

HOW TO SELECT A TRUE LEADER? INTRODUCING METHODS FOR MEASUREMENT OF IMPLICIT POWER MOTIVE*

Nataša Trojak**

Zvonimir Galić***

Received: 6. 9. 2018

Accepted: 15. 5. 2020

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30924/mjcmi.25.1.13>

Review

UDC 005.5-057.17

Abstract. *Organizations mark the life of every individual, and the success and well-being of an individual largely depends on the success of organizations they belong to. The success of an organization is significantly influenced by those who are in charge of it, leaders or managers, so it is important for organizations to choose those who will do this job well. There is a large number of studies with the subject of successful leadership, and the dominant ones are those in which the traits of a successful leader are investigated. One of the traits identified as an important element of a leader's success is the power motive. It consists of implicit and explicit dimensions, and the implicit dimension has been shown to be an important, and yet mostly overlooked, determinant of leadership performance. Measurement of the implicit dimension requires specially crafted instruments, including the "classic" Thematic Apperception Test, as well as recently introduced instruments such as the Implicit Association Test and the Conditional Reasoning Test for Power Motive. In this paper, we argue that introduction of the tests that assess implicit power motive to human resource management practice of business organizations might significantly improve selection procedures for leadership positions.*

Key words: *power motive, implicit and explicit personality, Thematic Apperception Test,*

Implicit Association Test, Conditional Reasoning Test

1. INTRODUCTION

People have always formed organizations. Joint action enables them to achieve a number of goals they would not be able to achieve on their own. That is why individuals join organizations, from families to companies in which they are employed to various associations or sports clubs. Our paper focuses on leadership as one of the most important elements of all organizations.

Yukl and Lepsinger (2004) argue that the key factor explaining the difference between successful and unsuccessful organizations is leadership, whereas Hogan (2007) states that the success or failure of an organization to a large extent depends on the characteristics of those responsible for those organizations. Joyce et al. (2003) demonstrated that chairmen of management boards "account" for 14% of organizational performance. Successful leaders, compared

* This paper was funded by the Croatian Science Foundation under the project no. 6719.

** Nataša Trojak, MSc, Algebra University College, Ilica 242, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia, Phone: +38512222159, E-mail: natasa.trojak@algebra.hr

*** Zvonimir Galić, PhD, Associate professor, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Ivana Lučića 3, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia, Phone: +38514092216, E-mail: zgalic@ffzg.hr

to average leaders, bring an additional \$ 25 million of value to an organization (Barrick, 1991). There is a whole range of research that demonstrate the relationship between leadership and organizational success (e.g., Harter et al., 2002; McClelland and Boyatzis, 1982; Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991; Winter, 1991).

Bearing in mind the importance of leadership for the success of organizations, and thus of the individuals involved in them, it is easy to conclude that the future of an organization largely depends on the choice of the right person to lead it. This fact has been known for centuries; Confucius, Plato and many other philosophers of the ancient times wrote about leadership, and interest in this subject has lasted until today. Despite of this extensive research, there is still no generally accepted, unanimous answer to the question “*Who shall lead?*”. According to Burns (1978), leadership is one of the most observed and least-understood phenomena. Incomplete knowledge of leader’s performance determinants obviously results in a poor choice of those who should lead. According to some research, poor selection results in as many as 50% of leader careers ending in failure (Dailey, 2011; Winsborough and Hogan, 2015; Riddle, 2016). Although the causes of that failure can be attributed to numerous factors (such as market competition or general economic situation), personal factors that are related to psychological characteristics seem critical (Furnham, 2010). If leadership is viewed from an employee’s perspective, the situation is not much better. As much as 65-75% of employees believe that the worst aspect of their job is related to their immediate superior (Hogan and Kaiser, 2005). Thus, Hogan and Kaiser conclude that leadership is important for two reasons. First, it solves the problem

of organizing the collective effort, resulting in organizational success. Secondly, and more important for the moral aspect of leadership, bad leaders cause terrible distress to those who are subject to their domination. If we wish to increase the successfulness of organizations and the well-being of their members, the need for further study of leadership is obvious.

Previous leadership studies can be categorized in different ways. Most commonly, this is done through three basic groups of leadership models: (1) trait models, (2) behavioural models and (3) contingency models (Buble, 2000). Trait models are based on the assumption that some people possess psychological characteristics (i.e., traits) that make them successful leaders. Research in this area has had the task of identifying those traits. Behavioural models assume that all successful leaders behave in the same way, so people who want to be successful leaders have to learn the appropriate leadership style. Contingency models argue that there is no one style of leadership that is always successful and that the style of leadership behaviour needs to be adjusted to the situation in which leadership takes place (Buble, 2000).

The trait model is the oldest one. Although the formal development of the model based on traits began with Galton’s book “*Hereditary genius*” (1869) and the so-called Theory of Great Man popularized by Scottish philosopher Thomas Carlyle (Zaccaro, 2007), the traits of good leaders have been explored since the ancient times. DeVries (1993) suggests that leader’s personality affects the strategy, organizational culture and even the structure of an organization to such an extent that it often happens that organizations cannot be successful unless attention is paid to the inner psychological world of the leader.

In other words, the individual traits of the leader contribute significantly to the organization's success. The interest never subsided but it significantly strengthened in the early 21st century, mainly due to the parallel development of personality psychology, but also because of the growing pressure on business organizations and their successfulness (see Hogan, 2007 for an overview).

At a time when competition is global and unstoppable, every element that can contribute to an organization's success is important. We believe that the power motive is one of the key leadership elements. The significance of this trait was observed in research from the second half of the last century (e.g., McClelland, 1975; Winter, 1973). Numerous studies, which have been carried out for more than 40 years, confirm that the power motive is one of the important determinants of a leader's success, and show that it has both a conscious/explicit and an unconscious/implicit component (e.g., Winter, 1991; McClelland and Burnham, 2003). Recently, particular emphasis has been given to its implicit component (e.g., James et al, 2013; Sheldon et al., 2007; Slabbinck et al., 2013). With the development of new instruments for measuring implicit personality dimensions, new opportunities for studying the implicit dimension of the power motive and its application in the business context are being developed.

This paper consists of three parts. In the first part, the power motive in the context of leadership will be described. The second part presents the characteristics and differences between the implicit and explicit component of traits, including the power motive. The third part describes three instruments for measuring the implicit dimensions of the power motive.

2. THE POWER MOTIVE IN THE CONTEXT OF LEADERSHIP

Power is a concept that has a great significance in a broad social context. It is especially important for business organizations. According to Clegg (2004), power lies in the centre of managerial practice and theory. It is a concept that encompasses mechanisms, processes and dispositions employed to ensure that employees stick to "the rules of the game" (though not always successfully). In organizations, exercise of power is unavoidable. The importance of the power motive in the context of leadership derives from the very definition of leadership. To lead means to influence people so that they contribute to collective goals of the organization (Wehrich and Koontz, 1998), and leadership is exercised when people mobilize institutional, political, psychological, and other sources to stimulate, engage, and meet the motives of followers (Burns, 1978).

Various definitions describe leadership in somewhat different ways, but almost all have two common elements. The first is the common achievement of (common) goals. The second important element, especially from the aspect of power, is the ability of an individual – leader, to influence other people. If we look at power as a desire to influence others (James et al., 2013) or as an expression of authority over others, i.e. ability to manage situations or people (Petz, 2005), then it is logical to conclude that the power motive is among key individual differences that might be related to organizational leadership. The responsibility for motivating followers is at the hands of the leader. Leader is a person who needs to put effort into directing their activities to achieve the goals mutually. To take on the activities of

directing others, it is necessary to have the motivation to do so. That motivation, the power motive, represents one of the individual characteristics of a leader.

The power motive, in literature also referred to as power motivation or need for power, is manifested by the desire and tendency to influence and control the behaviour of others (Winter, 1973). The assumption is that people with this motive will want to “climb” to higher organizational positions that include guidance and influencing others as the most important job tasks (Sikavica et al., 2008). According to Winter (1992), the power motive is the desire to have influence over other people, their behaviour and their emotions. Kotter (2003) argues that the skill of acquisition and use of power is a key element of success in large organizations. Successful leaders use power to influence people they are dependent on, with the goal of doing their job effectively. For Kotter, importance of having power is a necessary consequence of dependence on others. A person who does not have an inclination toward activities such as organizing and managing group activities, negotiating, lobbying, imposing necessary discipline, or who gets emotionally excited because of such activities or believes it is wrong to use power over others, will not be able to meet the requirements of a leader’s job (Miner, 1985).

According to James et al. (2013), the power motive is the primary force that motivates an individual to seek leadership positions. The broad definition of power motivation also includes a whole range of intertwined concepts such as influence, inspiration, care, authority, leadership, control, domination, coercion, and aggression. All these concepts, as well as the

power motive, have one common element, and that is the inclination to influence the behaviour or feelings of another person or group of people. However, as Winter (1973) points out, the power motive must be separated and distinguished from other psychological and sociological concepts of power, such as the roles and statuses that enable power, the skills to use power and the sense of power. Power motive is not and cannot be an isolated concept, but together with the aforementioned concepts, it determines the way it is channelled into certain behaviours.

The research of power motives in the organizational context began in the second half of the last century. Even though the contribution of Veroff and Veroff (1971) and Winter (1973) in this area is also very important, McClelland’s research first clearly showed that the power motive is an important element of successful leadership. Throughout a series of studies in various business organizations, McClelland (1975) noticed that managers must first and foremost influence others and, therefore, have a strong motivation for power. In accordance with that, he concluded that researching the power motive can lead to important insight into how efficient leaders work and that leadership and power are two closely related and interrelated concepts (McClelland, 1975). Based on his research, he also concluded that the same motive can be observed in two different ways: as explicit and implicit motive (McClelland et al., 1989). Since explicit and implicit motives influence behaviour in a different way, but co-exist and influence behaviour at the same time, McClelland saw them as two different motive systems. These motive systems are two components of McClelland’s model of dual motives.

3. THE MODEL OF DUAL MOTIVES - IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT MOTIVES

According to the McClelland's dual motives model (1975; 1989), it is necessary to distinguish between implicit and explicit components of psychological motives. The two components of motives are linked to specific and different behavioural characteristics, respond to different incentives and reflect different types of needs (Heckhausen and Heckhausen, 2010). McClelland (1987) came to this discovery by exploring the achievement motivation. In his studies, he noted that the motives captured by the self-assessment of desires or interests on psychological questionnaires (explicit dimension) largely differed from the motives assessed through the stories participants gave while depicting ambiguous drawings intended to arouse the same motive (implicit dimension).

The explicit dimension of a motive reflects the self-image of an individual and the way they explain their behaviour (McClelland and Burnham, 2003; McClelland et al., 1989). Explicit motives are under a strong influence of the social environment and social norms (Koestner et al., 1991; McClelland, 1985), and have a significant influence on cognitive choices, such as task selection or goal definition (McClelland, 1985; Spangler, 1992; Brunstein et al., 1998). Kehr (2004) also attributes the following features to explicit motives: they are very similar to values, they can be accessed on a conscious level and, along with goals and values, they are associated with intentions and the notion of self.

Implicit motives are affective tendencies towards certain incentives, probably acquired in early childhood (McClelland, 1987). The three functions of implicit

motives are selection, orientation and empowerment of spontaneous behaviour over time (McClelland et al., 1989). For example, a person with high implicit power motive has the desire to influence others. (S)he will select situations that provide the possibility to influence others and activities that enable him/her to achieve the results congruent with the power motive. In this situation, (s)he will focus his/her behaviour on influencing others. Because this behaviour is rewarding, it will occur more frequently. These motives are inaccessible to an individual's introspection and can only be measured indirectly. Implicit motives, as further defined by Kehr (2004), arise from basic human needs, and are aroused without conscious awareness. They determine affective preferences and implicit behavioural impulses, and reflect in spontaneous expression of behaviours.

In many cases, implicit and explicit motives differ: individuals' conscious image about them and their motives is not necessarily congruent with their unconscious tendencies and habits. In the best-case scenario, implicit and explicit motives work together, and the goals of an individual coincide with their implicit motives. However, such situations are not a rule; implicit and explicit motives are often in a discrepancy, which negatively affects efficiency, subjective well-being, and even mental health (Heckhausen and Heckhausen, 2010; Kehr, 2004). Considering that explicit and implicit motives are not related, to fully grasp the power motive it is necessary to cover both its explicit and implicit dimensions.

The most commonly used instruments for measuring the explicit dimension of the power motive are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Some frequently used instruments for measurement of the explicit dimension of the power motive

Instrument & authors	Description	Item examples
Dominance-Prestige Scale; Cheng, Tracy and Henrich, 2010	Dominance and prestige impact social models and social influence. A 17-item scale that captures two different strategies of competition for social standing.	“I enjoy having control over others.” (dominance) “Others seek my advice on a variety of matters.” (prestige)
Affective-identity motivation to lead from the Motivation to Lead questionnaire; Chan and Drasgow, 2001	A 9-item scale that captures an individual’s desire for leading others.	“Most of the time, I prefer being a leader rather than a follower when working in a group.”
Power motive from the Unified Motive Scale; Schönbrodt and Gerstenberg, 2012	A 6-item scale that asks about goals and behaviours that should be endorsed by individuals high in power motive	“To what extent is to you in your life important to: Be able to exert influence.” (goal) “I try to control others rather than permit them to control me.” (behaviour)

As we can see, explicit dimensions of motives are measured by “classic” psychological self-assessment questionnaires. Most of the instruments mentioned can also be used in other-ratings format in order to capture the expression of a particular motive, which is not possible with implicit measures.

4. MEASURES OF THE IMPLICIT DIMENSION OF THE POWER MOTIVE

The measurement of psychological characteristics, since they are not “visible to the naked eye” always represents a challenge, and scientific measurement of their implicit aspects is especially demanding. Intention of implicit measurement methods is to capture those parts of psychological functioning that reside outside conscious control, and, therefore, a person cannot consciously control or reliably self-report about (Gawronski and De Houwer, 2014; Šverko et al., 2011). By leading respondents into a situation where they project their inner psychological functioning onto

the testing material (Hock, 2004), implicit measures circumvent potential defensiveness that is maybe present when respondents describe their personality traits on explicit measures (Pervin et al., 2005) and reveal the underlying inhibited tendencies the respondents are unwilling or unable to admit (Murray, 1943). That is why they can be measured only by special instruments. Current research is mainly based on three methods: The Thematic Apperception Test, The Implicit Association Test and The Conditional Reasoning Test.

4.1. Thematic Apperception Test (TAT)

The Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) was first presented to the public in 1935 (Morgan and Murray, 1935). It is based on the assumption that, when faced with ambiguous social situations depicted in TAT stimuli and required to interpret probable events that take place in that situation, individuals reveal their unconscious psychological characteristics (i.e., their implicit motives). During such an interpretation,

the individual focuses on the image and interpretation of this image, not on himself/herself, so (s)he is less inclined to be defensive, less self-conscious, and, consequently, inclined to discover more about his/her inner psychological life (Tomkins, 2015). As the defensive mechanisms in such a situation are inactive and weak, the individual unintentionally reveals his/her inner desires, fears and other experiences. This allows the researchers to access the contents the respondents are otherwise unable or reluctant to report. The authors of this test (Morgan and Murray, 1935; Murray, 1943), as well as all the researches that followed (Wyatt, 1947; Murstein, 1963; Winter, 1973; Lundy, 1988; Lilienfeld et al., 2000), show that in such a way respondents can reveal basic inner themes that drive them. Owing to the fact that it can be adjusted to assess different psychological needs, the TAT is one of the most commonly used instruments to assess aspect of unconscious/implicit motives. In addition to scientific research, the test has been most frequently used for

therapeutic and counselling purposes in the field of clinical psychology, but its application can also be found in the business world for human resources management and/or market research purposes.

The test consists of black-and-white images showing different people in several ambiguous situations. For each measurement, it is important to select the images that arouse the assessed motive. It is usually recommended to use between four and eight images per measurement (Schultheiss and Pang, 2007) and appropriate selection of pictures for power motive according to Smith (1992) are pictures like ship captain, two women in lab coats in a laboratory or a trapeze artist. An example of such an image used for power motive measurement is shown in Figure 1. The respondents' task is to construct a story about each image that will describe what has led to the situation in the picture, what is happening now, what will happen in the future and what people in the picture think or feel.



Figure 1. Example of an image used in the Thematic Apperception Test

Source: Smith, C.P. (1992). *Motivation and personality: Handbook of thematic content analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Testing can be performed individually or in small groups. At the beginning of the process, the researcher reads the instructions that tell respondents to be creative while making a story about the social situations that take place on the TAT pictures. After the instructions are read, each image is displayed for 10-15 seconds. After that, the respondents write stories on a paper or on a computer, for which they have five minutes. Variants of this procedure are possible (e.g., respondents can process the material on their own, via a brochure containing instructions, images and list of papers to write stories). Once all the stories have been collected, the data coding follows. Coding is conducted according to coding systems that can be found in the scientific literature (e.g., Smith et al., 1992; Atkinson, 1958). The most commonly used method for coding power motive is the Winter's methodology (Winter, 1973). Before the researcher starts coding the collected data, it is necessary to practice coding for which there are materials available. It is also possible to include several coders in the coding of the same material, which depends on the experience of the researcher coding the collected material.

The psychometric characteristics of the TAT should be viewed in the context of the specificity of the test. The first specificity relates to the use of different images and different number of images in the research of the same motive. This actually means that the test is different each time, which psychometrically represents a problem. Furthermore, coding can be performed as per different systems (e.g., Veroff, 1957; Uleman, 1966; Winter, 1973), and this inconsistency makes the psychometric evaluation more difficult.

The reliability and validity for one coding system do not have to mean that the results will also be valid for another scoring

system (Groth-Marnat, 2003). However, if data collection and story coding are conducted properly the reliability of the test should be adequate with reliability coefficients being .85 or higher. The validity reviews vary. Hock (2004) considers that if a test measures certain psychological processes, then it should be able to distinguish between normal and mentally ill persons, or different mental states, and the TAT fails to do so. It is also questionable to what extent it can predict behaviour. Furthermore, it has not yet been established with certainty to what extent the TAT can reach the "real me" and to what extent it measures only the existing state or situation at the time of data collection. Despite the fact that TAT did not reach the standard validity levels, a part of the scientific community believes that validity, as defined by the classic test theory, is not a necessary precondition for TAT's constructive validity (Heckenhausen and Heckenhausen, 2010).

While the discussion about psychometric characteristics still persists, most scientists agree that TAT's positive characteristics justify its popularity in scientific and applied community. The power motive has been measured for years with this methodology, starting with McClelland's research in the 1970s, through Winter's research in the organizational and political context, and contemporary research in the Schultheiss's Human Motivation and Affective Neuroscience Lab. However, though the test can certainly be valuable in scientific and some applied purposes (e.g., counselling), its usefulness in organizations is limited by its impracticality which stems from the tiresome process of story scoring. Recently, newer approaches to implicit personality measurement that are both scientifically valid and practically convenient have been proposed. Among them, the most promising seem the Implicit Association Test and the Conditional Reasoning Tests

for implicit personality measurement.

4.2. Implicit Association Test (IAT)

The Implicit Association Test (Greenwald et al, 1998) was initially designed to measure implicit social cognition, such as attitudes towards certain groups. The development of the test made it also appropriate to be used for self-concept measurement. Nowadays the test has been applied broadly in the fields of social, developmental and clinical psychology but also in applied fields such as forensic psychology or marketing. Most importantly for our story, the test seems to be a promising tool for implicit power motive measurement (e.g., Parmač Kovačić et al., 2015; Sheldon et al., 2007, Slabbinck et al., 2011).

IAT for measuring self-concept is based on the idea that implicit personality consists

of many associations between the concept of self and different attributes. The strength of these associations can be measured with the tasks in which the respondents have to sort different stimuli into the correct category as quickly as possible. Considering that responses take usually well below a second, the speed makes the researchers assume that the responses are not the result of a process which is deliberate and under respondent's control (De Houwer and Moors, 2007). Faster responses point to the congruence of the stimulus and the self-concept. This can be explained on the example of IAT for measuring the implicit power motive. In this test, the target stimuli come from contrasted target categories (e.g., me, others, I, them, etc.) and contrasted attribute categories (e.g., serve, dominate, lead, etc.). Figure 2 shows two print screens that illustrate the test.




Figure 2. Sample items from the IAT

The subjects have the task to classify stimulus “serve” into the correct category by pressing the correct keyboard key (E for the left option and I for the right option). In this example, a cooperative individual will sort the stimuli “serve” into the congruent me/cooperation category faster than into the incongruent not me/cooperation category. A dominant individual will sort the same stimuli faster into me/

dominance, than into the not me/dominance category.

The relative strength and the direction of the connection of target categories is expressed by the D-score (or the D-measure) that quantifies the difference in the response times between incongruent and congruent stimuli. Its range theoretically varies between -2 and 2 but it rarely exceeds the

range between -1.5 and 1.5 (Greenwald et al., 2003). In our example, positive D-score indicates a stronger association between the self-concept and cooperation, while negative value indicates a stronger association between the self-concept and dominance. Absolute value indicates the strength of the association: the higher the D-score, the stronger the association between the self-concept and the attribute. For example, an individual who has D-score on the IAT for power motive measurement +1.40 shows a strong link between the self-concept with power and dominance, while D-score of -1.42 reveals a strong relationship of the opposite pole: the self-concept with cooperation.

The psychometric characteristics of the IAT are the subject of numerous researches. As with TAT, the results of psychometric checks differ depending on the variants of the test. Depending on what they measure, and what stimuli, attributes and target concepts are selected, every IAT has its own specifics and differences in relation to other tests. The reliability of internal consistency obtained by a meta-analysis of fifty researches is respectable .79 (Hofmann et al., 2005). The test-retest results are also satisfactory. In an analysis of twenty studies in which intervals ranged from several minutes up to one year, the test-retest reliability ranged from .25 to .69 (Lane et al., 2007). Additional analyses of this area still needs to be expanded. Meta-analysis by Hoffman et al. (2005) found correlation of .24 between the IAT and explicit measures of related constructs. Several studies also found that it successfully predicts a range of social behaviour (McConnell and Leibold, 2001; Maison et al., 2004; Lane et al., 2007; Greenwald et al., 2009).

Unlike the TAT, the benefits of IAT lie in an economical implementation of testing

and processing of the results. The test is also fully objective considering that the scores are fully independent from the assessor's interpretation. Nevertheless, researchers can still influence the quality of research via the choice of target concepts and attributes. This is also demonstrated by a research in which two versions of the IAT were designed to measure the power motive and compared on Croatian population (Parmač Kovačić et al., 2015). The versions differed by the attribute categories names and partly by the stimuli used to represent those categories. In the first version of the IAT, as attribute categories the researchers used "power" and "helplessness", while in the other version they used "domination" and "cooperation". In the second version, the attributes used are more uniform per evaluative meaning than in the first version, and the results showed that these two versions result in significantly different conclusions about the development of the implicit power motive. In this particular case, the version of IAT that contrasted domination with cooperation was a much better predictor of other ratings of dominance than the version that contrasted power with helplessness. Even though IAT's criticisms are numerous (see Azar, 2008 for an overview), its application in practice is becoming more frequent. Having in mind its convenience, it might be expected that the popularity of its use for scientific and applied purposes will continue to grow.

4.3. Conditional Reasoning Tests (CRT)

The Conditional Reasoning Tests for implicit personality measurement were designed by Lawrence R. James and his associates (James, 1998). Their intention was to create tests that keep all the advantages of existing implicit personality measures but also: (1) keep and improve the indirect

nature of measurements, (2) keep the use of multiple different stimuli in the assessment process and (3) keep the independence of the new implicit personality measure from the existing explicit measures of the same construct (James and LeBreton, 2012). They wanted to overcome the psychometric and practical limitations of the most often used implicit personality instruments such as TAT, and create a fully objective test that has standardized and economical test administration and scoring.

Having in mind the criteria, James and associates created instruments that capture motive-based cognitive biases individuals use to justify their behaviour. According to James (1998), those biases largely reside in the unconscious and frequency of their occurrence in a respondent's reasoning reflects the strength of the motive theoretically linked to the measured biases. More precisely, the test is based on the knowledge of defence cognitive processes that individuals apply to create an artificial sense of rationality for behaviours that are governed by their innate desires. Knowledge about these defence mechanisms, can be used to design the tasks that at first glance seem to be only reasoning tasks used for the measurement of cognitive abilities.

For each problem, responses are generated that are based on the defence

cognitive processes individuals use to rationalize and justify their behaviours. Individuals are attracted to those responses containing a justification for behaviours that are present in their defensive thinking. Those invisible biases in what individuals consider as a reasonable explanation for their behaviour reveal the implicit personality. In this way, those biases can be measured objectively, and valid conclusions on implicit motives can be drawn based on those measurements.

So, the measurement within the conditional reasoning paradigm is based on the principle that individuals with a strong motive (desire) to engage in certain behaviours will develop biased (i.e. defensive) ways of thinking according to which the behaviour will seem rational and meaningful rather than irrational and frivolous. Those biases in the way of thinking are called justification mechanisms. Individuals with different motives and behaviours develop different justification mechanisms and often differ, in consistent and predictable ways, in what they consider to be reasonable behaviour (James and LeBreton, 2012). Each task consists of a situation description and four potential conclusions that relate to that situation, as shown in the following example taken from the CRT for power motive (James et al., 2013).

Table 2. A sample item from the Conditional Reasoning Test for Power motive (CRT-P)

Situation description	Potential conclusions
Participative leadership involves inviting subordinates to share in discussions and decision-making with their leader. Together, the leader and subordinates generate and evaluate ideas, and then attempt to reach a consensus about what should be done. Subordinates are often more committed to a course of action when they have had a chance to participate in deciding what it will be. Based on the above, which one of the following provides the most logical reason for using participative leadership?	<p>The subordinates are independent and prefer to work alone.</p> <p>The leader is strong and has definite ideas about what should be done.</p> <p>The subordinates are well informed about the problem at hand.</p> <p>The subordinates are uncooperative and do not work well together.</p>

The respondents are asked to choose the response, i.e., the conclusion they find attractive or logical in relation to the described situation. Even though the respondents think that the choice depends on their rational reflection on the described situation, the conclusion they choose actually reflects their justification mechanism. In this case, the respondents who are looking at the situation from the perspective of leaders will choose alternative *b*. This answer implies the power motive. On the other hand, those who analyse the situation from the employee perspective will choose alternative *c*. These are the respondents with weak power motive. Alternatives *a* and *d* are illogical, and they are enhancing the impression that this is a reasoning test.

The conditional reasoning test was initially developed to measure implicit aspects of achievement motivation (James, 1998), and aggressiveness (James et al., 2005), but today it is used to measure certain aspects of leadership (James et al., 2013), team orientation (O'Shea et al., 2004), delays, absenteeism and withdrawal (Nieminen, 2012), addiction tendencies (Bowler and Bowler, 2014), and creativity (Schoen et al., 2016).

The conditional reasoning test for power motive measurement (James et al., 2013) captures four justification mechanisms or motive-based cognitive biases: agentic bias, social hierarchy bias, power attribution bias, and leader intuition bias. According to James et al. (2013), those are the biases that individuals high on implicit power motive often use to see their behaviour as rational and logically justified. The first mechanism is the Agentic Bias, whereat people with a strong power motive tend to confirm ideas, plans and solutions of the initiators of activity and instinctively see situations and conclude about them from the perspective

of those initiators. The second mechanism is the Social Hierarchy Orientation, which consists of implicitly accepting the hierarchical structure of authority as the primary form of human organization. The Power Attribution Bias reflects in the connection of the use of power with positive behaviour, values and outcomes. Taking initiative and responsibility, determination and influence on others is considered a precondition for the survival of every known organization, its stability, efficiency and success. The fourth mechanism is the Leader Intuition Bias, where people with a strong power motive believe that experienced managers have the ability to quickly find quality strategies because of their superior intuition. Specially designed inductive reasoning tasks, such as the one described in the example earlier, enable us to assess the occurrence of these biases in an individual's reasoning and, therefore, identification of individuals with high power motive suitable for leadership positions.

The first research included 101 managers of a large retail stores from a national chain. The results show that those with the highest scores on the CRT for power motive had higher profit, meaning that they are more successful than other managers (James et al., 2013). In an unpublished research (Galić et al., 2017), the results on conditional reasoning test for power motive correlated with a managerial position (.19) and level in the organizational hierarchy (.21). These results indicate CRT for power motive as a potentially useful instrument for predicting managerial potential in organizations.

A number of studies have confirmed the satisfactory psychometric characteristics of this instrument (James et al., 2005; LeBreton et al., 2005; Berry et al., 2010; Galić et al., 2014). The conditional

reasoning test for power still represents a work-in-progress, but Galić et al. (2020) showed that there is evidence about its convergent and discriminant validity. The same analysis also showed that CRT for power is less fakeable than self-reported measures. This relatively new instrument requires additional psychometrical checks and currently there are several attempts underway to improve this test. Still, the test has a strong potential for identifying future successful leaders while retaining full practical convenience needed for personnel selection procedures.

5. CONCLUSION

Even though the understanding of implicit and explicit dimensions of personality is not new (cf. McClelland, 1975; Winter, 1973), leadership research has long been dominated by instruments that capture only explicit psychological functioning, neglecting a large proportion of individuals' psychological functioning. One of the reasons for that was the lack of practical instruments for the assessment of implicit parts of personality for human resource management purposes. In that field, the Thematic Apperception Test has been dominantly used. However, the complex implementation of this test, the lengthy and complex scoring process, and sometimes questionable psychometric characteristics have led to the almost exclusive use of questionnaires (i.e., explicit measure). Business decisions, primarily in the selection process, were mainly made on the basis of self-assessment and evaluation of responses collected through interviews.

An increasing number of studies (e.g., Uhlmann et al., 2012; James and LeBreton, 2012) show that implicit personality aspects, such as implicit power motive,

significantly affects organizational behaviour. Work performance is a consequence of work behaviour, and work behaviour is the result of both explicit and implicit aspects of personality. Therefore, it is important to include both components of an individual's psychological functioning for the prediction of work behaviour. New instruments, such as the described IAT and CRT might facilitate this process due to their strong scientific base and practical convenience.

This is particularly important when leaders in business organizations are selected in the selection process, because the success of the organizations they lead largely depends on them. Previous research shows that most leaders are unsuccessful in carrying out their tasks. This fact can lead to the conclusion that the procedures that were used for selection do not provide a complete picture of traits and need to be supplemented. Therefore, we suggest to include instruments for measuring implicit personality components, such as the IAT and the CRT, in selection processes. As Slabbinck et al. (2018) suggest, different implicit measures capture different components of implicit personality; therefore, using more different instruments for measurement of implicit power motive can provide a better picture about the personality of a future leader and improve selection. The practicality of both measures allows their easy application and does not require much time for result analysis. Also, these instruments have predictive value for leadership positions, which can also improve the selection decisions and ultimately, overall organizational performance. In this paper, we aimed to describe currently available instruments that can be used to capture the power motive and improve leadership selection.

REFERENCES

1. Atkinson, J. W. (Ed.) (1958). *Motives in fantasy, action, and society: A method of assessment and study*. Oxford, England: Van Nostrand.
2. Azar, B. (2008), *IAT: Fad or fabulous?*, available at: <http://www.apa.org/monitor/2008/07-08/psychometric.aspx> (12.08.2016.)
3. Barrick, M. R., Day, D. V., Lord, R. G., Alexander, R. A. (1991), Assessing the utility of executive leadership, *Leadership Quarterly*, 2(1), 9-22.
4. Berry, C. M., Sackett, P. R., Tobares, V. (2010), A meta-analysis of conditional reasoning tests of aggression, *Personnel Psychology*, 63(2), 361–384.
5. Bowler, J. L., Bowler, M. C. (2014), Evaluating the fakability of a conditional reasoning test of addiction proneness, *International Journal of Psychology*, 49(5), 415-419.
6. Brunstein, J. C., Schultheiss, O. C., Grässmann, R. (1998), Personal goals and emotional well-being: The moderating role of motive dispositions, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(2), 494–508.
7. Buble, M. (2000). *Management*. Split: Ekonomski fakultet.
8. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
9. Chan, K. Y., Drasgow, F. (2001), Toward a Theory of Individual Differences and Leadership: Understanding the Motivation to Lead, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 481-498.
10. Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Henrich, J. (2010), Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status, *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31(5), 334-347.
11. Clegg, S. R. (2004), *Managing Power and Politics in Organizations*, available at: http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/5252_Clegg_I_Proof_Chapter_5.pdf (10.11.2016.)
12. Dailey, P. R. (2011), Why Leaders Fail, *European Business Review*, available at: <http://www.europeanbusinessreview.com/leaders-fail/> (12.05.2018.)
13. De Houwer, J., Moors, A. (2007), How to define and examine the implicitness of implicit measures in Wittenbrink, B., Schwarz, N. (Eds.), *Implicit measures of attitudes*, The Guilford Press, New York, 179–194.
14. DeVries, D. L. (1993). *Executive selection: A look at what we know and what we need to know*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership
15. Furnham, A. (2010). *The elephant in the boardroom*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
16. Galić, Z., Ružojčić, M., Bubić, A., Trojak, N., Zeljko, L., LeBreton, J. M. (2020), Measuring the motive for power using conditional reasoning: some preliminary findings, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2020.1745882.
17. Galić, Z., Scherer, K. T., LeBreton, J. M. (2014), Validity Evidence for a Croatian Version of the Conditional Reasoning Test for Aggression, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 22(4), 343–354.
18. Galić, Z., Trojak, N., Ružojčić, M., Zeljko, L. (2017), Spremnost preuzeti odgovornost? Validacija hrvatske verzije testa uvjetovanog rezoniranja za mjerenje motiva za moć, presented at: 23. Dani Ramira i Zorana Bujasa, 6.-8. April 2017, Zagreb, book of abstracts

- available at: <http://darhiv.ffzg.unizg.hr/id/eprint/8811/1/DRZB2017-Knjiga-Sazetaka.pdf> (20.04.2018.)
19. Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary Genius*. Macmillan and Co. Reprinted available at: <http://galton.org/books/hereditary-genius/text/pdf/galton-1869-genius-v3.pdf> (20.05.2018.)
 20. Gawronski, B., De Houwer, J. (2014), Implicit Measures in Social and Personality Psychology, in Reis, H. T., Judd, C. M. (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (2nd Edition), Cambridge University Press, New York, 283-310.
 21. Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998), Measuring Individual Differences in Implicit Cognition: The Implicit Association Test, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1464-1480.
 22. Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., Banaji, M. R. (2003), Understanding and using the Implicit association test: I. An improved scoring algorithm, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 197-216.
 23. Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E. L., Banaji, M. R. (2009), Understanding and Using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-Analysis of Predictive Validity, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(1), 17-41.
 24. Groth-Marnat, G. (2003). *Handbook of psychological assessment*. New Jersey: Wiley & Sons.
 25. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Hayes, T. L. (2002), Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.
 26. Heckhausen, J. and Heckhausen, H. (2010). *Motivation and Action*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 27. Hock, R. R. (2004). *Četrdeset znanstvenih studija koje su promijenile psihologiju*. Zagreb: Naklada Slap.
 28. Hofmann, W., Gawronski, B., Gschwendner, T., Le, H., Schmitt, M. (2005), A Meta-Analysis on the Correlation Between the Implicit Association Test and Explicit Self-Report Measures, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(10), 1369-1385.
 29. Hogan, R. (2007). *Personality and the Fate of Organizations*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
 30. Hogan, R., Kaiser, R. B. (2005) What We Know About Leadership, *Review of General Psychology*, 9(2), 169-180.
 31. James, L. R. (1998), Measurement of personality via conditional reasoning, *Organizational Research Methods*, 1(2), 131-163.
 32. James, L. R., LeBreton, J. M. (2012). *Assessing the Implicit Personality Through Conditional Reasoning*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
 33. James, L. R., LeBreton, J. M., Mitchell, T. R., Smith, D. R., DeSimone, J. A., Cookson, R., Lee, H. J. (2013), Use of Conditional Reasoning to Measure the Power Motive, in Cortina, J. M., Landis, R. S. (Eds.), *Modern Research Methods for the Study of Behavior in Organizations*, Routledge, New York, 233-264.
 34. James, L. R., McIntyre, M. D., Glisson, C. A., Green, P. D., Patton, T. W., LeBreton, J. M., et al. (2005), Conditional Reasoning: An efficient indirect method for assessing

- implicit cognitive readiness to aggress, *Organizational Research Methods*, 8(1), 69-99.
35. Joyce, W. F., Nohria, N., Roberson, B. (2003). *What really works: The 4+2 formula for sustained business success*. New York: Harper Business.
36. Kehr, H. M. (2004), Abilities: the Compensatory Model of Work Motivation and Volition, *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3), 479-499.
37. Kirkpatrick, S. A., Locke, E. A. (1991), Leadership: Do Traits Matter?, *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(2), 48-60.
38. Koestner, R., Weinberger, J., McClelland, D. C. (1991), Task-intrinsic and social-extrinsic sources of arousal for motives assessed in fantasy and self-report, *Journal of Personality*, 59(1), 57-82.
39. Kotter, J. P. (2003), Power, dependence, and effective management, in Porter, L. W., Angle, H. L., Allen, R. W. (Eds.), *Organizational influence processes*, Routledge, New York, 127-141.
40. Lane, K. A., Banaji, M. R., Nosek, B. A., Greenwald, A. G. (2007), Understanding and Using the Implicit Association Test: IV, in Wittenbrink, B., Schwarz, N. (Eds.), *Implicit Measures of Attitudes*, Guilford Press, New York, 59-102.
41. LeBreton, J. M., Binning, J. F., Adorno, A. J. (2005), Subclinical Psychopaths, in Thomas, C., Segal, D. L. (Eds.), *Comprehensive Handbook of Personality and Psychopathology, Personality and Everyday Functioning*, Wiley, New Jersey, 388-411.
42. Lilienfeld, S. O., Wood, J. M., Garb, H. N. (2000), The Scientific Status of Projective Techniques, *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 1(2), 27-66.
43. Lundy, A. (1988), Instructional Set and Thematic Apperception Test Validity, *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52(2), 309-320.
44. Maison, D., Greenwald, A. G., Bruin, R. H. (2004), Predictive Validity of the Implicit Association Test in Studies of Brands, Consumer Attitudes, and Behavior", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14(4), 405-415.
45. McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
46. McClelland, D. C. (1987), Characteristics of Successful Entrepreneurs, *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 21(3), 219-233.
47. McClelland, D. C., Boyatzis, R. E. (1982), Leadership motive pattern and long term success in management, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(6), 737-743.
48. McClelland, D. C., Koestner, R., Weinberger, J. (1989), How do self-attributed and implicit motives differ?, *Psychological Review*, 96(4), 690-702.
49. McClelland, D. C., Maddocks, J. A., McAdams, D. F. (1985), The need for power, brain norepinephrine turnover and memory, *Motivation and Emotion*, 9(1), 1-10.
50. McClelland, D., Burnham, D. H. (2003), Power is the Great Motivator, *Harvard Business Review*, available at: <https://hbr.org/2003/01/power-is-the-great-motivator> (10.04.2017.)
51. McConnell, A. R., Leibold, J. M. (2001), Relations among the Implicit Association Test, Discriminatory Behavior, and Explicit Measures of Racial Attitudes", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37(5), 435-442.

52. Miner, J. B. (1985), Sentence completion measures in personnel research: The development and validation of the Miner Sentence Completion Scales, in: Bernardin, H. J., Bownas, D. A. (Eds.), *Personality assessment in organizations*, Praeger, New York, 145-176.
53. Morgan, C. D., Murray, H. A. (1935), A method for investigating fantasies, *AMA Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry*, 34(2), 389-406.
54. Murray, H. A. (1943). *Thematic Apperception Test manual*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
55. Murstein, B. I. (1963). *Theory and Research in Projective Techniques (Emphasizing the TAT)*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
56. Nieminen, L. R. G. (2012), *The development and validation of a conditional reasoning test of withdrawal*, Doctoral Thesis, Graduate School of Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, available at: http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1465&context=oa_dissertations (23.08.2016.)
57. O'Shea, P. G., Driskell, J. E., Goodwin, G. F., Zbylut, M. L., Weiss, S. M. (2004), *Development of a Conditional Reasoning Measure of Team Orientation* available at: http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/army/rn_2004-10.pdf (23.08.2016.)
58. Parmač Kovačić, M., Galić, Z., Kušan, M. (2015), Usporedba dvije verzije testa implicitnih asocijacija za mjerenje motiva za moći, *Suvremena psihologija*, 18(2), 175-189.
59. Pervin, L. A., Cervone, D., John, O. P. (2005). *Psihologija ličnosti: teorije i istraživanja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
60. Petz, B. ur. (2005). *Psihologijski rječnik*. Jastrebarsko: Naklada Slap.
61. Riddle, D. (2016), *Executive Integration: Equipping Transitioning Leaders for Success*, Center for Creative Leadership, available at: <http://www.ccl.org/wpcontent/uploads/2015/04/ExecutiveIntegration.pdf> (12.05.2018.)
62. Schoen, J. L., Bowler, J. L., Schilpzand, M. C. (2016), Conditional Reasoning Test for Creative Personality: Rationale, Theoretical Development, and Validation, *Journal of Management*, 44(4), 1651-1677.
63. Schönbrodt, F. D., Gerstenberg, F. X. R. (2012), An IRT analysis of motive questionnaires: The Unified Motive Scales, *Journal of Research in Personality*, 46(6), 725-742.
64. Schultheiss, O. C., Pang, J. S. (2007), Measuring implicit motives, in Robins, R. W., Fraley, R. C., Krueger, R. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Personality Psychology*, Guilford, New York, 322-344.
65. Sheldon, K. M., King, L. A., Houser-Marko, L., Osbaldiston, R., Gunz, A. (2007), Comparing IAT and TAT measures of power versus intimacy motivation, *European Journal of Personality*, 21(3), 263-280.
66. Sikavica, P., Bahtijarević-Šiber, F., Pološki Vokić, N. (2008). *Temelji menadžmenta*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
67. Slabbinck, H., De Houwer, J. de, Van Kenhove, P. (2011), A pictorial attitude IAT as a measure of implicit motives, *European Journal of Personality*, 25(1), 76-86.
68. Slabbinck, H., De Houwer, J., Van Kenhove, P. (2013), Convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of the pictorial attitude implicit association test and the picture story exercise as measures of

- the implicit power motive, *European Journal of Personality*, 27(1), 30–38.
69. Slabbinck, H., Van Witteloostuijn, A., Hermans, J., Vanderstraeten, J., Dejardin, M., Brassey, J., Ramdani, D. (2018), The added value of implicit motives for management research development and first validation of a brief implicit association test (BIAT) for the measurement of implicit motives, *PloS ONE*, 13 (6), 1-29.
70. Smith, C. P. (1992). *Motivation and personality: Handbook of thematic content analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
71. Spangler, W. D. (1992), Validity of questionnaire and TAT measures of need for achievement: Two meta-analyses, *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 140–154.
72. Šverko, B., Zarevski, P., Szabo, S., Kljaić, S., Kolega, M., Turudić-Čuljak, T. (2011). *Psihologija*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
73. Tomkins, S. S. (2015). *The Thematic Apperception Test - the Theory and Technique of Interpretation*. New York: Andesite Press.
74. Uhlmann, E. L., Leavitt, K., Menges, J. I., Koopman, J., Howe, M., Johnson, R. E. (2012). Getting explicit about the implicit: A taxonomy of implicit measures and guide for their use in organizational research, *Organizational Research Methods*, 15(4), 553-601.
75. Uleman, J. S. (1966), *A new TAT measure of the need for power*, unpublished PhD thesis, Harvard University.
76. Veroff, J. (1957), Development and validation of a projective measure for power motivation, *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 54(1), 1-8.
77. Veroff, J. (1992), Power motivation, in Smith, C. P. (Ed.), *Motivation and personality – Handbook of thematic content analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 278-285.
78. Veroff, J., Veroff, J. B. (1971), Theoretical notes on power motivation, *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development*, 17(1), 59-69.
79. Weihrich, H., Koontz, H. D. (1998). *Menadžment*. Zagreb: Mate.
80. Winsborough, D., Hogan, R. (2015), *Bad Managers*, available at: https://237jzd2nbeeb3ocdpdcjau97-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Bad_Managers.pdf (12.05.2018.)
81. Winter, D. G. (1973). *The Power Motive*. New York: Free Press.
82. Winter, D. G. (1991), A motivational model of leadership: Predicting long-term management success from TAT measures of power motivation and responsibility, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2(2), 67–80.
83. Winter, D. G. (1992), Power motivation revisited, in Smith, C. P. (Ed.), *Motivation and personality – Handbook of thematic content analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 301-310.
84. Wyatt, F. (1947), The Interpretation of the Thematic Apperception Test, *Rorschach Research Exchange and Journal of Projective Techniques*, 11(1), 21-25.
85. Yukl, G., Lepsinger, R. (2004). *Flexible leadership: Creating value by balancing challenges and choices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
86. Zaccaro, S. J. (2007), Trait-based perspectives of leadership, *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 6–16.

KAKO ODABRATI PRAVOG VOĐU? UVOĐENJE METODA ZA MJERENJE IMPLICITNOG MOTIVA ZA MOĆI

Sažetak. Organizacije obilježavaju život svakog pojedinca, a o njihovoj uspješnosti ovise njihova uspješnost i dobrobit. Na uspjeh organizacije značajno utječu oni koji njima upravljaju – vođe, odnosno menadžeri, zbog čega je važno odabrati one, koji će taj posao dobro obavljati. Cijeli niz istraživanja bavi se temom uspješnog vođenja, a dominantna su ona u kojima se traže osobine uspješnih vođa. Jedna od osobina, koja je identificirana kao važan element uspješnosti vođe je i motiv za moći. On se sastoji od implicitne i eksplicitne dimenzije, a upravo se implicitna dimenzija pokazala važnom odrednicom uspješnosti vođenja. Mjerenje implicitne dimenzije

zahtijeva posebno kreirane instrumente, među kojima se ističe „klasični“ test tematske apercepcije, ali i novi instrumenti, kao što su test implicitnih asocijacija i test uvjetovanog rezoniranja. U ovom radu tvrdimo da uvođenje testova, koji procjenjuju implicitni motiv za moći, u upravljanje ljudskim potencijalima poslovnih organizacija može značajno poboljšati procese selekcije za vodeće pozicije.

Ključne riječi: motiv za moći, implicitna i eksplicitna ličnost, test tematske apercepcije, test implicitnih asocijacija, test uvjetovanog rezoniranja