as students and employed as professors and staff. The university offers programs for students who need assistance with their studies such as note takers and escorts for those who need a wheelchair

to navigate, if needed or requested. This exposure to other students who have a disability may cause them to reconsider what abilities the disabled have. If a non-disabled person sees a disabled person as a student working on a degree then other thoughts of abilities may be expanded such as “Maybe a person with a disability can be a professor.” In both the classroom and at the bookstore there is a chance for exposure to people with disabilities. There are at least two professors with disabilities that the participants may have seen before or during the experiment. A professor is a good example of a strong leader. If the students had exposure to this professor or others on campus their schema for what constitutes being a professor which may be connected to their schema for leadership or a leader may have changed. Any exposure, either positive or negative, will change the idea of schema of how a leader or the concept of leadership is defined. This change in the schema may allow for someone with a disability to be in a leadership position. This is a possible positive explanation because of the general exposure in an environment where ideas are formed. Ideas of what leadership is may have changed and in the future the possibility of accepting someone with a disability is greatly increased. The key to all these possible explanations for the results that were obtained is exposure to people with disabilities who are in a leadership position. This is a positive commentary on society as a whole in allowing and accepting more people with disabilities as leaders where before there may have been few if any leaders who had a disability.

A final thought about the positive possible reasons for the results that were obtained is the qualifications of the individual. The resume was created to show that the individual in the picture was qualified to perform the job selected. Perhaps the participants read the resume and thought that the individual was qualified and should be given the job no matter the disability

status of the individual; be it without a disability, needing the use of a wheelchair, or being visually impaired.

“Negative” Explanations

One possible reason for the higher ratings for the disabled applicants on the leadership scales is because the individual in the picture did have a disability/handicap. A person may not want to give someone with a disability a low rating consciously because, even though all participants' ratings were anonymous, the participants may have thought that giving a low rating would make them look bad and would not be viewed as the same as before the experiment. Social approval is a very important factor when dealing with others. If a person wants to be accepted by the group, s/he may perform behaviors and actions that would not go along with their original thoughts or feelings. To gain approval from the group, the participants may have “given” higher results to individuals with a disability because to do so would make the participant look good to other members of the group or to the experimenter. By rating an individual with a disability higher on the leadership scales, the participant may have thought that this action would make them look better and would be easier to gain and or maintain access to all the benefits of the group. There may be feelings of guilt that may accompany giving lower scores to someone who has a disability/handicap and that “boosting” the scores may be a way of relieving this guilt that could come from internal forces or cognitions or from guilt experienced if the group or experimenter knew that person A gave such a score. Also, there may have been a halo effect with regards to the participants' ratings. All scores, no matter the condition, were extremely high across all leadership scales. The participants may have possibly thought that the individual in the picture was good on one particular subscale and that may have crossed over to

all other scales. All conditions were rated positively, the disability conditions were rated slightly more positively than the non-disabled condition.

Minorities are sometimes given special consideration in a hiring situation. If two individuals are equal in qualifications, then the minority; whether it be a woman, ethnic minority, a person who is of a certain faith or religion, or one with a disability, is supposed to get the job (Shirayev & Levy, 2001). The phenomenon of reverse discrimination is when one group, usually the majority, is discriminated against over the minority. Discrimination is still present, however it is just displaced from one group to another. That may be one explanation of the results that were found. If a participant thought that there was a lack of visually impaired or individuals needing the use of a wheelchair in leadership roles then s/he may have given higher scores to those particular individuals than s/he may have actually thought they truly deserved on their qualifications. The participants support the idea of giving workplace access to more disabled individuals and when the participants saw a disability (a visually impaired individual or an individual needing the use of a wheelchair) it may have triggered the idea and resulted in the disabled applicants being rated higher on the leadership scales because they did have a disability/handicap.

A final thought about why the individuals with disabilities were rated higher may be due to the leadership position that was selected for the present investigation. Because the job was in a library setting, the participants may have thought that this job was or would be out of the view of the public. There are very few leadership positions that are known to the public where the leader has a disability. If the participants thought that the job was out of the public eye they may have given the higher ratings to the individual because (A) they thought the individual had the

necessary qualifications and (B) there would not be much contact with the public. A person may have difficulties thinking of a disabled individual in a “figure head” leadership position, a leadership position that is well known to the public. If the participants thought that few people would be in contact with the individual that has a disability then the participants may have given the disabled applicants higher scores on the leadership scales.

Strengths of this study

This study focused on leadership and disabilities. One strength of this study was the control of the independent variables. The resumes were the same for all three conditions to insure that the qualifications were the same and no one condition had better or worse qualifications. The only difference between the resumes was the disability in the picture that was included with the resume. A common characteristic that is thought of when one thinks of a leader or the concept of leadership is that the person is/will be a man. So the individual used in the pictures was a man. To control for attractiveness the same man was used in each condition. For reference, this individual does not have a disability/handicap. To manipulate the disability the individual sat in a chair to, hopefully, show that he did not have a disability. To show the need for use of a wheelchair, the individual simply sat in a wheelchair that was borrowed. To show that the individual was visually impaired, he wore a pair of dark sunglasses and in the picture a can with a red tip was superimposed in his open hand. For this condition nearly all participants did say that he was visually impaired or blind. To check for the realism of the disability or if the disability was easily noticed a question at the end of the survey asked if the individual had a disability/handicap and if so what was the disability/handicap. Nearly all

participants correctly stated that the individual did not have a disability, needed the use of a wheelchair, or was visually impaired depending on the condition s/he was randomly assigned.

The survey used was a compilation of three different surveys. The first was the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale and the third survey used was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII). Both surveys have been tested and have shown high reliability and validity. Also, the six leadership dimensions came from the leadership literature. Throughout the research process those concepts were mentioned but never put together in this combination.

Weaknesses of this study.

A few weaknesses of this study include the following. In the picture of the applicant that was visually impaired a cane that is used by the visually impaired was superimposed in the picture. Due to the superimposing of the cane onto the picture, the cane was slightly distorted giving it a “block construction” appearance. If a person were to look at the picture of the visually impaired applicant and focus on the cane, then s/he would be able to point out that the cane was not in the original picture and was added with the help of computer manipulation. This may have lead the participants to think that his person may have not actually been visually impaired but that the experimenter wanted the participants to think he was visually impaired.

Another weakness of this study is the person that was asked to pose in the pictures for the resumes. In the beginning of the study obesity was to be included. The person asked to pose for the pictures was not obese but slightly overweight. He was selected because of his weight. An obese individual’s picture was to be taken and the original individual’s head was to be placed on the obese person’s body to hopefully give the impression that he, the original person, was obese. However, the modifications were not “convincing” enough to the experimenter to properly

convey that the picture was not modified. The contrasts were too great and easily pointed out so the obese condition was dropped from the study. However the pictures for the other conditions were taken and used. The individual was overweight in the pictures and that may have caused the scores that were reported. Also, the individual in the pictures worked part-time at one of the college bookstores. There may have been exposure by the participants going to the bookstore at a previous time and seeing this individual.

Another weakness of this study is that, although the LPC and LBDQ-XII were used, they were modified so that they would measure the individual in the picture with whom the participants had no previous contact. The LPC and LBDQ-XII were originally constructed for the participant to use when s/he had previous contact with the person they were thinking of. The LPC is supposed to be used with a coworker, not necessarily a leader. The LPC was used for this study because of the bipolar adjectives that comprise the scale. The measurements for this study were not used to measure the leadership abilities of the participant filling out the survey but the adjectives were used to describe the individual in the picture on the resume. The LBDQ-XII is supposed to be used by a participant who has had previous contact with a leader or a current leader. This scale was modified to measure the participants' views of the individual although they had not had previous contact with the individual. The LBDQ-XII measures the people orientation or task orientation of the leader being measured. For this study, the questions were modified by adding "Do you think this person . . ." to the beginning of each question. This change in scale use/purpose could have potentially influenced responses.

Though most people have probably been exposed to a leader at one time, their concept of what a leader is may not fit the general schema for most individuals' schema for leadership or a

leader. If all past experiences with leaders consisted of the exposure of a part time job then the schema may not be well defined in that there are many “blank” units in the mental construct of leadership/leader because of a lack of exposure. If someone worked full time then there would be more exposure to a leader and his/her schema of leadership or a leader would be better defined. A participant who worked part time and had limited exposure to the manager/supervisor/leader may not have enough experience to construct a complete schema of leadership or a leader. Given the mean age of the participants, many were unlikely to have long term full time employment exposure.

Future research

Leadership has been a field of study dating back to the Greeks and Romans. However, certain aspects of leadership have been ignored, such as people with disabilities being leaders. This field of study can and should be continued. Future research can look at different physical, sensory, and mental disabilities. Future research can also look at how a person with previous experience with a leader who has a disability feels acts or thinks. Another possible research topic deals with combining the fields of cross cultural psychology and industrial organizational psychology. Are there cultural differences dealing with leaders and disabilities? The research possibilities are endless because there is no or little current research dealing with these two topics, people with disabilities and leadership. There has been research that has looked at the hiring of the disabled, but during this study no research could be found.

References

- Bass, B. M. (Ed.) (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications*. 3rd edition. New York: The Free Press.
- Feidler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gilbert, D. T., Fiske, S. T., & Lindzey, G. (1998). *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 1). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Goktepe, J. R., & Schneier, C. E. (1989). Role of sex, gender roles, and attraction in predicting emergent leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74* (1), 165-167. retrieved Sept. 16, from EBSCOHost: "PsycArticles" database.
- Hanges, P. J., Lord, R. G., & Dickson, M. W. (2000). An information-processing perspective on leadership and culture: A case for connectionist architecture. *Applied Psychology*, *49* (1), 133-161. Retrieved Sept. 16, from EBSCOHost: "Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection" database.
- Hernandez, B. (2000). Employer attitudes towards workers with disabilities and their ada employment rights: A literature review. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, *66* (4) 4-17. Retrieved Sept. 21, from EBSCOHost: "Academic Search Elite" database.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *5* (3), 184-200. Retrieved Sept. 16, from EBSCOHost: "Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection" database.
- Horner, Jr., D. H. (1996). A different twist: Nonrational views of leadership. *Military Review*, *76* (6), 45-51. Retrieved Sept. 28, from EBSCOHost: "Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection" database.

- Kenrick, D. T., Neuberg, S. L. & Cialdini, R. B. (1999). Social psychology: Unraveling the mystery. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Lefton, L. A. (1997). Psychology 6th edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Lievens, F., Van Geit, P., & Coetsier, P. (1997). Identification of transformational leadership qualities: An examination of potential biases. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 6 (4), 415-430. Retrieved Oct. (, from EBSCOHost: "Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection" database.
- Lord, R. G. (2000). Thinking outside the box by looking inside the box: Extending the cognitive revolution in leadership research. Leadership Quarterly, 11 (4), 551-579. Retrieved Sept. 30, from EBSCOHost: "Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection" database.
- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Harvey, J. L., & Hall, R. J. (2001). Contextual constraints on prototype generation and their multilevel consequences for leadership perceptions. Leadership Quarterly, 12 (3), 311-338. Retrieved Sept. 30, from EBSCOHost: "Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection" database.
- Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & DeVader, C. L. (1984). A test of leadership categorizational theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34 (3), 343-378.
- Lowenberg, G., Conrad, K. A., Dower, D., & Harness, C. (1998). Current perspectives in industrial/organizational psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Manz, C. C. & Sims Jr. H. P. (1991). Superleadership: beyond the myth of heroic leadership. Organizational dynamics, 19 (4), 18-36. Retrieved Mar. 5, from EBSCOHost: "Psychological and Behavioral Sciences Collection" database.
- Payne, K. E., & Cangemi, J. P. (1998). Power and the esteemed professorate. Education, 118 (3), 394-405. Retrieved Oct. 7 from EBSCOHost: "Academic Search Elite" database.
- Raphael, T. (2002). Disabling some old stereotypes. Workforce, 81 (8), 88-89. Retrieved Oct. 2, from EBSCOHost: "Academic Search Elite" database.
- Rodriguez, A., & Prezant, F. (2002). Better interviews for people with disabilities. Workforce, 81 (8), 38-42. Retrieved Oct. 2, from EBSCOHost: "Academic Search Elite" database.
- Shirayev, E., & Levy, D. (2001). Introduction to cross cultural psychology: Critical thinking and contemporary applications. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Solso, R. L. (2001). Cognitive psychology 6th edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ward, M. J., & Meyer, R. N. (1999). Self-determination for people with developmental disabilities and autism: Two self-advocates' perspectives. Focus on Autism and other Developmental Disabilities, 14 (3), 133-140. Retrieved Oct. 2, from EBSCOHost: "Academic Search Elite" database.
- Wofford, J. C., Goodwin, V. L., Whittington, J. L. (1998). A field study of a cognitive approach to understanding transformational and transactional leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 9 (1). 55-81. Retrieved Sept. 28, from EBSCOHost: "Psychological and Behavioral Sciences Collection" database.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. Journal of Management, 15 (2), 251-289.

Appendix A



Gabriel Duffer
526 Hunter Lane,
Huntington, WV 25701

(304) 696-1216

Objective: Library Technician Supervisor

Qualifications:

- Computer proficient.
- Previous library experience.
- Familiarity and experience with the Library of Congress classification system.
- Excellent communication skills.
- Previous research experience.
- Knowledge of public records' use for tradition and professional research.

Education: B.S., Library and Information Sciences
Marshall University, Huntington, WV. GPA: 3.7

Employment history:

Processing Archivist at Fogler Library, Czar, WV May 1994 to August 1996

Provided daily research and reference services to various newsrooms, bureaus, and businesses.

Maintained all subscription records and acquired/deleted subscriptions as necessary.

Developed and maintained close communication with other library staff members and newsrooms.

Library Assistant at Wayne County Library, Wayne, WV September 1996 to December 2002

Worked with Reference desk and aided patrons.

Coordinated summer youth reading program.

Activities and Honors

Marshall University Dean's List

Gamma Beta Phi (Collegiate honor society)

John Marshall Scholar

Honored by United States Library Association for outstanding leadership abilities in coordinating reading programs and promoting youth reading with The Golden Book

References

Available upon request.



Gabriel Duffer
526 Hunter Lane,
Huntington, WV 25701

(304) 696-1216

Objective: Library Technician Supervisor

Qualifications:

- Computer proficient.
- Previous library experience.
- Familiarity and experience with the Library of Congress classification system.
- Excellent communication skills.
- Previous research experience.
- Knowledge of public records' use for tradition and professional research.

Education: B.S., Library and Information Sciences
Marshall University, Huntington, WV. GPA: 3.7

Employment history:

Processing Archivist at Fogler Library, Czar, WV May 1994 to August 1996

Provided daily research and reference services to various newsrooms, bureaus, and businesses.

Maintained all subscription records and acquired/deleted subscriptions as necessary.

Developed and maintained close communication with other library staff members and newsrooms.

Library Assistant at Wayne County Library, Wayne, WV September 1996 to December 2002

Worked with Reference desk and aided patrons.

Coordinated summer youth reading program.

Activities and Honors

Marshall University Dean's List

Gamma Beta Phi (Collegiate honor society)

John Marshall Scholar

Honored by United States Library Association for outstanding leadership abilities in coordinating reading programs and promoting youth reading with The Golden Book

References

Available upon request.



Gabriel Duffer
526 Hunter Lane,
Huntington, WV 25701

(304) 696-1216

Objective: Library Technician Supervisor

Qualifications:

- Computer proficient.
- Previous library experience.
- Familiarity and experience with the Library of Congress classification system.
- Excellent communication skills.
- Previous research experience.
- Knowledge of public records' use for tradition and professional research.

Education: B.S., Library and Information Sciences
Marshall University, Huntington, WV. GPA: 3.7

Employment history:

Processing Archivist at Fogler Library, Czar, WV May 1994 to August 1996

Provided daily research and reference services to various newsrooms, bureaus, and businesses.

Maintained all subscription records and acquired/deleted subscriptions as necessary.

Developed and maintained close communication with other library staff members and newsrooms.

Library Assistant at Wayne County Library, Wayne, WV September 1996 to December 2002

Worked with Reference desk and aided patrons.

Coordinated summer youth reading program.

Activities and Honors

Marshall University Dean's List

Gamma Beta Phi (Collegiate honor society)

John Marshall Scholar

Honored by United States Library Association for outstanding leadership abilities in coordinating reading programs and promoting youth reading with The Golden Book

References

Available upon request.

Appendix B

What is your gender? Male or Female? Circle one.

What is your age? Under 18. 18-19. 20-21. 22-23. 24 or older.

Please rate the person in the photograph on the following scale according to what you think of him. Circle your answer.

- | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Pleasant | 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | Unpleasant |
| Friendly | 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | Unfriendly |
| Rejecting | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Accepting |
| Helpful | 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | Frustrating |
| Unenthusiastic | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Enthusiastic |
| Tense | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Relaxed |
| Distant | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Close |
| Cold | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Warm |
| Cooperative | 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | Uncooperative |
| Supportive | 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | Hostile |
| Boring | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Interesting |
| Quarrelsome | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Harmonious |
| Self-assured | 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | Hesitant |
| Efficient | 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | Inefficient |
| Gloomy | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Cheerful |
| Open | 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 | Guarded |

For the following, please use this scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not at all	Not very likely	Somewhat not likely	Somewhat likely	Very likely	Extremely likely

“Do you thin this person,”

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. can overcome obstacles in the group’s path? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. has a personal history of prevailing over obstacles? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. can accomplish our goals? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. can find the most efficient way to accomplish our goals? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. can maintain a schedule? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6. If the group were to encounter overwhelming difficulties, do you think this person could maintain focus on the main goal? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7. can create new ways of thinking? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. can entertain new ideas, even if the ideas seem foolish? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9. can connect many different ideas and view points? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. Does this person have average intelligence? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11. Does this person have above average intelligence? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12. Is this person physically attractive? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 13. has a vision for the group? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 14. has high self-esteem? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 15. is innovative? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 16. has confidence? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 17. can treat all members fairly? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 18. represents a symbol of success and accomplishments? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 19. can maintain high moral among the group? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

20. is confident?	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. has a good attitude?	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. seems trustworthy?	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. can communicate ideas effectively?	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. is able to listen to all perspectives?	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. When this person speaks, will the group understand what is asked of them?	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. can be empathic to your concerns?	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. can make an individual feel safe?	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. can create an environment that promotes high standards of excellence?	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. can be responsive to your concerns?	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. can maintain peace among members of the group?	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. can deal with people in an honest, ethical and moral way?	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. can teach others to lead?	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. Is this person strong?	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. can do all the tasks that an individual in the group can do?	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. can maintain a position of power and influence?	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. can successfully complete the task with the group?	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. can promote an image that represents the group positively?	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. can entrust others with power if needed?	1	2	3	4	5	6
Do you think this person						
1. can maintain definite standards of performance?	1	2	3	4	5	6

2. can make sure that his part in the group is understood by the group members?	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations?	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. makes his attitude clear to the group?	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. lets group members know what is expected of them?	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. can encourage the use of uniform procedures?	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. can schedule the work to be done?	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. can decide what shall be done and how it shall be done?	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. can assign group members to particular tasks?	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations?	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. refuses to explain his actions?	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. can act with out consulting the group?	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. is friendly and approachable?	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. can treat all members as his equals?	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. can look out for the personal welfare of group members?	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. keeps to himself?	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. can do little things that make it pleasant to be a member of the group?	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. puts suggestions made by the group into operation?	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. is willing to make changes?	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. gives advance notice of changes?	1	2	3	4	5	6

Have you had a past experience with a leader who had a physical disability/handicap?

Yes

No.

If yes, on a scale of 1-6 with one being the lowest and six being the highest, how would you rate the most recent past experience of him/her being a leader?

1

2

3

4

5

6

Not at all good. Not very good. Somewhat not good. Somewhat good. Very good. Extremely good.

After viewing the picture in the resume, do you think this person has a physical disability/handicap?

Yes

No.

If yes, what physical disability/handicap did he have?
