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Effective communication, decision-making, resilience to change… there’s a growing body of psychology and behavioral science research relating personality traits to many of the qualities of a high-impact leader and follower. It’s unsurprising that our ability to successfully lead people or follow leaders is influenced by our personality, given the decidedly interpersonal nature of leadership and followership. Maximizing the effectiveness of strong leadership and followership requires an individual to have a strong understanding of themselves and the skills they possess. This paper will take a look at my results of the FFM, MBTI, and the LOC assessment to explain how my results would impact how I experience leadership as both a leader and a follower. I will do this by comparing and contrasting my results to each other, explaining how my personality traits impact the manner in which I enact leadership, analyzing what type of leadership style I value most as a follower, pointing out my preferred leadership style or method, disclosing my leadership “blind spots”, and lastly, break down how I will overcome these “blind spots” by using a leadership development plan derived from theories presented in the course so far.

The first personality trait assessment that I took was the Myers-Briggs type indicator (MBTI). The Myers-Briggs Personality Type Indicator is a self-report inventory designed to identify a person's personality type, strengths, and preferences. The questionnaire was developed by Isabel Myers and her mother Katherine Briggs based on their work with Carl Jung's theory of personality types. Today, the MBTI inventory is one of the most widely used psychological instruments in the world.

After finishing the test on personalitytest.net, I was giving the personality type of INTJ. The dichotomy for INTJ stands for (I) Introverted, (N) Intuition, (T) Thinking, and (J) Judging. Introversion describes the manner in which I interact with others. I focus inwardly and tend to gain my energy from cognition rather than focusing outwardly and gaining energy from others. In the assessment I took I scored 100% on introversion. I don’t think I am 100% introverted but I have scored very high on introversion on other tests, so it’s safe to say I definitely prefer to spend time alone to recharge and gain energy from my cognitions. The manner in which I process information is through intuition. This means that I focus on possibilities, the future, and tend to see the big picture rather than focusing on the five senses and experience. In the MBTI assessment I scored as 90% intuitive. I agree with this result as I tend to get lost in thought fantasizing about future possibilities frequently. I also always try to focus on viewing the big picture and underlying meaning behind any situation so that I am always prepared on the best course of action for various situations. The manner in which I evaluate information is through thinking. This means that I focus on objective facts and cause & effect rather than focusing on subjective meanings and values. On the MBTI assessment I scored 81% on thinking. Once again, I agree with the results, as I do have a propensity to make decisions based on logic and rationality, rather than letting my feelings take over in the decision-making process. Lastly, the manner in which I come to conclusions is through judgement. I focus on timely, and planned decisions rather than focusing on process-oriented decision-making. I scored as 62% judging on the MBTI assessment. This means that I do like to make planned decisions and typically avoid spontaneous decisions, but I can sometimes just “go with the flow” and make unplanned decisions on a whim sometimes.

The second personality trait assessment that I took on personalitytest.net, was the five-factor model (FFM)/ Big 5 test. The Big Five Model, also known as the Five-Factor Model, is the most widely accepted personality theory held by psychologists today. The theory states that personality can be boiled down to five core factors, known by the acronym CANOE or OCEAN: conscientiousness, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness to experience, and extraversion. Unlike other trait theories that sort individuals into binary categories (i.e. introvert or extrovert), the Big Five Model asserts that each personality trait is a spectrum. Therefore, individuals are ranked on a scale between the two extreme ends (0-100).

After taking the assessment my scores were 1 on extraversion, 19 on agreeableness, 55 on conscientiousness, 79 on neuroticism, and 52 on openness to experience.

The first trait of the FFM I was tested on was extraversion. Extraversion is marked by pronounced engagement with the external world. My score of 1 on extroversion is very low. Low scores on extroversion indicates that I am introverted, reserved, quiet, and typically prefer solitary activities. The second trait of the FFM I was test on was agreeableness. Agreeableness reflects individual differences in concern with cooperation and social harmony. My score of 19 on agreeableness is also very low. Scoring low on agreeableness means that I have less concern for other’s needs than my own, I am usually critical, uncompromising, and don’t easily trust others. The third trait of the FFM I was tested on was conscientiousness. Conscientiousness concerns the way in which we control, regulate, and direct our impulses. My score of 55 on conscientiousness is average. An average score on conscientiousness suggests that I am reasonably reliable, organized, and self-controlled. The fourth trait of the FFM I was tested on was neuroticism. Neuroticism is typically defined as a tendency toward anxiety, depression, self-doubt, other negative feelings, and the degree to which a person experiences the world as distressing, threatening, and unsafe. I scored 79 on neuroticism which is considered high. A high score on neuroticism is indicative a person who is easily upset, sensitive and emotional. This is the only score I disagree with. Usually I am pretty well controlled in stressful situations, but at the time of taking the test I was really stressed out with having to do a large amount of schoolwork, so I believe that skewed this result a bit. The final FFM trait I was tested on was openness to experience. Openness to experience describes a dimension of cognitive style that distinguishes imaginative, creative people from down-to-earth, conventional people. I scored a 52 on openness to experience. My score of 52 is average, which means that I enjoy tradition but am willing to try new things. My score also suggests that my thinking is neither simple nor complex, and to others I may appear to be a well-educated person but not necessarily an intellectual.

The last personality assessment I took on personalitytest.net was the Lotus of control. A locus of control orientation is a belief about whether the outcomes of our actions are contingent on what we do (internal control orientation) or on events outside our personal control (external control orientation). People with an internal locus of control believe that their own actions determine the rewards that they obtain, while those with an external locus of control believe that their own behavior doesn't matter much and that rewards in life are generally outside of their control. The assessment that I took on personalitytest.net indicated that my total score was 66. This score is nearly identical to the average score which is 66.44. A score of 66 means that there are certain things that I deem to be out of my control, while others seem to be will in my capabilities. I am aware that if I want to succeed then I need to keep working hard on tasks without giving up (personalitytest.net,2018). Essentially, my results indicate that I have some tendency for both external and internal control orientations, but overall, my locus of control is average.

**(Q1.)** Both Big Five and 16-Personality offer personality insights that help people understand themselves and others. Whether you’re an employer looking to better understand candidates for an open position, a person trying to understand your friend, or just someone looking to understand yourself, personality models and assessments can give you a foundation for understanding *people,*which can help in every aspect of your life. After analyzing both my MBTI and Big 5 results I noticed that there were a lot of correlating results.

For example, I noticed that both the FFM and MBTI measure extroversion. In the MBTI result I scored a 100% on introversion, and on the FFM I scored a 1 on extroversion. My results almost exactly identical since both personality assessments tested for my level of outgoingness and both concluded that I was introverted and more on the reserved side. The only difference was the FFM went a bit more in depth, scored me on more categories of extroversion, and described more aspects of outgoingness such as my level of friendliness, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity level, excitement seeking, and cheerfulness. According to the Trait Theories (2020) PowerPoint, the correlation between extroversion on the MBTI and extroversion on the FFM is r =.71, and the correlation between introversion on the MBTI and extroversion on the FFM is r = -72. A relationship of r = -72 means that there is indeed a strong correlation in extroversion for both assessments, and my results of scoring low on extroversion on the FFM and high on introversion on the MBTI supports the correlation on the PowerPoint.

In the MBTI I was tested on whether I was more of an intuitive person or sensing person. On the MBTI I scored as 90% Intuitive. I believe the closet personality trait that correlates to defining the way an individual processes information on the FFM is openness to experience. Openness to experience consists of broad aspects such as intellectual curiosity, creativity, imagination and aesthetic interests, and is therefore the most likely trait among the Big Five to exhibit a relationship with intuition. The relationship between intuition and openness to experience was r=.62 (Trait Theories.pptx, 2020, p.24). A relationship of r=.62 indicates that there is a correlation between intuition and openness to experience, but it is not strong. This is further supported by my slightly differing results on both assessments. On the FFM I scored a 52 on openness to experience. If we go more in depth and look at my scores for the different aspects of openness to experience, then I scored a 72 on imagination, 58 on artistic interests, and 37 on intellect. It seems that the MBTI scored my imagination and creativity much higher (90% on intuition) than the FFM (52 on openness to experience, 72 on imagination, and 58 on artistic interests).

The next personality trait I was tested on in the MBTI was thinking vs feeling. On the assessment I scored 81% thinking. The closest correlation between thinking vs feeling on the MBTI would be agreeableness on the FFM. Agreeable individuals value getting along with others. They are therefore considerate, friendly, generous, helpful, and willing to compromise their interests with others'. Disagreeable individuals place self-interest above getting along with others. They are generally unconcerned with others' well-being, and therefore are unlikely to extend themselves for other people. Sometimes their skepticism about others' motives causes them to be suspicious, unfriendly, and uncooperative. I think that an individual that would score high in feeling on the MBTI would score high on agreeableness on the FFM. The reason for this is that a feeler is described to be empathetic and willing to compromise their interests for others, similarly to an agreeable individual. Since I scored low on agreeableness and also high on thinking I believe that overall, there is a correlation between thinking vs feeling on the MBTI and agreeableness on the FFM. As someone who scored high on thinking I am usually described as aloof, detached, critical, and even selfish sometimes. I think the description for someone who scores high in thinking are similar enough to an individual who would score low on agreeableness like me, who scored a 19 on agreeableness. The correlation between agreeableness on the FFM and feeling on the MBTI is r =.28, while the correlation between agreeableness on the FFM and thinking on the MBTI is r = -41 (Trait Theoreis.pptx, 2020, p.24). The results indicate that there is a low correlation between agreeableness and feeling, however there is a slightly higher correlation between disagreeableness (low agreeableness) and thinking. Even though my results on both assessments were exactly identical, the overall correlation between agreeableness/disagreeableness and feeling/thinking is still somewhat low.

The last personality trait I was tested on in the MBTI was the manner in which I come to conclusions. In the FFM I believe that conscientiousness would correlate the highest to the manner in which an individual would come to conclusions in the MBTI. High scorers in conscientiousness tend be more careful, thorough, and goal-oriented. Low scorers in conscientiousness tend to be more willing to go with the flow, enjoy life and prefer reacting to things coming their way. The description of high and low scorers of conscientiousness in the FFM is similar to that of judgers and perceivers in the MBTI. Judging people think sequentially, they value order and organization, and their lives are scheduled and structured. Judging people seek closure, enjoy completing tasks, and take deadlines seriously. In contrast, perceivers are adaptable and flexible. They are random thinkers who prefer to keep their options open. Perceivers thrive with the unexpected and are open to change. They are spontaneous, often juggle several projects at once, enjoy starting a task better than finishing it, and deadlines are often merely suggestions. The relationship between conscientiousness on the FFM and judging was r=.46, and the relationship between conscientiousness and perceiving was r=-.46 (Trait Theories.pptx, 2020, p.24). These results indicate that there is a connection for conscientiousness and judging/perceiving, but that connection is somewhat low. However, my results aren’t indicative of this because for both assessments I had similar scores on them (55 on conscientiousness, and 62% judging).

When comparing the FFM to the locus of control (LOC), the FFM traits that have the highest similarities to the LOC are neuroticism, extroversion, and conscientiousness. According to the Expectancy theory and Path-Goal Theory (2020) PowerPoint, there is a relationship of r= -48 for neuroticism and LOC. The relationship indicates that an individual who has low lotus of control, would likely be more neurotic. These results make perfect sense, because an individual with lower lotus of control/higher external lotus of control are more likely to be neurotic and experience more negative emotions, because they believe that they are not in control of their life. They believe that external factors such as luck, fate, injustice, bias, or prejudice control their lives. In contrast, an individual with internal LOC would likely be less neurotic and more composed, because they understand that their success is solely dependent on their own actions. This mindset often generates higher motivation, perseverance, and self-determination, which would make a person less neurotic and prone to anxiety.

The next relationship between FFM and LOC is extroversion. The relationship between extroversion on the FFM and LOC is r=.30 (Expectancy Theory.pptx,2020, p.11). The results show that there is a correlation between and individual with higher internal LOC and extroversion, although it is low. My interpretation of this result, is that an individual who is highly motivated and experiences less neuroticism, would likely be more outward with their energy and gain energy from others. A high internal LOC individual would also likely be more assertive (r=.46 on assertiveness), and willing to communicate their ideas to others without fear of being judged negatively.

The last relationship between FFM and LOC is conscientiousness. The connection between conscientiousness on the FFM and LOC is r =.69. This connection is strong and indicates that an individual with high internal LOC would also score high in conscientiousness. I think the reason for this is that an individual with high internal LOC has higher self-efficacy (the relationship was r =.64) and higher achievement striving (relationship was r= .55) than an individual with higher external LOC (Expectancy Theory.pptx, 2020, p.11). Self- efficacy refers to an individual’s belief in his or her ability to attain specific performance attainments. Self-efficacy is also indicative of an individual’s confidence in the ability to exert control over one’s own motivation, behavior, and even social environment. This correlates to an individual with higher internal LOC because and individual with higher internal LOC will believe that the events in their life derive primarily from their own actions, and tend to praise or blame only themselves and their abilities. Also, the reason why higher internal LOC individuals score high in conscientiousness is because their high strive for achievements. Achievement striving can be described as the innate ability to sail through tough times and have higher levels of perseverance to achieve goals. The description of achievement striving also connects to the description of an individual with higher internal LOC. A person with higher internal LOC will be more willing to stick with a task and persevere through it, because of they have the mindset that success is based solely on their own actions.

**(2.)** As a person who was typed as an INTJ, scored low on agreeableness, and scored average on the LOC, I believe that these traits impact the manner in which I enact leadership. I don’t focus most of my attention on group harmony and the concern of other’s, instead I focus more on achieving goals and desired outcomes in the most rational matter. For this reason, I believe that if I were a leader or a follower I would both utilize and or want my leader to use a situational approach that focused on directive behaviors. According to the Northouse 2016 7th edition text on page 94, Directive behaviors help group members accomplish goals by giving directions, establishing goals and methods of evaluation, setting timelines, defining roles, and showing how the goals are to be achieved. Directive behaviors clarify, often with one-way communication, what is to be done, how it is to be done, and who is responsible for doing it. I value knowing what my task is, how long I have to complete it, and knowing the guidelines for completing the task. For this reason, a situation approach that prioritizes directive behaviors is one I would incorporate if I was a leader, and is one I value most as a follower. However, there are 4 distinct categories of supportive and directive behaviors in which leadership styles are classified. These four styles are S1 which a high directive – low supportive style, S2 which is a high directive- high supportive style, S3 which is a low supportive- low directive style, and S4 which is a high directive – low supporting style (Northouse,2016, p.94).

I believe that I would use a different style as a leader, than as a follower. As a leader I would want to use an S2 coaching leadership style. The situational approach leadership style S2 is a high directive and high supportive style in which the leader focuses communication on both achieving goals and also meeting follower’s socioemotional needs. The coaching style requires that the leader by involved and encouraging to the followers while still remaining firm and making the final decisions (Northouse, 2016, p.94). I believe that this is the most effective for of leadership and forms the most trust and respect between leader and follower. However, according to the assessments I have taken, enacting this form of leadership would prove to be very difficult because I am very introverted and have low levels of agreeableness. In order to enact an S2 style of leadership I would have to work on improving my social skills so that I could better meet the socioemotional needs of my followers. Being disagreeable is actually a trait that I common in many leaders and correlates with being to direct and delegate tasks, but scoring too low on it can affect overall relationships with my followers which is why I think I will have to become slightly more friendly or accommodating.

As a follower I would want a leader to solely use a S1 leadership style. S1 leadership is a style of leadership in which the leader focuses on communication and goal achievement, and spends less time on using supportive behaviors. In this style the leader instructs his/her followers on what the goals are and how to achieve them, and also supervises the followers (Northouse,2016, p.94). I value this leadership style the most as a follower, because I just want know what the goal is, how to achieve it, and then be left alone to complete it. Since I scored high on thinking rather than feeling on the MBTI, and also average on the LOC, I don’t feel the need to constantly be encouraged or supported emotionally. I have enough self-efficacy, internal lotus of control, and motivation to be assigned a task and still remain confident enough in my ability to complete it. However, since I scored high on neuroticism on the FFM, if I do make a mistake, then I would appreciate it if my leader would ease my anxiety by telling me it’s okay and that they don’t expect blunders like this from. For all of the reasons I’ve listed so far, I think that a high directive- low supportive style suits me the best.

I’ve mentioned what type of leadership I want to enact as well as what type of leadership I would want my leader to enact, but I haven’t yet gone over what type of follower I would actually be. Using the Kelley typology (1992) I believe that I would be an exemplary follower. Exemplary followers are effective followers that self-manage and think for themselves, exercise control and independence, and work without supervision. These types of followers also show strong commitment to organizational goals as well as their own personal goals. Additionally, these types of followers build their competence, master job skills, are credible, and ethical, (Kelley, 1998, 2008; as cited in Northouse, 2008, p. 298). The reason I think I would classify as an exemplary follower is because I believe I have many of the attributes listed above. Also, I think my personality traits indicate that I have am likely to be an exemplary follower. As an INTJ I am usually very goal oriented, like completing tasks, take criticism well, value systems and organization, and am good at coming up with ideas and strategies. I think that these traits correspond with the attributes of an exemplary follower. In addition, as a scorer with average LOC I also have an average amount of self-efficacy, motivation, and perseverance to complete any task. While this may not sound like an attribute for an exemplary follower, I think that if I am in a setting in which I am proud of the work I do, then I would have much more self-efficacy and motivation to complete a personal or group goal than an average person.

**(3.)** Based upon the results of the assessments I’ve taken at the end of each chapter in Northouse, I’ve come to the conclusion that my preferred leadership style is one in which I prioritize technical and conceptual skills over humans’ skills, display higher task behaviors than relationship behaviors, and use a directive and achievement-oriented leadership style. One of the first test I recall taking and saving my answers for was the skills inventory at the end of the skills approach chapter. The skills inventory made me add up my scores for technical, human, and conceptual skills. I scored 24 on technical skills which is considered high. I scored 16 on human skills which is considered moderate, and I scored 23 on conceptual skills which is considered high. Leadership skills are defined as the ability to use one’s knowledge and competencies to accomplish a set of goals or objectives (Northouse,2016, p.44). So, it seems that the leadership skills that I utilize most often to achieve a set of goals and objectives are technical and conceptual skills, while still using a moderate amount of human skills.

Technical skill is knowledge and proficiency in a specific type of work or activity. It includes being competent, having analytical ability, and having the ability to use appropriate tools and techniques to complete a task (Katz, 1955) as cited in (Northouse,2016, p.44). Scoring high on technical skills indicates that I like knowing specifically what a work or activity entails, and having the ability to understand and complete that work or activity using my analytical ability and different techniques. For example, I a am majoring in IST with a focus on the design and development option. Before I go out in the workforce, I want to have a very strong understanding of multiple different types of software languages, programming, and how to design, develop, and implement a variety of different software applications. My future career and success are directly correlated with having a strong understanding of a specific area. For this reason, I believe that this is why I tend to prioritize technical skills above the other two skills I was tested on, even in situations in which having higher conceptual skills or human skills would be more beneficial. I think that having auxiliary extroverted thinking, directly correlates to prioritizing technical skills as well. Extroverted thinking is all about rationality, effectiveness, and completing goals. Since I have extroverted thinking high in my Jungian cognitive functions stack, I think that is one of the reasons why I prioritize technical skills since I see it as effective and important.

For conceptual skills, my results were also high. Conceptual skills are described as the ability to work with ideas and concepts. The difference between conceptual skills, technical skills, and human skills, are that technical skills deal with things, human skills deal with people, conceptual skills involve the ability to work with ideas (Northouse, 2016, p.44). I do believe that conceptual skills are vital, especially as a leader. A leader has to be able to have a vision for the direction he/she would like to lead his/her organization and or followers. A leader must also be able to have a long-term strategic plan in order to make the visions or ideas an actually possibility through action. If I were ever to be in a leadership position I would focus heavily on the technical aspects, but would also be focused on the long-term goal and vision for the success of my company, followers, and myself. I believe that having dominant introverted intuition in my Jungian cognitive stack directly correlates with my ability to see the big picture, and easily come up with long term plans to achieve future goals, and help strengthen my overall conceptual skills.

The last skill I was tested on in the skills inventory, was human skills. I scored a 16 which would be considered moderate. Human skills are described as being sensitive to the needs and motivations of others, while also taking into account others’ needs in one’s decision making. In essence, human skills are the capacity to get along with others as you go about your work (Northouse, 2016, p.44). I do believe that having human skills is vital in all aspects of life, but I tend to not prioritize human skills as much as technical or conceptual skills. The reason I don’t focus as much on human skills is because I am introverted and typically become drained when I am around other’s for too long. Also, I tend to focus more on results, goals, ideas and task completion, rather than actual people.

Overall, the skills inventory was a fun and quick assessment, and the results indicated to me that I prefer to focus more on technical and conceptual skills rather than human skills. My results also showed me that if I am a leader than I would likely be more focused on coming up with long term strategies, refining my techniques and competencies in a specific area, and would more likely direct my followers, rather than spending time on the needs and emotions of my followers. The results also show me that I have skills that would suit middle management rather than top management. The reason for this is that I still need to work on and improve my human skills, since human skills are more important than technical skills in top level management (Northouse, 2016, p.44).

Another assessment I took, was the leadership behavior questionnaire at the end of the behavioral approach chapter. The leadership behavior questionnaire is designed to measure two major types of leadership behaviors: task and relationship. It is important to understand the behavior approach because the central purpose of the behavioral approach is to explain how leaders combine both task and relationship behaviors to influence followers in their efforts to reach a goal (Northouse,2016, p.71). More specifically, task behaviors facilitate goal accomplishment. Task behaviors facilitate goal accomplishment by helping group members to achieve their objectives. Inversely, relationship behaviors help followers feel comfortable with themselves, with each other, and with the situation in which they find themselves (Northouse,2016, p.71). I scored a 41 on task, and 32 on relationship. A score of 41 is deemed as being in the high range, and a score of 32 is deemed as being in the moderately to low range. According to my results my preferred leadership behavior is task oriented. A leadership behavior style with an emphasis on tasks refers to the degree to I help others by defining their roles and letting them know what is expected of them (Northouse,2016, p.89). According to my results, I mainly utilize task-oriented behaviors. This means that my leadership style is focused on facilitating goal accomplishment and helping my follower reach their overall goal, rather than helping my followers feel comfortable.

The last end of chapter assessment I would like to review is the path-goal leadership questionnaire. The questionnaire contained questions relating to the different styles of path goal leadership. The different styles of path goal leadership are directive leadership, supportive leadership, participative leadership, and achievement-oriented leadership. Directive leadership is described as a leadership style in which the leader gives instructions about their task, how it is to be done, and when it should be complete (Northouse,2016, p.117). In essence, directive leaders set clear standards of performance and makes the rules and regulations clear to followers. Supportive leadership is described as being a leadership style in which leadership consists of being friendly and approachable as a leader and includes attending to the well-being and human needs of followers (Northouse,2016, p.117-118). Leaders who use supportive behaviors also tend to go out of their way to make work pleasant for followers. Participative leadership is described as a leadership style in which leadership consists of inviting followers to share in the decision

Making process (Northouse,2016, p.118). A participative leader consults with followers, obtains ask his/her followers for ideas and suggestions, and then integrates their ideas and suggestions into the decisions making process on how the organization will proceed. The last style of path goal leadership is achievement-oriented leadership. Achievement oriented leadership is described as a leadership style that is characterized by a leader who constantly challenges followers to perform at high levels. An achievement-oriented leader establishes a high standard of excellence for followers, seeks continuous improvement, and shows a high degree of confidence that his/her followers are capable of establishing and accomplishing challenging goals (Northouse,2016, p.118). After taking the path-goal leadership questionnaire, I scored a 28 on directive style, 18 on supportive style, 23 on participative style, and 24 on achievement-oriented style. According to the results my directive and achievement-oriented styles would be considered high, my participative style is average, and my supportive style is low. These results line up with my previous assessments, as well as, personality traits. I have lower human and social skills and tend to focus more on completing tasks and achieving goals. In order to complete tasks and achieve goals, I find it most effective to set guidelines, delegate tasks, set deadlines, and encourage my followers to effectively towards their goal because it would benefit us all. For this reason, the path-goal leadership styles of directing and achievement orientation are ones I would most likely utilize.

Considering the results from my personality trait tests and the end of chapter assessments, I have concluded that is interrelationships among the test. My personality trait tests indicate that I am very introverted, prefer making decision on logic instead of feelings and values, prioritize my own concerns over the concerns of others, and I like setting guidelines and completing tasks on time. My end of chapter assessments suggest that I have low social skills and tend to not be very support my follower on a socioemotional level, have high technical and conceptual skills, and prioritize the use of directive and or achievement-oriented path-goal leadership styles. I believe that being introverted and having low human skills is directly correlated since I am energized by focusing my energy inwardly rather than outwardly to others. Scoring high in technical skills also correlates to me scoring higher in thinking than feeling and lower in agreeableness, because I tend to focus on being competent and mastering a specific field rather than making people feel comfortable and happy. Lastly, since the manner in which I come to conclusions is through judgement, my conscientiousness is higher than average, and I have a decent amount of self-efficacy, my leadership behavioral style is more task oriented. I tend to focus on task behaviors because I like completing work and goals in an efficient manner. This means setting timelines, knowing what the roles in a given task are, and how to complete the task. Overall, my personality trait test and end of chapter tests both gave me similar results, which means there is definitely a relationship between personality trait tests and leadership style assessments.

My preferred leadership style or method will be most or least effective depending on different situations and circumstances. Triadic reciprocal determinism (TRD) is often utilized as a conceptual and analytical model in studies using social cognitive theory (SCT) as a theoretical framework, representing relationships among an individual's behavior, personal factors, and the environment. According to this theory by Albert Bandura, an individual's behavior influences and is influenced by both the social world and personal characteristics. In addition, the Mumford et al skill’s model examines the relationship between a leader's knowledge and skills (i.e., capabilities) and the leader's performance. The capabilities that make effective leadership possible. The skill-based model of Mumford’s group has five components: competencies, individual attributes, leadership outcomes, career experiences, and environmental

Influences (Northouse,2016, p.47). By looking at my leadership style though the lens of the SCT and the Mumford et all skills model, I can have a clearer understanding of which factors positively or negatively effect my leadership method.

The first factor that effects how effective my leadership method will or will not be, are personal/individual factors. Personal/individual factors include personality, emotions, cognition, and physiology. According to the Mumford skills model, in order to be competent an individual needs to have problem solving skills, social judgement skills, and knowledge (Northouse, 2016, p.46). Since I am introverted and disagreeable my social judgement skills would be poor. This would affect my overall competency negatively and would be noticeable in situations or circumstances in which I would have to work with people or have to quickly establish new relationships. However, I value problem-solving skills and knowledge because I prefer making decisions based on thinking rather than feeling. Therefore, in situations where I need to rely solely on problem-solving skills or having extensive knowledge in a particular field, I would excel. Basically, my social skills limit the effectiveness of my leadership method and situations in which I would need to rely on these skills, would likely be problematic for me. However, my problem-solving skills and knowledge are high, so situations in which I would need to rely on these skills would be beneficial for me and would improve the effectiveness of my leadership method and my overall competencies, leading to a positive leadership outcome.

Another factor that effects how effective or ineffective my leadership method is in a given situation or circumstance is behavioral. Behavioral factors include actions, choices, achievements, and learning. Choices, actions, achievements, and learning correlates with a lot with the LOC. For example, an individual with high internal LOC would have higher motivational levels which is an individual attribute in the Mumford’s skills model that affects overall leadership outcomes and performance. Therefore, an individual with higher internal LOC would be more motivated, have higher self-efficacy, and would be less neurotic than an individual with higher external LOC. My results on the LOC assessment indicated that I had an average internal LOC. For this reason, I believe that my individual attributes or more specifically, my motivational level and overall self-efficacy, would neither be advantageous or disadvantageous to my overall leadership outcome. Situations or circumstances in which having high levels or motivation and perseverance would not hinder or improve the effectiveness of my leadership method.

The last factor that effects how effective or ineffective my leadership method is in a given situation or circumstance is environmental. According to the Mumford’s skills model, environmental influences deals with individual attributes, as well as, leadership outcomes (Northouse, 2016, p.48). Environmental influences represent factors that lie outside the leader’s competencies, characteristics, and experiences. These environmental influences can be either internal or external. Typically, environmental influences are a part of the skills model but not usually under the direct control of the leader (Northouse, 2016, p.55). Internal environmental influences affecting leadership performance can include such factors as technology, facilities, expertise of subordinates, and communication. Essentially, internal environment is the usually the tools needed to complete tasks. My effectiveness as a leader and even as a follower is greatly increased if I have the supplies necessary to actually complete my tasks to reach my goals. For example, I want to be able to design and implement software applications. If I have a personal computer, with a plethora of software creation tools, and access to instructions online, then I can accumulate more knowledge and complete tasks in my field a lot easier than if I didn’t have the proper equipment. External environmental influences include economic, political, and social

issues, as well as natural disasters, have the potential to negatively impact a leader (Northouse, 2016, p.55). External environmental factors would most likely negatively impact my leadership method. For example, if a natural disaster struck and my company or organization was wiped out, then remaining positive and motivated might be hard for me and also my followers, since it is likely we won’t be able to effectively work and meet our organization’s goals.

**(4.)** There are several advantages to viewing leadership from the trait approach. First, it fits clearly into the popular idea that leaders are special people who are out front, leading the way in society. Second, a great deal of research validates the basis of this perspective. Third, by focusing exclusively on the leader, the trait approach provides an in-depth understanding of the leader component in the leadership process rather than on the follower perspective. Last, it has provided some benchmarks against which individuals can evaluate their own personal leadership attributes (Northouse,2016, p.40). The trait approach is a useful tool to analyze one’s own strengths and weaknesses.

Using the MBTI, I’ve learned that I am introverted, intuitive, prefer thinking over feeling, and make decisions based on judgement. These are the traits that make up my personality, and they are also the traits that I am strong at using. However, the traits that I don’t utilize often can be considered “blind spots”. My introversion means that I am self-reliant, independent, and often think before I speak. These are all very useful and beneficial traits, but being introverted also means that I have difficulty forming relationships, dislike small talk, can only be around people for short bursts of time, and can come across as aloof. These traits can be considered negative, especially in a leadership position because a leader has to have strong human skills. Leaders with human skills adapt their own ideas to those of others. Furthermore, they have the ability to create an atmosphere of trust where employees can feel comfortable and secure in their environment. Leaders with human skills also create an environment where their followers can feel encouraged to become involved in the planning of things that will affect them (Northouse, 2016, p.45). Having low human skills due to my introversion means that creating an atmosphere of trust, security, and encouragement in the decision-making process will be a blind spot for me.

The next personality trait of the I have is intuition. Intuition is the ability to understand something without conscious reasoning. It can also be described as a sixth sense, instinct, or hunch. Individuals who are intuitive tend to be big picture oriented, more future focused, and have a clear vision of the future. The ability to have a strong vision of the future is a conceptual skill that is central to long term strategic planning for an organization as a CEO (Northouse, 2016, p.45). Being intuitive might be useful for long term strategic planning, but it also means that I struggle with small details, remaining in sync with my five senses, and tend to dismiss experience in favor for newer theoretical approaches. Not being adept at noticing small details can be a blind spot for me since it could affect my technical skills, and more importantly, my knowledge. Even though I scored high in technical skills, if I don’t pay attention to the smallest details in a specific area, then I won’t have truly mastered a specific field and my overall knowledge won’t be where I need it to be to complete my goals. Knowledge is related to the application and implementation of problem-solving skills in organizations. It directly influences a leader’s capacity to define complex organizational problems and to attempt to solve them (Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, et al.,2000) as cited in (Northouse,2016, p.51). If I don’t understand every detail in relation to a complex organizational problem, then my problem-solving skills will diminish and I won’t be an effective leader that can lead his followers through organizational problems.

The next personality trait I have according to the MBTI, is a preference for thinking over feeling. This means that I prefer to make decisions based on logic and reasoning, rather than values and group harmony. Having a higher preference for thinking over feeling also means that I would likely have higher problem-solving skills. The criteria for good problem solving is determined by the originality and the quality of expressed solutions to problems. Good problem solving involves creating solutions that are logical, effective, and unique, and requires critical thinking (Zaccaro et al., 2000) as cited in (Northouse, 2016, p.53). Focusing on logic over feelings would be a criterion of good problem-solving skills, which is important for a leader to have. However, a blind spot of this personality trait is the fact that in situations which require making the follower feel comfortable and secure, I would struggle with. More specifically I would struggle with incorporating supportive leadership. Leaders using supportive behaviors go out of their way to make work pleasant for followers. In addition, supportive leaders treat followers as equals and give them respect for their status (Northouse, 2016, p.118). Since I prefer making logical decisions, I would prefer to delegate or direct tasks instead of going out of my way to make work pleasant for my followers. Solely delegating and directing tasks instead of meeting my follower’s emotional needs can make my followers feel unappreciated, unmotivated, and not respected.

The last personality trait I have according to the MBTI, is making decisions through judgement. Being a judger means that I like having deadlines, completing tasks and goals, and knowing what to expect ahead of time. A potential blind spot of being a judger is that I place more of an emphasis on task and job requirements than I do on people. A style of leadership that is similar to this is the authority-compliance (9,1) style of behavioral leadership. The 9,1 style of leadership places heavy emphasis on task and job requirements, and less emphasis on people, except to the extent that people are tools for getting the job done. Communicating with subordinates is not a priority except for the purpose of giving instructions about the task.

This leadership style is result driven, and people are often regarded as tools to that end. The 9,1 leader is often seen as controlling, demanding, hard driving, and overpowering (Northouse,2016, p.75). If I become to focused on simply completing a task and getting results than that that could negatively impact my relationship with my followers and will make it more difficult to complete a task since I wouldn’t be surprised if a follower decided they didn’t want to be apart of an organization with a leader that views them as tools. Therefore, I need to be always be conscious of the fact that setting goals, completing tasks, and delegating tasks is fine, but viewing followers as only tools to get a job done is a terrible mindset to have as a leader.

A potential blind spot in regards to my FFM results, is my low score of agreeableness. Scoring low on agreeableness means that I tend to prioritize my own concerns over the concerns of others. It also means that I tend to be more confrontational, less friendly, and bossier than people who score high on agreeableness. A leadership style that famous disagreeable leaders through history have displayed, is pseudo transformational leadership. This term refers to leaders who are self-consumed, exploitive, and power oriented, with warped moral values (Bass & Riggio, 2006) as cited in (Northouse,2016, p.163). Pseudo transformational leadership is considered personalized leadership, that focuses on the leader’s own interests rather than on the interests of others (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999) as cited in (Northouse,2016, p.163). This leadership style has proven to be one of the most dangerous in human history. I understand that scoring low on agreeableness does not mean I will end up being some evil dictator. However, I know that if I become too self-absorbed, power oriented, and have a leadership style that solely serves my own needs than I can become the worst kind of leader…an evil one.

A potential blind spot in regards to the LOC assessment I took, would be my average result. An average result means that I understand that most things are in my control, however, there are outside forces that I can’t control. Also, my motivation and self-efficacy levels are average. This means I have a decent amount of confidence in my ability to complete most tasks, and can persevere through most tasks, but not always. The reason why I believe this could be a blind spot is because in order to be a leader that inspires, exudes self-confidence, and shows competence, you have to be highly motivated and can motivate your followers to have equally as high motivation and self-efficacy. Charismatic leaders can forge a link like this with their followers by emphasizing the intrinsic rewards of work and deemphasizing the extrinsic rewards. Throughout the process, leaders express high expectations for followers and help them gain a sense of confidence and self-efficacy (Northouse, 2016, p.165). Being a charismatic leader that has the behavior of showing competence, expressing confidence, and arousing motives will be much more difficult to do if the leader doesn’t have motivation to lead his followers to work towards a common vision. For this reason, I believe that my average motivation and self-efficacy isn’t enough if I wish to be a leader that can transform his followers into the best versions of themselves. Hence, why I consider average LOC to be a blind spot.

**(5.)** Leadership development, as a type of human development, is a process that takes time; it is incremental in nature, it is accretive; and it is the result of interactions between the leader, others, and the social environment. Therefore, effective leadership development realizes that leaders develop and function within a social context; and, although individual-based leader development is necessary for leadership, it is not sufficient. Leadership requires that individual development is integrated and understood in the context of others, social systems, and organizational strategies, missions, and goals (Olivares et al.,2007, p. 79) as cited in (Olivares, 2008, p.531). Furthermore, experiences that are beneficial to leadership development possess traits or characteristics that mirror the processes of human agency and goal setting. Essentially, beneficial developmental experiences are goal and task-relevant, are socially embedded, require reflectivity, pose a challenge, and enhance overall self-efficacy (Olivares,2008, p.538). The main idea Olivares is trying to get across is that leadership development is process that builds upon itself gradually. Also, even though the leader can become more effective by focusing on his strength and weaknesses and improving themselves, ultimately a leader can only become more effective by improving in a social context. Therefore, my goals and leadership development plan should incorporate goals that will help me improve on an individual basis, as well as, help me improve in regards to the context of others. My goals should be challenging, increase my confidence in my abilities, remain relevant to the tasks I want to pursue, and affect others.

After I figure out what goals I want to accomplish, it is important that actions follow. People need to make things happen and to see themselves as the agents of their actions (Bandura,2006) as cited in (Olivares,2008, p.536). It is important that a leader view himself as the one responsible for achieving his own goal of developing as a leader. However, to be an agent, and or responsible for your own growth does not necessarily mean that one solely operates and grows independently. Agents’ experiences are directed toward others; that is, we are constructed by our relations with others. People not only influence themselves but they can also influence others, through working collectively to achieve a common goal (Bandura, 2006) as cited in (Olivares, 2008, p.536). Not only should my goals be centered around individual growth, and growth in regards to being part of a collective, my actions should also be centered around improving myself and the collective so that I can better influence others to work towards a common goal with me.

Now that I have an idea on what the leadership development process entails, and also what kind of goals I should be working towards, it is time to actually create a development plan. I will be using the same template from the goal setting activity that I completed with my group. **The template:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Goal**  What is the desired outcome? | I want to improve my human skills so that I can create an environment in which my followers feel safe and secure around me. Also, I want to become better at communicating my ideas in a less directive and bossy way, while at the same time, encouraging my followers to not be afraid to share their own ideas. |
| **Benefits of Achieving Goal**  Impact to team and organizational effectiveness | Actively communicating will result in a more engaging environment where all parties feel comfortable sharing their ideas and ensure that everyone’s opinions are heard. Also, having developed human skills with help with forming relationships, inspiring followers, and instilling trust and loyalty among my followers. |
| **Current Behavior**  Describe your current behavior that you wish to STOP (Unskilled, Overused, or a Problem) | I am rather reserved so I tend to avoid talking a lot or expressing any kind of encouragement to others. When I do communicate, I tend to be very direct and to the point. I can also be passive aggressive when a member isn’t performing at the level I expect. |
| **Some Causes for Me**  What drives my behavior? | I’ve focused my energy inward all my life so I always stuck to myself growing up. This is the reason why I am introverted and is also the reason why I am self-reliant and have high standards of success form myself and especially others. Also, I have an innate drive to want to succeed and hate failing. So when I see others not performing I get annoyed a bit too easily. |
| **Future Behavior**  What is the desired behavior and/or actions that you want to START and/or CONTINUE that will help you achieve your goal? | 1. Work on communicating with my group members or followers in a less direct and sometimes passive aggressive way. 2. Focus on building stronger relationships with my followers rather than only delegating tasks and giving orders. 3. Even if a follower doesn’t perform at my expectations, I will be more patient and understanding. I will ask what is limiting them from performing well and try to help fix it. 4. Lastly, I will work on incorporating stress relief techniques so that I can remain calm in any situation. I am high in neuroticism, so I believe learning to relieve stress will be greatly beneficial on an individual and social level. |
| **Obstacles and Possible Solutions**  To achieving goal | I’ve been introverted and direct all my life. So focusing on the needs of other’s instead of my own needs will be very challenging. |
| **Success Factors**  (How will you know you are making progress?) | I will know I have succeeded in accomplishing my goals, because I will notice that I will be less neurotic, more patient, friendlier, encouraging productive flow of conversation, building relationships, and building trust and loyalty with my followers. |
| **Feedback and Support**  Individuals you trust that can offer you support and/or guidance as well as feedback on your success | I trust that my group members, family, friends, and even teachers will offer guidance if I don’t constantly work towards my goals. For example, If I am being too direct and bossy during a group assignment my group members will let me know. I have already told them I wish to fix my shortcomings, and they have agreed to help. |
| **Resources**  What are other learning resources to use in achieving this goal? | Reviewing this paper, the theories we’ve discussed in class, looking over the discussions, watching videos and stress reliving techniques, asking for advice from my therapist, etc. |

Looking over my paper, I have realized that the main shortcoming I want to improve upon is my human skills. The results of all the assessments I’ve taken indicate that I prefer logic, completing tasks, setting goals and achieving them, and directing others, farm more than I try to build relationships, encourage, and inspire my followers. One way I could work towards my goal of improving my human skills is by using the LMX approach. The LMX approach is a leadership style in which the focus on is centered around interactions between leader(s) and followers (Northouse, 2008, p. 140). I realized, as a leader I could aid in the development of my goal (improving my human skills) by utilizing the power of the in-group. A leader can work on a stronger relationship with followers to get them in the in-group. Followers in the in-group feel more confident and receive more concern from the leader (Northouse, 2008, p. 141). If I work on improving my relationship with my followers and make them feel like they can trust me, then in theory they will be more likely to be exemplary followers who communicate, share ideas, and feel confident enough tell me if I am making mistakes as a leader. In response to being exemplary followers who are part of an in-group, I can give these followers more responsibilities, more activities, and will do more than what’s necessary to make these followers feel inspired and motivated (Northouse,2016, p.138). Even if I am not in a leadership position, and instead a follower, I would still want to improve my human and social skills so that I can form a strong relationship with the leader and be part of the in-group. As a follower in the in-group I will receive more information, influence, confidence, and concern from my leader (Northouse,2016, p.138). Being part of the in-group as a follower will also give me the experience, I need to better understand my followers once I become a leader, since I will have been in their position.

Another way I can work on overcoming my shortcoming or blind spots as a leader is using a coaching leadership style instead of a directive leadership style. The situational approach is constructed around the idea that followers need different leadership styles depending on a given situation. In the situational approach leaders need to how to adapt their leadership styles to what their followers need (Northouse, 2016, p.97). For this reason, it is important that I can become adaptable and incorporate whichever leadership style best suits my followers. Currently I display s1 directive behaviors, due to having low human skills and prioritizing task completion. As a follower I don’t mind having a leader with an s1 directive high directive low supportive style. However, as a leader I really want to not only command and lead my followers, but also build on my human skills by learning how to also support my followers, in conjunction to directing them. For this reason, I believe that utilizing an s2 coaching leadership style would be the best approach to work on my shortcomings, while still incorporating my strengths in a leadership position. If I learn how to use both high directive and high supportive styles, then in the future my goal is to be able to switch between any of the 4 behavioral styles. But for now, I want to learn how to use an s2 coaching style effectively. In this approach, the leader focuses communication on both achieving goals and meeting followers’ socioemotional needs. The coaching style requires that the leader involve himself or herself with followers by giving encouragement and soliciting follower input. However, coaching is an extension of S1 in that it still requires that the leader make the final decision on the what and how of goal accomplishment (Northouse, 2016, p.94). Mastering this leadership style will help me in figuring out how to meet my follower’s socioemotional needs, encouraging them, and inspiring them, while also enabling me to still use directive behaviors since it coincided with my personality.

Overall, after taking the personality tests, end of chapter assessments, figuring out my blind spots, and learning how to deal with my shortcoming, I have a far greater understanding of myself and also how I want to improve as both a leader and a follower. I am grateful for learning about so many different types of leadership theories and learning how to connect them all in a way that helps me become a better leader and follower. To some this may have been an annoying paper to write, but to me this was life long knowledge that I will 100% utilize for the rest of my life. Thank you for this opportunity!
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