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Social service programs have existed in society for decades, with many contemporary services tracing origins in Elizabethan times and practices to assist the vulnerable and poor. Philanthropic and government dollars have funded many of these programs. And while programs and social problems have changed over the years, the core of the system to address these issues has not. And while the services and programs have changed over time, the goal and purpose of these have always been to assist clients to change and improve their lives.

These services and programs are provided under the umbrella of many nonprofit social services agencies by front line workers. These front line workers provide a myriad of tasks within the structures of both the funding entity, the organization that employs them, and the supervisors and leaders who provide leadership to guide the process. The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between the front line workers’ perceptions of their supervisors’ styles of leadership and the self-efficacy level of those front line workers who motivate social service program clients to change and improve their own lives. The research question generated the following hypotheses: Perceived leadership styles relate to the front-line social service worker’s levels of self-efficacy; Transformational and Transcendental/Spiritual leadership styles will have a stronger relationship to front-line worker levels of self-efficacy than transactional and Laissez-faire non-leadership styles; and there will be differences in levels of self-efficacy between subgroups based on gender, age, years in relationship to the supervisor, and education level.
Through the integration of several conceptual frameworks, including leadership theories and self-efficacy, this study used a random sampling method of United Way funded partners in major metropolitan cities in several Midwestern states. United Way funded agencies were invited to participate because of the Live United branding which suggests some degree of philosophical and missional consistencies. Permission from a number of regional United Ways was granted to access the chief executives of funded partner agencies identified as part of the United Way Agenda for Change™ Education Change Initiative. Chief executives were invited to share an integrated survey instrument composed of the General Self-efficacy Scale, Bass and Avolio’s Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire to measure Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-faire Leadership, and Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership Assessment with front line workers in these social service agencies. From the random sample of front line worker participants, 103 completed the survey.

Results of descriptive statistics showed that front line workers have a high level of self-efficacy, which was not related to any demographic variables as shown by Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) tests. However, review of the descriptive statistics revealed remarkable characteristics of these front line workers including length of service and age which demonstrated commitment and dedication to their work. Results of Pearson-r correlation tests showed that self-efficacy levels were positively correlated to Transcendental/ Spiritual, Transformational, and Transactional Leadership styles. However, self-efficacy was shown to have a negative correlation to Laissez-faire/ non-leadership.

Conclusions that were drawn by this study were that front line workers showed high levels of self-efficacy for each of the three major leadership styles, with Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership showing the strongest correlation. This suggested that perhaps front line
workers in an organizational culture with a leader who articulates spiritual values may have a higher level of self-efficacy. Results also suggested that front lines workers have a high level of self-efficacy independent of leadership, indicating that perhaps their own professional and personal skills and individual resilience serve to complete the leadership experience rather than depend on it for their self-efficacy.

Implications for practice encourage leaders to seek out training opportunities to expand their own leadership skills and integrate the best practices of each of the three major leadership styles, and to seek out training that explores leadership styles and self-efficacy of workers in a simultaneous study. Further, recognizing the importance of self-efficacy for front line workers, leaders may wish to provide in-service training, professional development and personal reflective opportunities for their workers such as the ones they take for themselves. Lastly, important considerations for recruitment and retention of leaders and managers was offered, including identification of skills, attitudes, and behaviors consistent with Transcendental/ Spiritual and Transformational Leadership to assist organizations transitioning from periods of great difficulty and dysfunction.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Dream no small dreams for they have no power to move the hearts of men.

Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe (1749-1832) German poet, novelist and dramatist.

Forms of social philanthropy have existed for centuries and have their roots in biblical times. The struggle about what to do to assist others is echoed in the scriptures: “The poor you will always have with you and you can be generous to them whenever you wish, but you will not always have me” (Mark 14:7). These forms of philanthropy have given rise to numerous social programs funded through the years by both government and private sources. As social conditions have changed and new problems affecting the quality of life of the less fortunate have emerged, so have new programs and their accompanying funding streams, such as The Child and Adult Care Food Program, funded by the United States Department of Agriculture, or Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), funded by the United States Department of Health and Human Services. However, many social programs fail to assist people to achieve their highest level of self-actualization, which Maslow (1971) defines as functioning at the level of fulfillment as evidenced by self reported indication of life satisfaction. In addition, those who provide services to the poor often fail to operate from a level of inspired self-efficacy (Bullock, 2004; Early & GlenMaye, 2000). Often times those providing services to the poor do not have the support they need from leadership (Grant & Campbell, 2007). From this institutional cultural void, a disengaged system perpetuates disengaged processes and front-line workers that perpetuate the status quo among their clients; thus, the dismal cycle continues. Those who survive the challenges of the industry articulate the need for personal and professional support from administrators and supervisors (Westbrook, Ellis, & Ellett, 2006).
The ramifications of this disengaged system in contemporary society are systemic and pervasive. Front-line workers who feel unsupported in a vacuum either abandon the social service industry or abandon the vulnerable families they are assisting (Ellett, 2009). These struggling families either stress the system already functioning with shrinking budgets and resources or fall through the proverbial cracks only to resurface in more significant crisis. Complicating this bleak picture is a brewing perfect storm of poverty’s firm grip on the economy stirred into tornadic chaos simultaneous with a growing social discontent of government spending and shrinking philanthropic dollars. What results is an increasing impatience from funders and service providers directed at those in poverty to get control over their personal lives. There is a clarion cry for personal change at every level from systems to organizations to leadership to service delivery models and to recipients of services. How that change process needs to be facilitated and fostered is a broad and nebulous challenge. One place to start is with the role of the leader.

**Rationale**

Research exists exploring the relationship between leadership and the self-efficacy level of front-line workers in many industries, especially for profit business (Peterson, & Speer, 2000; Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang, & Shi, 2005). Research also exists that relates the self-efficacy level of the front-line worker to the level of self-efficacy and personal empowerment of the participating client (Early & GlenMaye, 2000; Everette, Homstead, & Drisko, 2007; Westbrook, Ellis, & Ellett, 2006). However, there has been little to no identifiable research correlating the perceived leadership style’s relationship to the front-line worker’s level of self-efficacy within the sphere of social service and the front-line worker’s sense of empowerment to assist clients. Lack of research in this area may be the result of an industry that has distanced the
notions of business from social services (Johnson, 2000). The present study measured perceived leadership styles of immediate supervisors on the continuum of Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Transcendental/Spiritual Leadership, and laissez-faire non-leadership and front-line workers’ level of self-efficacy within the context of social service nonprofit agencies.

In addition, most research in the field of strategic leadership has focused on the for-profit sector (Boal & Hoojberg, 2000) rather than on the non-profit sector (Phipps & Burbach, 2010). Evidence suggests that the type of leadership required for the non-profit sector is different from that found to be effective in the for-profit world (Thach & Thompson, 2007). Warren Buffet addressed the unique challenges nonprofit leaders face when he said,

The nature of the problems that a foundation tackles is exactly the opposite of business. In business, you look for easy things, very good businesses that do not have very many problems and that almost run themselves....In the philanthropic world, you’re looking at the toughest problems that exist. The reason why they are important problems is that they’ve resisted the intellect and money being thrown at them over the years and they haven’t been solved. You have to expect a lower batting average in tackling the problems of philanthropy than in tackling the problems of business.” (Buffett, 2003, p. D1)

Several related studies (e.g., Deluga, 1990; Gellis, 2001; Rank, Nelson, Allen, & Xu, 2009, and Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang, & Shi, 2005) have considered demographic variables and related diversity issues generally within the business and for profit sectors, but studies identified in the literature review of Chapter 2 that examined the relationship between leadership style and front-line worker self-efficacy within the social service sector placed very little consideration of demographic variables and diversity related issues. This may be a
reflection on sensitivity or a gap in the research. There may be a justification going forward to consider relationships between standard demographic variables and related diversity issues, leadership style, self-efficacy of front-line workers, and sense of empowerment within the social service nonprofit sector.

The exploration of the relationship between leadership styles and the self-efficacy of the front-line workers within the social service nonprofit sector is significant for the industry to draw important conclusions about the implication of organizational culture and leadership style and the relationship between organizational culture and empowerment practice as a consequence of self-efficacy so that organizations can be molded to enhance the self-efficacy and empowerment of members, thus reinforcing organizational power and, ultimately, personal change (Peterson & Speer, 2000). According to Ellett (2009), employing competent and qualified employees is critical when working with vulnerable families. In addition to competence and qualifications, there are also important personal and professional factors necessary to support service delivery to this population (Early & GlenMaye, 2000; McElroy, 2002).

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between the front-line worker’s perceptions of leadership styles and their level of self-efficacy. Motivated by a question posed by a professional colleague many years ago, “If we have all these social programs and philanthropic dollars, why do we not see positive change in the lives of the poor?”, this study examined the relationship between the social service agency supervisors’ perceived styles of leadership (Transformational, Transactional, Transcendental/ Spiritual or Laissez-faire/ non-leadership) as measured by Bass and Avolio’s Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Servant Leadership Behavior Scale, and the front-line worker’s level of self-efficacy as
measured by Schwarzer and Jerusalem’s General Self-Efficacy Scale. While the present study with its research limitations was not able to resolve the over-arching question, it did examine one aspect of the challenge by engaging front-line workers. This study invited front-line workers in social service agencies to reflect on the perceived leadership styles of their immediate supervisor and to reflect on their own level of self-efficacy as they assisted client participants in United Way funded programs under the Education Mobilization Initiative.

The United Way World Wide has catalyzed a movement of individualized change which has been adopted and implemented within the United Way of America and many local affiliates. This movement has been identified as the Agenda for Change™ and is characterized by an emphasis on programs that promote education, health and financial stability as vehicles to improve lives. These regional United Way offices use the Live United branding throughout their operations to generate a social momentum within the communities they serve, their funded partners, and various programs. Agencies in several Midwestern states that are identified as funded partners with the United Way and who were engaged in the Education Mobilization Initiative were selected for this study. The Education Mobilization Initiative was selected over the Health and Financial Stability Initiatives because this process has received attention first in many United Way agencies; therefore, it is more clearly branded and consistent. To provide a broad and varied sample, United Way affiliates and partner agencies with similar missions and programs were drawn from numerous metropolitan communities in several states. These programs included child care, early learning, youth, after school programs and other education related programs. While it is reasonable to infer that most agencies invited to participate in this study were serving vulnerable populations because they were located in urban areas where there are concentrated levels of poverty, it is possible that not all programs served only poor clients.
However, the filter of The United Way funding support remained constant providing some level of consistency of missions and programs.

Current figures available through Jobs and Family Services identify a Midwestern county at 11% unemployment with 27% of area families living in poverty. According to Give USA (2010 report) and data available through the United Way, a local area Community Foundation, and The Combined Federated Campaign, one county has nearly 250 social service nonprofits, rivaling the number of agencies serving metropolitans the size of Cleveland, Cincinnati, or Pittsburgh. With the superfluity of service providers, many who have been in existence for decades, why do we not see an improvement in the personal conditions of our most vulnerable citizens? To probe this overarching question, this research utilized United Way funded agencies to explore the social service industry in the Midwest by focusing on direct front-line social service workers to ask: Is there a relationship between the immediate supervisor’s perceived styles of leadership and the front-line worker’s level of self-efficacy as they work with clients to improve their lives?

**Research Question**

The following research question was explored:

What is the relationship between the front-line social service worker’s perception of leadership styles of the social service agency supervisors and the self-efficacy level of front-line social service workers?

This research question generated the following hypotheses:

1. Perceived leadership styles relate to the front-line social service worker’s levels of self-efficacy.
2. Transformational and Transcendental/Spiritual leadership styles will have a stronger relationship to front-line worker levels of self-efficacy than transactional and Laissez-faire non-leadership styles.

3. There will be differences in levels of self-efficacy between subgroups based on gender, age, years in relationship to the supervisor, and education level.

**Design of the Study**

Most of the research in the study of organizational leadership and self-efficacy within the social service sector has been done qualitatively through focus groups and purposive sampling (see, e.g., Boehm & Staples, 2007; Early & GlenMaye 2000; Ellett 2009; and Everette, Homstead & Dresko, 2007). This study sought to undertake a quantitative analysis to determine if important personal and professional factors identified qualitatively could be generalized to the population. Therefore, the descriptive and inferential statistics employed in this study allowed the findings to be explored and applied beyond the subjective scope of confined focus groups and personal interviews. A correlation test for relationships between pairs was also used. The study examined the correlation between the perceived leadership styles and the self-efficacy level of front-line workers. To explore these relationships, Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) explored group differences based on demographic variables and Pearson R correlation examined the relationship between leadership styles and self-efficacy levels. The sample for this study was composed of front-line workers from metropolitan social service agencies.

**Significance of the Study**

This study, which identified relationships between the leadership styles of social service agency leaders and the self-efficacy of front-line social service agency workers who work to motivate clients, will be of interest to not only the leadership of social service agencies, but also
funders of professional development programs, such as local community foundations which provide training in areas of leadership and which influence ongoing funding decisions among numerous funding sources based on measurable outcomes. As resources in the non-profit social service sector continue to shrink daily, those making important funding decisions will be interested in the dynamic between leadership, self-efficacy, and related empowerment models in effective organizations when determining resource allocations.

Social service agency leaders will recognize the important responsibility they have in establishing an organizational culture that supports self-efficacy within their workers through their leadership style. This study will also contribute to the body of information influencing the quality of services provided by front-line caseworkers in the field as they determine the effects of their own self-efficacy beliefs on those they serve as clients. This study may provide insight to illuminate the problem of insufficient improvement in the personal conditions of our most vulnerable citizens and suggest possible solutions for organizational leaders and front-line workers to consider in their organizational culture and individual practice.

Moreover, with regard to practitioners (in this case, supervisors and leaders of social nonprofit organizations), this study may potentially inform leadership practice to change and improve organizational culture, encourage engaged workers, and promote effective practice that may support improvement in the personal conditions of our vulnerable citizens. With regard to policy, this study may influence potential funding decisions based on effectiveness, influence the development of high-functioning partnerships, and influence practices within social service nonprofits to intentionally catalyze systemic and personal change.
Definition of Terms

The following terms were used in this study:

_Agenda for Change™_: a United Way of America branded initiative to promote systemic social change through funded programs in areas related to education, health, and financial stability.

_Client_: an underprivileged or vulnerable individual receiving program services.

_Front-line social service agency worker_: a licensed or degree holding professional providing social services to underprivileged or vulnerable participants.

_Empowerment_: for purposes of this study, empowerment is defined through integrating the notions of Gutierrez (1995) who described empowerment in terms of a reduction of self-blame, an assumption of personal responsibility for change, and an enhancement of self-efficacy (Everette, Homestead, & Drisko, 2007) and those of Spreitzer (1996) who described empowerment as a motivational construct manifested in four cognitions: meaning, competence or self-efficacy, self-determination, and impact. While nuances are slightly different, there is fundamental similarity between the two perspectives on empowerment which is referenced throughout the study as an implied related concept.

_Laissez-faire non-leadership_: for purposes of this study, laissez-faire non-leadership is defined based on Bass and Avolio (1994) model of leadership that is disengaged, avoids decision making and supervisory responsibility. This leadership style is only considered within the overall perspective of leadership and is not analyzed individually.

_Motivation_: for purposes of this study, motivation is defined by Bass (1985, 1990) and Shamir, House and Arthur (1993) as the reason for an action; that which gives purpose and direction to behavior.
**Transformational Leadership:** for purposes of this study, Transformational Leadership is defined based on Bass (1998) and Bass and Avolio (1990) who identified key components including charismatic and inspirational leadership, which creates a vision of a valued future and how it may be attained, and which embodies a role model which followers seek to emulate; intellectual stimulation, whereby the leader encourages followers to challenge assumptions, look at problems from new perspectives, and to think more creatively and be more innovative; and individualized consideration, whereby the leader treats each follower as an individual with particular hopes, needs and potential, and develops individuals’ potentials.

**Self-efficacy:** for purposes of this study, self-efficacy is defined based on Bandura (1977): perceived self-efficacy refers to beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute courses of action to produce given attainments, influence the course of action people choose to pursue, how much effort they put forth in given endeavors, how long they will persist in the face of obstacles and failures, their resilience to adversity, whether their thought patterns are self-hindering or self-aiding, how much stress and depression they experience, and the level of accomplishments they realize (Ellett, 2009).

**Transactional Leadership:** for purposes of this study Transactional Leadership is defined based on Bass and Avolio (1990) model whereby the leader motivates subordinates to perform as expected.

**Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership:** for purposes of this study, transcendental or spiritual leadership is defined as leadership which models higher level values that are consistent with personal achievement at the optimal levels. It is this different perspective that, according to numerous scholars (e.g., Covey, 1991, 2004; Frankl, 1984; Maslow, 1971, 1998; Palmer, 2000;
Senge, 1994), positions personal meaning, fulfillment, and mastery within the content of leadership.

**Data Sources**

Access to the data for this study was granted by the United Way affiliates in each of the communities selected for this study and by the leaders of the funded agency partners where there is a substantial investment by The United Way to fund programs related to the Agenda for Change™. Those communities selected for the study are the larger metropolitan cities in several Midwest states where levels of poverty are considered significant (over 20% of the population) and the population is above the threshold of 50,000 residents according to the most recent United States census. The funded partner agencies were contacted for permission to engage their front-line social service agency workers in programs related to the Agenda for Change™. Additional data was gathered from governmental poverty statistics and population census.

**Limitations**

The limitations in this study are the researcher’s inability to know the bureaucratic and political influences that underlie the organizational cultures of the agencies involved and the reality that every agency has some degree of internal challenge that may affect the participants on any given day. Another limitation is the possible exclusion of a significant participant creating potential outliers or false positives in the data set. The conclusions of this study may only be generalizable to the Midwest states participating in the study and not reflect other regions of the country. It may not be reasonable to control for these limitations. It is possible that they may exist without justification.
Delimitations

Only United Way funded partners are included in this study because of the consistency of branding and marketing for social change. Agencies whose United Way allocation is below $25,000 are excluded because less than this level of community investment may indicate the program may not be large enough to have the hierarchical structure of supervisor and front-line workers necessary for this study. Only agencies serving within municipalities with populations exceeding 50,000 and poverty rates of 20% or above were eligible for the study. There was the basic assumption that agencies would be willing to participate with openness and integrity. However, this proved more challenging than expected and resulted in a modification to the original study that only focused on United Way funded agency partners in metropolitan cities located in Ohio. However, a severe paucity of responses from Ohio necessitated a revision that extended the research into several nearby states with agencies fitting the comparable structures, missions, programs, and United Way funding as the ones selected in Ohio.

Organization of the Study

The rest of this study is organized as follows: Chapter One includes the introduction, purpose, statement of research questions, rationale for the study, scope of the study, definition of terms, methods, data sources, limitations and delimitations, and organizational summary of this study. Chapter Two reviews the literature on leadership styles and self-efficacy of front-line social service workers with a focus on both theoretical analyses and empirical studies. Related concepts of empowerment, motivation, and inspiration, while not measured in this study, will be reviewed briefly in the literature to form a conceptual framework for the context of front-line workers within social services. Chapter Three is an explanation of the research methodology used, data collection, and procedures of this study. Chapter Four presents the descriptive
narrative of the study’s results and analysis of the data. In conclusion, Chapter Five summarizes the study’s major findings and includes recommendations for future research and implications for practice.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter Two presents an introduction of the literature related to the study, beginning with a brief overview of the history of social work to position the problem within its current context. Then studies related to each of the primary variables are considered, including leadership theory and self-efficacy of front-line workers. Additional studies examining motivation, empowerment, and inspiration are also examined to provide context for this study. It is likely that by being self-efficacious, one can empower, motivate and inspire clients. However, this study did not measure these factors. Lastly, the chapter looks forward to the methodology that is presented in Chapter Three.

The field of social work, with its roots in Elizabethan Poor Laws according to the National Association of Social Workers (http://www.socialworkers.org), has a long history of attempting to cultivate the resiliency of the human spirit. During the mass immigration and Industrial Revolution of the late 19th century, charity organizations, according to Early and GlenMaye (2000), operated in large cities to address the emerging needs of vulnerable populations in transition. From those early days, there existed “friendly visitors” who would go into the homes to investigate needs of those requesting assistance and “to serve as a moral influence to improve the family” (p. 121). From the beginning, this form of social work took an advocacy role of rousing public conscience to create preventive and corrective measures. Consistent with the public health movement at the time, casework was conceived as a problem-solving process using a disease metaphor.

Over time, casework with vulnerable families integrated Freudian ideas with psychoanalytic techniques that focused on maternal personality problems as the main target for change to stabilize the household. A psychosocial approach emerged in the 1930s which
emphasized character disorders through diagnostically oriented assessments in the individual and environment. By the 1970s, social work began to view problems as part of the human condition and “living as a problem solving process” (Early & GlenMaye, 2000). Contemporary social work, with its focus on strengths and asset building, has identified the family unit as the major driving force for resilience and empowerment. In a movement away from a punitive or failure perspective, this more humane and humanistic approach opens the door to positive influences which can further assist vulnerable families through access to supportive services that enhance existing strengths. Through high expectations and goal setting, social workers can generate a climate of optimism, hope and possibility (Hopps, Pinderhughes, & Shanakar, 1995) within families affected by transgenerational poverty.

Numerous research articles (Berlin, 2007; Mauldon, 2009; and May, 2001) indicate that there remains a disconnect between the intent of public policy, the functioning of front-line workers, and program effectiveness to generate authentic social and personal change for those living in poverty. The current system, Morris and Shepherd (2000) claim, continues to ration services and distance families from full participation in the decision making process, increasing hurdles families must overcome.

Families receive services in agencies, and many of these agencies are struggling to provide quality services (Ellett, 2009; Morris & Shepherd, 2000). Quality services are those programs which are identified as consistent with measurable outcomes or results and delivery methods which are identified as consistent with established best practices. While there may be a logical relationship between the effect of leadership style on the front-line worker’s level of self-efficacy and subsequently on the client’s level of self-efficacy, a review of the existing literature supports that this relationship needs further research. The current body of literature examines
numerous studies that relate the concepts of leadership style and the concepts of self-efficacy, personal empowerment and front-line worker commitment (Anderson, Krajewski, Goffin, & Jackson, 2008; Boehm & Staples, 2002; Ellett, 2008; Everett, Homstead, & Drisko, 2007; Gutiérrez, GlenMaye, & DeLois, 1994; Morrison Van Voorhis & Hostetter, 2006; Ohmer, 2007; Peterson & Speer, 2000; Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang, & Shi, 2005; Westbrook, Ellis, & Ellett, 2006).

The following literature review presents research related to the three major leadership styles: Transformational, Transactional, and Transcendental/Spiritual Leadership from the perspectives of classical and supporting researchers. Laissez-faire/non-leadership is only examined briefly and within the context of the other styles because by its very nature and definition, it is not relevant for this study. Theoretical or conceptual works will be examined first followed by empirical studies. The dependent variable of self-efficacy will also be explored within the context of leadership theories. For each study reviewed, the purpose of the studies, findings and conclusions will be summarized. In addition, related concepts of empowerment, motivation, and inspiration will be reviewed briefly and summarized as important theoretical frameworks related to self-efficacy.

For this study, I examined leadership styles. For purposes of this study, leadership styles means those behaviors of the leader—what they do or how they act—toward subordinates or workers in various contexts. Leadership styles emphasize both task and relationship behaviors (Northouse, 2004). While there are several instruments that measure leadership style, I used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1994) to measure transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire non-leadership and the Servant Leadership Behavior Scale.
(Sendjaya, 2003) based on Greenleaf’s (1977) Servant Leadership Assessment to measure Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership.

The second dependent variable, front-line worker self-efficacy, is presented through a review of the literature based on the research of classical and supporting authors. For this study, I focused on Bandura’s concept of self-efficacy in terms of the belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute courses of action to produce given attainments, influence the course of action people choose to pursue, how much effort they put forth in given endeavors, how long they will persist in the face of obstacles and failures, their resilience to adversity, whether their thought patterns are self-hindering or self-aiding, how much stress and depression they experience, and the level of accomplishments they realize. To measure self-efficacy, I used Schwarzer and Jerusalem’s (1993) General Self-Efficacy Scale. Theoretical or conceptual works will be reviewed collectively followed by empirical studies.

Related concepts are considered in the literature review including the sense of personal empowerment based on Spreitzer’s (1996) definition of personal empowerment as the motivational construct manifested in four cognitions: meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact. Personal empowerment has two important antecedents: self-esteem and locus of control and two major consequences in the workplace: effectiveness and innovative behavior. In addition, concepts of empowerment, motivation and inspiration related to leadership styles are also presented through an examination of related studies.

**Transformational Leadership**

In this section of the literature review, I will explore Transformational Leadership on three perspectives: classical, supporting, and theoretical. Transformational Leadership is characterized by its hallmark components: (a) charisma or idealized influence, (b) inspirational
motivation, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration. Several key studies demonstrate the significance of Transformational Leadership and the relationship to follower self-efficacy:

- A longitudinal study of military leaders, direct and indirect followers supported the hypothesis that has a positive impact on the development of followers’ empowerment in terms of their critical-independent approach, active engagement in the task, and specific self-efficacy (Dvir Dov Edon, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002).

- An integrated literature review and research agenda indicated aspects of follower self-conception, (i.e., self-construal, self-efficacy, self-esteem, and self-consistency) may be affected by leadership, and may mediate the effects of leadership on follower behavior (van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, De Cremer, & Hogg, 2004).

- A quantitative study of 300 managers in India showed Transformational Leadership more important than Transactional Leadership within the public sector to support organizational effectiveness through empowerment, motivation, and inspiration (Rukmani, Ramesh, & Jayakrishman, 2010).

- A three-factor, repeated measures experiment tested the effect of leadership style (charismatic, structuring, and considerate) on performance improvement in the manufacturing sector. Findings support individuals exposed to considerate leadership had superior performance, but this faded over time. Further analysis indicated that self-efficacy fully mediated the relationship between leadership style and performance (Shea, 1999).
A quantitative study of 426 employees and 75 immediate supervisors in a large automotive dealership revealed that relationship identification with the supervisor mediated the relationship between Transformational Leadership and self-efficacy, which was then positively related to employee performance. Performance in this study refers to the individual’s ability to be creative, innovative, inspiring, and take on challenging tasks to achieve organizational goals for the greater good (Walumbwa and Hartnell, 2011).

Transformational Leadership is currently the most widely accepted leadership paradigm. The interest in Transformational Leadership has been significantly impacted by Avolio and Bass’s “full range leadership theory” (Avolio & Bass; 1999 Bass, 1998). In this theory, leader behavior has three broad categories: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire (Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005). As Avolio and Bass (1999) indicated, every leader displays each of these behaviors at different times; “however, effective leaders more often display Transformational Leadership behavior and contingent reward behavior (i.e., Transactional Leadership) and less frequently display more passive and ineffective behaviors i.e., laissez-faire leadership” (Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005).

The contemporary theoretical framework of Johnson, Chang, and Yang (2010) erects an arc to position the established researchers and experts. Numerous researchers in the field of leadership have explored the foundations established by Avolio and Bass (1999) in recent years. The work of Kark and Van Dijk (2007) examined the foundations established by the revered classical writers through the lens of motivational theories. Their work reflected transformational and charismatic leadership theory, identity and self-concept-based theories of leadership, and the theory of regulatory focus to develop a conceptual framework for studies which examined the

The research of Rubin, Munz, and Bommer (2005) was inspired by Bass’ question, “Can the tendency to be more transformational be accurately predicted? If so, how?” (1998, p. 117). To assist the development of appropriate hypotheses, the authors considered the arguments that emotion at the individual level is critical in creating radical change (Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005). Rubin, Munz, and Bommer (2005) maintain that the arguments are consistent with descriptions of Transformational Leadership behavior whereby leaders attempt “to evoke change by appealing to followers’ emotional states to motivate personal adaptation.” Rubin, Munz, and Bommer (2005) examined how leaders’ emotion recognition ability and personality characteristics influenced performance of Transformational Leadership.

The results of analysis support the hypotheses and yield additional insights into the goal of the research project which was to examine the influence of emotional intelligence and personality traits on Transformational Leadership behavior. With respect to personality traits, the study replicated previous findings, added new data, and extended research by including contingent reward behavior. Leaders with high positive affect were more likely to perform Transformational Leadership behavior but not more or less likely to engage in contingent reward behavior. Moreover, results indicated that agreeableness but not extraversion, predicted transformational and contingent reward behavior (Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005). These findings were consistent with Bono and Judge’s (2000) study demonstrating that agreeableness
was the strongest predictor of Transformational Leadership behavior (Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005).

Walumbwa, Wang, and Lawler (2003) reinforce the considerations of the previous researchers. Referencing the work of Dov Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002), the authors indicate that there is empirical evidence that consistently demonstrates strong support for the positive effects of Transformational Leadership on follower and organizational outcomes. However, according to Walumbwa, Wang, & Lawler (2003), there is a paucity of research to test the mediating effects between leader behaviors and follower effects to explain how Transformational Leadership works (Bass, 1998; Conger, 1999; Kark & Shamir, 2002). To address this gap in the research, Walumbwa, Wang, and Lawler (2003) explored the role of collective efficacy in mediating the relationships between Transformational Leadership and work-related attitudes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Drawing on the work of Bandura (1997, p. 477) who defined collective efficacy as “a group’s shared belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainment,” Walumbwa, Wang, and Lawler (2003) point out that efficacy beliefs play an important role in both individual and group motivation since people do need to rely on each other to some degree to accomplish their work. Moreover, based on the work of researchers who examined Transformational Leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Conger & Kanungo, 1998), those who examined self-concept or identity (Brewer and Gardner, 1996), social identity (Pratt, 1998), and social cognitive theories (Bandura, 1986), Walumbwa, Wang, and Lawler (2003) argued that Transformational Leadership can have a positive effect on collective efficacy, which consequently, will influence organizational outcomes.
Results support the hypotheses as delineated by Walumbwa, Wang, and Lawler (2003) and indicate that collective efficacy did in fact mediate the relationship between Transformational Leadership and work related attitudes. This then reinforces the conclusion that suggests transformation leadership is a possible mechanism through which collective efficacy may be enhanced, which then influences group outcomes. The research of Walumbwa, Wang, and Lawler (2003) has extended previous studies by attempting to improve our understanding of how transformational leaders motivate followers through efficacy beliefs.

A comparable study by Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang, and Shi (2005) examined how collective and self-efficacy moderated the influence of Transformational Leadership on followers’ work related attitudes such as organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Reflecting on the contributions of Bass (1985) and Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) who explored Transformational Leadership and numerous empirical studies (e.g., Chen & Bliese, 2002; Kark, Shamir & Chen, 2003; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; and Walumbwa, Wang, Lawler, & Shi, 2004) which suggest that efficacy beliefs would mediate the relationship between Transformational Leadership and work related attitudes, Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang, & Shi (2005) sought to investigate the role of both collective and self-efficacy in moderating the relationship of Transformational Leadership with organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

Integrating social identity theory based on Ashford and Mael’s (1989) perspective which maintains that individuals categorize themselves and others on the basis of how closely their individual characteristics match the prototype of others, with Shamir et al., (1993) who suggested the decision to follow a leader is an active process, Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang, and Shi (2005) viewed efficacy beliefs as contextual variables impacting the relationship
between Transformational Leadership and followers’ work attitudes. The hypotheses offered by Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang, and Shi (2005) were grounded in the expectation that individuals with higher levels of self-efficacy would more readily embrace visionary statements, set higher performance expectations, and to express greater confidence in their abilities to contribute to the organization’s mission and goals. Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang, and Shi (2005) maintained that the positive interactions observed between Transformational Leadership and efficacy beliefs suggest that a combination of efficacy beliefs (self and collective) may engender the greatest level of organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

An empirical study by Arnold, Barling, and Kelloway (2001) sought to test the hypothesis that the “iron cage” or the pressing influence of the team structure with its standards and often unspoken code of conduct could be as effective in creating trust, commitment, and team efficacy as Transformational Leadership behaviors. Drawing on the work of Bass (1985, 1998) the authors indicate that Transformational Leadership is composed of inspirational motivation, idealized influence, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Barling et al., (1996) demonstrated that strong leadership positively affects satisfaction and performance of individuals, teams, and organizations. Transformational Leadership, according to Barling et al., (1996), has also been found to lead to higher levels of organizational commitment and is associated with performance. Arnold, Barling, and Kelloway (2001) also cite the work of Bandura (1977) to emphasize the empirical evidence between Transformational Leadership and self as well as team efficacy.

In contrast, the iron cage refers to a coercive force created by a team structure (Barker, 1993, p. 42) that mandates performance and adherence to a code of conduct based on established group norms and values which evolves into rule-based system. These group norms or values of
responsibility, quality, member contribution and commitment to the team and company become
the governance system to determine behavior. Data analyses indicated that Transformational
Leadership increases trust, commitment, and team efficacy over and above the levels that a team
achieves through the perceptions of the iron cage (Arnold, Barling, & Kelloway, 2001). Also,
strong values and norms within a team are still important in that they have an effect on the
commitment that is felt within the team (Arnold, Barling, & Kelloway, 2001). In summary, the
authors indicate that Transformational Leadership is a more effective way to engender trust,
commitment, and self-efficacy than the encouragement of strong values and norms. They
maintain that these strong values and norms can easily lead to rules that govern the behavior of
team members and constrain their behavior similar to the hierarchical structure associated with
bureaucracy (Arnold, Barling, & Kelloway, 2001).

Building on previous authors who examined aspects of leadership’s effects on followers’
motivation and efficacy, Bono and Judge (2003) discussed the construct of self-concordance
which they defined as “the extent to which activities such as job related tasks or goals express
individuals’ authentic interests and values (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999).” According to Bono and
Judge (2003), this self-concordance model is a theory of self-regulation that is based in self-
determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Bono and Judge (2003) look to the integrated
theories of Transformational Leadership and charismatic leadership (Bass, 1985; Shamir et al.,
1993) to frame their discussion of self-concept-based theory and the self-concordance model.
Bono and Judge (2003) maintain that in self-concept-based theory, there are three ways in which
transformational leaders motivate followers: “by increasing follower self-efficacy, by facilitating
followers’ social identification with their group, and by linking work values to follower values—
thus increasing the extent to which followers view their work as self-expressive.”
In summary, Bono and Judge (2003) demonstrated support of psychological theories related to motivational effects of Transformational Leadership with respect to follower self-engagement and meaningful work. Furthermore, the authors identified that 1) external factors (for example, Transformational Leadership) can influence the extent to which individuals perceive their work as important and self-congruent, and 2) when individuals do have such perceptions, they experience higher levels of job satisfaction, are more willing to assist, and perform tasks better.

In another study by Castro, Periñan, and Bueno (2008), the authors extended the research of Transformational Leadership done by contributors such as Yukl (1999) and Kark and Shamir (2002), to examine the role of psychological empowerment as a mediating influence between Transformational Leadership and followers’ attitudes. Castro, Periñan, and Bueno (2008) maintain that followers play a key role in leadership models which must consider the cognitions and psychological states of followers. The study conducted by these authors analyzed how Transformational Leadership promotes job satisfaction among employees and the affective commitment to the organization, (Castro, Periñan, & Bueno, 2008).

**Transactional Leadership and Laissez-faire Leadership**

Less has been written in the available literature demonstrating the utility of Transactional Leadership and laissez-faire leadership in motivating worker self-efficacy. Considered key aspects of the full range model of leadership, Bass (1997) and Bass and Avolio (1994, 1995) define Transactional Leadership within the context of social exchange where the leader clarifies what the followers need to do as their part of the transaction (successfully complete the task) to receive a reward or avoidance of punishment (satisfaction of the follower’s needs). In the case of active management by exception, the leader looks for mistakes, irregularities, exceptions,
deviations from standards, complaints, infractions of rules and regulations, and failures and he or she takes corrective action before or when these occur. Passive management by exception implies that the leader is reactive and waits to be informed about errors and deviances before taking action.

Laissez-faire or passive leadership, also called non-leadership, implies the avoidance or absence of leadership. The leader leaves responsibility for the work to followers and avoids setting goals and clarifying expectations, organizing priorities, becoming involved when important issues arise, taking a stand on issues and making decisions. If this style is used as a component of other leadership styles it allows for the possibility of self-management.

Of the studies available (Deluga, 1990; van Eeden, Cilliers, & van Deventer, n.d; Gellis, 2001; Rukmani, Remesh, & Jayakrishnan, 2010; Vecchio, Justin, & Pearce, 2008; and Webb, 2007), these leadership styles are most often presented within the context of and in contrast with Transformational Leadership in studies exploring the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire with various groups, in different cultures, and in different types of organizations.

A study by Gellis (2001) is particularly relevant to this present study. Positioned within the healthcare industry, this study examined the perceived style of leadership to determine the degree to which social work managers were perceived to use transformational and Transactional Leadership behaviors and to identify which leader behaviors were best able to predict social work leader effectiveness, satisfaction with the leader, and extra effort by hospital social workers. Results supported the anticipated conclusion through data analysis that included a series of hierarchical regressions that Transformational Leadership did have significant and substantial add-on effects compared to Transactional Leadership in the prediction of perceived effectiveness and satisfaction.
Research also shows Transformational Leadership to be more effective than either Transactional Leadership or Laissez-faire/ non-leadership as a positive predictor for organizational effectiveness (Rukmani, Ramesh, & Jayakrishnan, 2010) as a positive predictor for stimulation of employee motivation and performance (Webb, 2007), and as a positive predictor for performance and satisfaction (Vecchio, Justin, & Pearce, 2008). Research by van Eeden, Cilliers & van Deventer (n.d) using the same Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire instrument showed personality traits consistent with Transformational Leadership as more positive predictor of innovation and a transformative process than personality traits consistent with either Transactional Leadership or Laissez-faire/ non-leadership. Viewed collectively, these limited studies further indicate the positive relationship and potential of Transformational Leadership in inspiring self-efficacy that either Transactional or Laissez-faire non-leadership.

Transcendental/Spiritual Leadership

This section of the literature review will explore the extant literature and several current studies on the role of spirituality in leadership as an integral part of promoting self-efficacy. Related to Transformational Leadership which promotes a high level of functioning between leadership and followers, Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership integrates many of the same factors such as motivation, efficacy, and empowerment. Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership integrates a perspective of spirituality that points to performance at the highest levels of human functioning, as Maslow (1971) defines self-actualization. Studies demonstrate that leaders who integrate both transformational and transcendental factors impact the organizational culture and the worker’s psychological levels of self-efficacy and empowerment.

As stated by Hayden, Barbuto, and Goertzen (2008), spirituality is not the same thing as religiosity. “Spirituality itself is not necessarily a religious state, because while spirituality has to
do with human experience, religion has to do with the articulation and propagation of a particular conceptualization” (Hayden, Barbuto, & Goertzen, 2008). Why study spirituality and its affect on leadership? The justification lies in the application of self-actualization within the construct of leadership. Senge (1994, p. 173) links personal mastery to effective leadership stating, “The core leadership strategy is simple: be a model. Commit yourself to your own personal mastery….There is nothing more powerful you can do to encourage others in their quest for personal mastery than to be serious in your own quest.”

Therefore, this section of the literature review will examine how spiritual leadership models higher level values that are consistent with personal achievement at the optimal levels. It is this different perspective that according to numerous scholars (e.g., Covey, 1991, 2004; Frankl, 1984; Maslow, 1971, 1998; Palmer, 2000, Ray, 2004; Senge, 1994,) which positions personal meaning, fulfillment, and mastery within the content of leadership. According to Dhiman (2008), personal mastery is an individual pursuit for finding authenticity, meaning, and fulfillment in life at both the personal and professional level. Drawing on the writings of Maslow, Frankl, Covey, and Palmer, Dhiman (2008) discussed the important contributions of the writings of Buddha and Lao Tzu (the Dao de Ching) to center the teachings of mindfulness and living in harmony with the Tao (the Divine). These are the early examples of humanity’s attempts to live a life of self-awareness, meaningfulness, and mastery. Later, existentialists and psychologists such as Jung, Adler, Frankl, Sartre, and Camus posited the same questions in contemporary language.

In modern literature, Maslow (1971) recognized humanity’s longing for more in his theory of self-actualization. He acknowledged the ultimate values of the human spirit as “metaneeds” and listed these as wholeness, perfection, completion, justice, aliveness, richness,
simplicity, beauty, goodness, uniqueness, effortlessness, playfulness, truth, honesty, self-sufficiency, and meaningfulness (Dhiman, 2008). Maslow (1971) maintained that the desire to self-actualize, to reach one’s highest potential as a person would cause someone to be stronger, healthier, and “to take their own lives into their hands to a greater extent.” He believed this would also cause people to change the society in which they lived, since the movement toward psychological health “is also a movement toward spiritual peace and harmony.”

Maslow’s (1998) recipe for increased self-esteem is to have a cause that one believes in and that this cause gives a person the reason to live. Their work becomes their vocation and mission in life. Parker Palmer (2000) called this “letting your life speak” with integrity while Victor Frankl (1984) celebrated the beauty that suffering brings to a life intent on learning its lessons and finding the purpose in the suffering, if only to go on to do something great something that only we are meant to accomplish. Wayne Dyer (2004) told the story based on Tolstoy’s character Ivan Illyich who lamented the pointlessness of his life. Dyer (2004, p. 95) encouraged his reader “don’t die with your song still in you.”

Dhiman (2008) maintained that personal mastery is concerned about creating what one wants in life and in work. He pointed to Senge who said personal mastery is a discipline based on “personal vision, holding creative tension between vision and current reality, commitment to truth, and understanding the subconscious, compassion, and seeing our connectedness to the world.” Dyer (2004) called this living in harmony with The Power of Intention, or the Divine Source, from which we come.

**Leadership and Spirituality**

However sublime the philosophers of past and present, their sentiments have contemporary champions who have examined the literature of spirituality and related it to the
reality of leadership in our modern day. One group of scholars, Sanders, Hopkins, and Geroy (2003) explored the spiritual dimensions of leadership by proposing a theory that integrates and extends the relationship between transactional and transformational theories of leadership. The authors claim that several writers (e.g. Wheatley, 1999; Kouzes & Posner, 1999) emphasize the journey of leadership as an “internal plight to connect with a higher influence” (Sanders, Hopkins, & Geroy, 2003). These same studies indicate that it is important to focus on the internal development of leader if we are to understand the concept of leadership.

Reflecting on the available literature, Sanders, Hopkins, and Geroy (2003) identified theory of transcendental leadership as a concern about one’s followers and the effort to contribute to their development. Specifically, the transcendental leader as develops followers’ transcendental motivation (i.e. the motivation to help others and the motivation to contribute). Sanders, Hopkins, and Geroy (2003) concentrated on the spiritual development of the individual leader as central rather than focusing on the intrinsic motivation of followers’ so that their needs are aligned with those of the leader. From the perspective of Thompson (2000), effective leadership is a developmental process that is nurtured more by the leader’s inner spirit than external ambition. Building on this fundamental concept, Sanders, Hopkins, and Geroy (2003) constructed and explicated a theory of transcendental leadership which explored the development of leadership beyond ego toward a higher influence in order to integrate an extraordinary spiritual presence in their lives. They focused on three essential dimensions of spirituality: consciousness, moral character, and faith. The theory of transcendental leadership that the authors posed demonstrated linkages along a continuum that moved from transactional to transformational to transcendental leadership and explored the foundations of locus of control, effectiveness, and spirituality each with their own continuum. Ultimately, spiritual leadership
leads by love, the highest of the moral virtues according to St. Thomas Aquinas. The model of
transcendental leadership posed by Sanders, Hopkins, and Geroy (2003) went beyond the
frequently asked question of “What are the behaviors of an effective leader?” to include “What contributes to effective leader behavior?”

Echoing the fundamental conclusion of Sanders, Hopkins, and Geroy (2003) that spiritual leaders lead by love, Fry (2003) articulated a causal theory of spiritual leadership developed within the framework of an intrinsic motivation model that integrated vision, faith/hope, and altruistic love. He maintained that the purpose of spiritual leadership is to create vision and value congruence within an empowered team and at individual levels, and to foster increased organizational commitment and productivity.

**Spiritual Leadership Theories**

Examining the literature contributions of established experts including Bass, Avolio, Conger, Fry, House, Kanungo, and Kouzes and Posner, Reave, (2005), explicated the relevant theories including Transformational Leadership theory, charismatic leadership theory, and spiritual leadership theory to extract the common themes and traits of an effective, inspired, and inspiring leader. Using measurement tools such as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), results in the literature demonstrated the consistent pattern of values and high level of spirituality (as distinguished consistently from religion and religiosity) as predictors of effectiveness. Spirituality was seen as a major motivation factor both for the leader who recognized work as a calling and also for the follower who emulated the same inspirational sensitivity.

To address challenges related to spiritual leadership theories, Benefiel (2005) examined the issues from a philosophical perspective to conceptualize a blending of objective and
subjective perspectives. To make sense of the discrepancy between the lack of adequate empirical analysis of spirituality and the emphasis on leadership, Benefiel again examined the issue and reflected on the spiritual transformation of great leaders and teachers through the centuries, such as Moses, the Buddha, Jesus, Rumi, Teresa of Avila, the Ba’al Shem Tov, Gandhi, Thich Nhat Hanh, and others. She summarized the experience of personal spiritual transformation through the language popularized by St. Teresa of Avila: awakening, transition, recovery, dark night, and dawn. Each of these stages reflects the journey of a soul to God and is characterized by a process of releasing the ego.

In an application to the process of organizational transformation, Benefiel (2005) related the same spiritual development model to organizations going through a point of pivotal change. Just as an individual may become stalled in the spiritual development process and fail to achieve the highest levels of self-actualization, organizations who commence on a spiritual journey may also fail to transcend the learning experiences along the way. It is the role of the spiritual leader, according to Benefiel, who not only attends to their personal spiritual development, but also attends to the spiritual development and transformation of the organization. Crafted in the language of mysticism, Benefiel quoted Walter Conn:

Properly understood, one surrenders not oneself or one’s personal moral autonomy, but one’s illusion of absolute autonomy. But such total surrender is possible only for the person who has fallen in love with a mysterious, incomprehended God, for the person who has been grasped by an other-worldly love and completely transformed into a being-in-love….Among all the possible realizations of human potential, such cognitive, moral, and affective self-transcendence is the criterion of authentic self-realization. (1986, p. 24, p. 31)
Benefiel acknowledged that most leaders will glimpse this mystical realization, but then drift back into their ego space. However, for leaders who can remain at this heightened awareness, their demonstrated leadership allows them to be more available to the needs of the people they serve and more available to their organizations (Benefiel, 2005). This then provides the enlightenment that enables leadership to assist their followers through the same process of spiritual development and renaissance.

In a theoretical analysis, Fry, Matherly, Whittington, & Winston (2007) examined the significant role spiritual leadership plays as an integrating paradigm for servant leadership to transform organizations so that human well-being and organizational effectiveness not only co-exist but are maximized. The work of Fry et al., (2007) attempted to integrate the language of spiritual leadership and servant leadership, to identify the gaps in the servant leadership model, and to argue that spiritual leadership theory, because it focuses on satisfying both leader and follower spiritual needs for calling and membership through vision, hope/faith, and the values of altruistic love, addresses these gaps and provides insights for servant leadership theory, research, and practice. Lastly, the authors examine legacy leadership as a more explicit model of spiritual leadership for servant leadership development.

The literature examined by Fry et al., (2007) relied on the conceptualization of servant leadership as summarized by Greenleaf (1977). For Greenleaf, the servant-leader is first a servant, stemming from a primordial sense of the orientation to service. Greenleaf established the anchoring concepts of leadership and servant, defining the difference between the two based on emphasis of concern: the servant-first focuses on the serving the others’ highest priority needs. As articulated in his “test” for those who would be identified as servant-leaders:
The best test, and most difficult to administer, is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And what is the effect on the least privileged in society, will they benefit, or, at least, not be further deprived. (pp. 13-14)

Some scholars have criticized the over-emphasis on followers’ needs inherent in the servant leadership model which may or may not benefit the organization’s needs as contrasted with Transformational Leadership which focuses more clearly on organizational objectives (Fry et al., 2007). This appears to place the two theories at opposing ends of consideration: the well-being of the followers or the well-being of the organization.

**Empirical Studies of Spiritual Leadership**

In one of the few quantitative studies identified through an extensive search, Fawcett, Brau, Rhoads, and Whitlark (2008) examined spirituality and organization culture as important mechanisms that support worker creativity, insight, and passion. Concerned about the ill-effects of organizational practices that thwart worker’s involvement, the author set out to study how an organization’s culture is influenced by spirituality thus fostering an inspiring environment. The literature review and philosophical support emphasized the important role employees play over technology as the true resource to be valued in organizations. The authors examined the culture of both Southwest and JetBlue Airlines to reinforce the salient value of people-centered organizations, recognizing that people “can be the competitive differentiator.” Leaders who capture the hearts of workers can unleash their energy and insight.

Central to an organization, according to Fawcett, Brau, Rhoads, Whitlark and Fawcett (2008) are the core values of a company which move the cultural spirit along the continuum from
limiting to inspiring. These values affect the organization’s performance which drives its fundamental workplace attributes. The workplace attributes determine the organization’s climate and therefore affect the perceived benefits of belonging to that organization.

The conclusions reached by the authors indicate that in many cases organizations require a cultural overhaul to achieve the type of positive environment that truly supports the fullest functioning of workers. Fawcett, Brau, Rhoads, Whitlark and Fawcett (2008) maintained that many companies carry extensive baggage from years of negative culture. However, it is possible to create a culture that encourages and enables employees to bring their efforts and best ideas to work every day, and to promote individual growth as well as organizational development. This cultural overhaul has one underpinning requirement, according to Fawcett et al., (2008): “a leap of faith.”

A qualitative study by Yusef Nur (2009) represented the findings of five unstructured interviews and observations carried out in small businesses led by Christian CEOs. Spiritual management styles and values were inferred from the interviews and observations. Several important themes emerged which supported the important contribution of spiritual leadership to business practice. Nur’s (2009) perspective focused on the Christian expression of spiritual leadership based on a profound and deeply felt personal experience of God, a “steady awareness” of His presence, a carefully and intentionally cultivated personal relationship with God, and sense of calling to use their business activities to attain their spiritual goals of leading meaningful and purposeful lives in this world.

The conclusions reached by Nur (2009) indicate that in order to achieve a high level of spiritual leadership, individuals must strive intently to foster a deep prayer life and personal relationship with God. It is the leader’s effort to live an authentic virtuous life that permeates
every aspect of their business and professional life. Leading by example, they treat others according to the standard by which people should be treated, with compassion and empathy, honesty and integrity, themselves led by the Spirit to perform business as a ministry and calling.

**Theoretical Analysis of Spiritual Leadership**

Conceptual papers demonstrated that servant leaders and servant followers are characterized by moral love for others, humility, altruism, trust, and a commitment to the leader. Numerous analytic studies cited by Fry et al., (2007) resulted in distinct factors inherent in servant leadership including emotional healing, empowerment practice, altruism, integrity, and ethical behavior. Further application of servant leadership theory integrated into spiritual leadership theory is the dimension of legacy leadership which refers to the lasting effect or “changed lives” for the followers. This lasting effect is a measure of internalization of motivation factors that move from egotistical to altruistic.

The authors concluded by arguing for the integration of both servant and spiritual leadership theoretical models to promote ultimate congruence which serves both the well-being of the individual and that of the organization. By recognizing the factor congruence between the two theoretical frameworks, the authors promoted an integrated paradigm.

Recognizing the importance of core values for an organization, a conceptual paper prepared by Ferguson and Milliman (2008), examined the impact of poorly articulated core values versus the impact of well articulated and inspiring values. They explicated the business literature through the perspective of spiritual leadership philosophy as an essential mechanism to articulate, communicate, and implement genuine core values within an organization. Citing the research of Collins and Porras (1994), the creation of effective core values has been identified as
significant to enable employees to fulfill their higher level personal aspirations and also to contribute to organizational effectiveness.

Different from an organization’s mission statement which focuses on activities, values describe what an organization considers important and are used to direct behaviors. The values of an organization become the center of the culture within that company because they represent the philosophical views, priorities and sense of purpose of the organization (Ferguson & Milliman, 2008). The authors, therefore, define core organizational values as a “unique set of organizational wide beliefs that intrinsically influence the attitudes and behaviors of employees” for the purpose of achieving both organizational and personal goals.

Researchers, according to Ferguson and Milliman (2008), have demonstrated the far reaching effects of core values to guide decision making, motivate and inspire a connection to the vision and higher purpose within an organization, and to provide moral guidance especially in times of ethical dilemmas. However, for all their positive purpose, if values are not witnessed and articulated authentically, they are ineffective and only serve to further disengage workers. Therefore, the integrity of the organizational leader is paramount to energizing an organization’s core values.

Ferguson and Milliman (2008) maintained that leadership that is grounded in spiritual principles is essential for effective organizational core value programs. Because spirituality has been demonstrated as having a significant role in both the public and private sector of business, spiritual leadership principles are important to core values because of several key aspects, including articulating a higher cause or purpose, authenticity and integrity, serving others in order to develop and empower employees. Spiritual leadership is based on the fundamental concept that people need and want something they can commit to, something they feel worthy of
their best performance. This translates into inspired and inspiring motivation factors based on deeper values that resonate with the employees’ own personally held values.

**Self-efficacy**

These inspired and inspiring motivation factors which extract the employees’ personal values also contribute to that individual sense of personal worth and ability to make meaning out of the daily-ness. Bandura (1977) defined this can-do spirit as self-efficacy. The concept of self-efficacy, introduced and developed by Albert Bandura (1977), is based on social cognitive theory, which states that individuals act based on multiple influences from both internal and external sources. Among those internal influences, self-efficacy, which is a form of self-evaluation, describes how cognitive functioning affects new behavior patterns. While self-esteem is related to a person’s perception of self-worth, self-efficacy refers to a person’s perception of competence and capability in completing certain task (Bandura, 1977). Bandura states, “An efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes” (Bandura, 1977, p.193).

According to Bandura (1977), an individual’s self-efficacy belief can vary in level, generality and strength. **Level** refers to the simplicity or complexity of the task that the individual feels competent to perform. The measure of self-efficacy the individual feels is calculated against the measure of challenge the task provides. **Generality** of self-efficacy indicates the series of tasks the individual feels capable of accomplishing. While some individuals feel capable of handling a wide variety of tasks, others may feel particularly competent in more specific areas. **Strength** refers to the measure of confidence that the individual feels in being to complete the task. While a very strong sense of self-efficacy does not necessarily mean that an individual will be more likely to participate in a given task, it does lead to greater perseverance in the face of
obstacles (Bandura, 1977). Rather than being task-specific, self-efficacy beliefs are associated to an individual’s prospective to handle complex, varied situations.

There are four sources or determinants of self-efficacy according to Bandura (1977). The first of these is enactive mastery which refers to knowledge and skill gained through experience and perseverance. The second source is vicarious experience which allows the individual to learn from others’ experiences as a model and level of comparison to identify skills necessary to complete a task. The third source is known as verbal or social persuasion. This feedback serves to reinforce feelings of self-efficacy when facing failure or minor setbacks. The fourth source of self-efficacy is the physiological and affective states the individual experiences as a result of stress.

Bandura (1989) further indicates that feelings of self-efficacy have been shown to have a significant effect on the level of motivation and amount of additional effort an individual demonstrates. High levels of self-efficacy are associated with an increased level of goal setting, which leads to a firmer commitment in achieving goals that have been set and greater resolution to persevere in the face of obstacles (Bandura, 1989). This strong commitment to success increases the likelihood that goals will be met. Belief in one’s abilities also decreases the degree of stress and anxiety that is experienced in overwhelming or difficult situations (Bandura, 1989), thereby increasing the probability that these challenges will be surmounted and motivation will remain unbroken.

**Front-line Worker Self-efficacy**

This section of the literature review will examine key studies that explore front-line worker self-efficacy. The belief that one has the ability to work effectively with those participating in social service programs is a key element of this study. Those providing direct
services are the front-line workers in agencies. Viewed as the cornerstone of the social service sector (Ellett, 2008; Everett, Homstead, & Drisko, 2007; Westbrook, Ellis, & Ellett, 2006), these individuals, their level of self-efficacy, and their integration of empowerment, motivation, and inspiration are the crucial link to success for program participants. They form the bridge between leadership and clients, between mission and organizational culture, between program goals and service delivery. The degree to which front-line workers possess self-efficacy to assist clients depends on many factors including personal characteristics such as age, gender, and education. Experience and personal problems are also factors (McElroy, 2002).

In addition, organizational characteristics including job satisfaction, commitment and intention to stay are affected by variables such as heavy workload, low salary, poor agency operation and low agency morale, and few opportunities for advancement precipitate the inclination to leave (McElroy, 2002). These factors play a significant role in employee self-efficacy and are directly related to leadership style within the organization (Ellett, 2008; Everett, Homstead, & Drisko, 2007; Westbrook, Ellis, & Ellett, 2006).

Researchers examined self-efficacy’s mitigating effect on front-line workers. One such study conducted by Westbrook, Ellis, and Ellett, (2006), examined the organizational and personal factors related to retention among child welfare workers. This study integrated previous work that developed a structural model which linked elements of human caring, professional organizational culture, and self-efficacy beliefs to child welfare employees’ intentions to remain employed in the field. Results of the study delineated the absence of organizational supports that workers desired in order to make challenging positions more tolerable. However, the participants also indicated several key characteristics they believed to be essential to remain employed in child welfare. These included: possession of efficient time-management or organizational skills;
an open, non-judgmental attitude; self-confidence; personal commitment to clients and to the professional field; compassion combined with firmness; intuition and the ability to think fast on one’s feet; strong self-efficacy beliefs; an ability to be both a team player and to work independently; an ability “to make your needs known”; and the enjoyment of problem solving.

In a correlative follow up study, Ellett (2009) expanded previous research to explore the role of human caring, self-efficacy beliefs, and professional organizational culture on the intentions to remain employed in the child welfare industry. The author cites the critical importance of competent and qualified employees responsible for empowering vulnerable families, according to the Child Welfare League of America (2004). Results showed that the human caring, self-efficacy, and professional organizational culture variables were all positively related to employees’ intentions to remain employed in child welfare. These findings were consistent with the hypothesis framing the study that personal and professional characteristics of child welfare staff and work environments are positively related to intentions to remain employed in child welfare.

A study by Everette, Homstead, and Drisko (2007) offered a description of the empowerment process from the perspective of clients and workers in high-risk communities. The purpose of this study was to present the stages of the empowerment process from the perspective of front-line workers, the challenges they faced when implementing empowerment practice, and the strategies they used to deal with these challenges. The authors extended the work of Gutierrez et al., (1995) who described empowerment in terms of “reduction of self-blame, an assumption of personal responsibility for change, and an enhancement of self-efficacy.”

Team leaders and family support workers were able to articulate six stages associated with empowerment: recruitment, engagement, involvement, retention, partnership, and
leadership. These themes surfaced consistently and became the framework for the processes related to empowerment practice in at-risk community centers.

**Empowerment, Motivation and Inspiration**

Classic humorists and comic artists have paraphrased a popular joke for years, “If you wanna see the dead come back to life, hang out at the time clock when it’s quittin time.” What comedians have interpreted with an original spin, researchers have studied and analyzed for decades: motivation. This section of the literature review will examine the prevailing theorists and contemporary researchers who have discussed this complex phenomenon through the lens of leadership, and in particular the constructs of Transformational and Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership. Likewise, related concepts of empowerment and inspiration are also included here.

While empowerment, motivation, and inspiration are not measured as dependent variables in this study, they are important considerations within the theoretical framework that underpins and provides the foundation for this research. Each of these constructs is closely linked with both leadership and self-efficacy and also to each other. To exclude them would leave a void of logic.

**Leadership Style and Empowerment Practice**

In a study that examined the relationship between organizational leadership and factors that could enhance or support empowerment theory, Gutiérrez, GlenMaye, & DeLois (1994) reported the findings of barriers and supports to empowerment practice. These barriers included expectations of funding sources, the social environment, intrapersonal and interpersonal issues. However, the supports for empowerment included staff development, enhanced collaborative approach which includes sharing power and information among all levels of staff, and administrative leadership and support in the form of advocacy, encouragement, vision-setting, and programmatic development.
The authors conclude that those organizations that empower workers by creating an employment setting that provides participatory management, the ability to make independent decisions about their work, communication and support from administrators, and opportunities for skill development, “will be more capable of empowering clients and communities,” (Gutiérrez, GlenMaye, & DeLois, 1994).

Similar research was conducted by Glisson and Hemmelgarn (1999) and Peterson and Speer (2000) in which the authors explored the relationship between organizational characteristics, quality service outcomes and psychological empowerment. Their research identified two methods in which leaders may empower organizational members. Relationally, leaders may delegate authority to encourage initiative and responsibility among members. Motivationally, leaders may enhance members’ beliefs in their own self-efficacy.

To advance the hypotheses of perceived organizational characteristics as promoting psychological empowerment, researchers studied whether three different community-based organizations differed on the basis of perceived organizational characteristics and dimensions of psychological empowerment. Specifically, member perceptions of four organizational features were assessed: (a) leadership, (b) opportunity role structure, (c) support system, and (d) group-based belief system. Psychological empowerment was assessed by measuring four psychological features of community-based organizations’ members: (a) political efficacy, (b) perceived competence, (c) internal locus of control, and (d) desire for control. In addition, this study examined whether perceived organizational characteristics were associated with psychological empowerment across community-based organizations.

The most important finding in these studies was that perceived organizational characteristics combined with dimensions of psychological empowerment to distinguish
members of different community-based organizations, whereas perceived organizational characteristics were not related with dimensions of psychological empowerment in expected ways across groups. This model of empowerment practice demonstrated more positive results in child protective service organizations where organizational climate was supportive of workers who then were able to address the needs of vulnerable families.

**Theoretical Analysis of Transformational Leadership, Motivation, and Empowerment**

This section will examine theoretical or conceptual articles related to Transformational Leadership, motivation, and empowerment. An analysis by Kark and Van Dijk (2007) set out to comprehend how leaders’ self-regulatory foci, which included habitual/chronic and situational motivation, and leaders’ values, which function as strong regulatory guides, affect leaders’ motivation to lead and their resulting behavior or leadership style. The secondary goal was to determine how various leadership behaviors affect followers’ motivation and performance by priming different manners of followers’ self-regulatory foci which could be either promotion or prevention.

Kark and Van Dijk maintained that the ability to engender motivation has been understood in terms of the theories of leadership which concentrate on the followers’ self-concept. The dimensions of self-concept including personality traits, dyadic relationships and organizational culture, according to Higgins (1997), can be influenced by the manner in which the leader is able to affect the followers’ different self-regulatory focus. Moreover, Kark and Van Dijk (2007) indicated studies conducted by Higgins and others (e.g. Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Forster et al., 2003; Friedman & Forster, 2001; Higgins, 1997, 1998, 2000; Liberman et al., 1999; Shah et al.,1998) demonstrate a variety of outcomes derived from the two regulatory foci.
This variety of outcomes includes behavior tendencies, emotions, cognitions, decision-making styles, and problem-solving strategies.

In addition to leadership’s affect on individual motivation, there is empirical evidence based on the work of Schein (1992), Yukl (1998), and Trice and Beyer (2003) that supports leadership’s affect on organizational culture including the ability to change or reinforce the culture. Further, Kark and Van Dijk (2007) indicate that theories of transformational and charismatic leadership suggest there is a significant relationship between these types of leadership and organizational innovation (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1998). Kark and Van Dijk (2007) summarize the main contribution of their theoretical paper as the attempt to simultaneously explore aspects of both the followers’ and leaders’ self-regulatory focus in order to gain a broader understanding of the leadership process that originates within the leader’s inner self and motivations. This process then affects the leader’s behavior (style) that in turn, influences the transformation of the followers’ inner self and behavior.

**Empirical Studies of Transformational Leadership, Motivation, and Empowerment**

In another study, Li and Hung (2008) examined social identity and social exchange theory to examine the role of leader-member relationships (LMX) and co-worker relationships (CWR) in explaining the relationship between Transformational Leadership and task performance/organizational citizenship behavior. With no paucity of research on Transformational Leadership, Bass, Avolio, Jung, and Berson (2003) identified a gap in the examination that links leadership style to performance. This gap is the focus of the study by Li and Hung (2008).

To address this, Li and Hung (2008) examined how employees experience and recognize their leader’s transformational behavior as influencing the quality of leader-member relationships.
and coworker relationships, which in turn implies that these relationships will augment task performance and advance organizational citizenship behavior. Reflecting on the numerous related studies Li and Hung (2008) maintained that the social-identity process also provides a foundation for understanding how identification with leader behaviors guides the leader-member relationship. Therefore, according to Li and Hung (2008), “transformational leaders have a direct influence on the development and maintenance of leader-member exchange relationships by emphasizing similar characteristics, values, beliefs (idealized influence) visions (inspirational motivation), and positive dyad-level influence (intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration).”

**Spiritual Leadership and Empowerment, Motivation, and Inspiration**

Fry (2003) examined leadership from the perspective as motivation to change (Kouzes & Pozner, 1987; Kotter, 1988) and reviewed the contributions of extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation based theories (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Spreitzer, 1996; Thomas 2000). Fry also reflected on the increased demand for spirituality in the workplace based on the universal need for spiritual survival through calling and membership. An increasing number of leaders are awakening to a spiritual sense of calling that integrates their personal and professional lives with purpose and meaning, an “experience of transcendence” that fosters compassion and joy. For Fry, God is identified as a “Higher Power” based on the summary writings of Horton (1950) which provided a continuum for numerous perspectives to define God in humanistic, theistic, and pantheistic terms. Furthermore, he reviewed and summarized the religious and ethics based leadership theories (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Covey, 1989; Greenleaf, 1977; Kouzes & Posner, 1999) and concluded that in order to motivate followers, leaders must resonate at a deeper level with their own core values and be able to communicate them to followers through vision and
personal actions to create a sense of spiritual survival through calling and membership. Fry (2003) maintained there appears to be considerable overlap between workplace spirituality and motivation based theories of leadership, the components and process of intrinsic motivation, spiritual survival through meaning/calling and membership, and the dimensions of workplace spirituality and management practices. Spiritual leadership draws upon the needs of the leader and followers to integrate vision, altruistic love, and hope/faith.

Measurement of workplace spirituality or spiritual leadership, while supported with a few scientifically valid and reliable tools, still needs further development. Some researchers contend that it is not possible to measure one’s relationship to the sacred; however, some studies have examined the validity and reliability of measures of the “Spiritual Leadership Theory” causal leadership model (Dent et al., 2005). Workplace spirituality seems to provide the potential for increased levels of individual effectiveness in organizational performance improvement. And lastly, there is a greater understanding of the nature of the phenomenon. At one time, leadership was considered an individual phenomenon. However, current research points to a theorizing of the collective nature of leadership (Bass, 1991; Chanoch & House, 2001). Instead of seeing charismatic, transactional and Transformational Leadership theories as mutually exclusive, Dent et al., (2005) called for a more integrative approach that recognizes leaders as complex beings who mature and develop over time in relationship to spiritual, emotional, cognitive, social and physical domains and recognize that leaders have desired transcendent-related work accomplishments.

Motivation

After many years of research exploring employee commitment toward organizations and its constituents, authors (e.g., Cooper-Hamik and Viswesvaran, 2005; Mathieu and Zajak, 1990;
Meyer and Allen, 1996; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky, 2002) indicate that commitment levels relate to numerous criteria, including task and contextual performance, satisfaction, and turnover. According to Johnson, Chang, and Yang (2010) there are different reasons why employees are committed, perhaps for job security or they resonate with the goals espoused by the organization. However, researchers have struggled to determine different forms of commitment because some forms such as normative and affective share similar relationships with criteria, while the dimensionality of others, such as continuance commitment, is debated (Johnson, Chang, & Yang, 2010).

**Theoretical Analysis of Motivation**

The thesis explored in this theoretical analysis is that “consideration of motivation-based individual differences can resolve impasses concerning the convergent and discriminant validity among different forms of commitment” (Johnson, Chang, & Yang, 2010). The authors propose that chronic self-identity and regulatory focus are two motivation-based that clarify differences among different types of commitment and suggest a model that specifies how commitment, identity, and regulatory focus are interconnected.

In their theoretical analysis, the authors delineate forms of commitment (affective, normative, and continuance), motivation (internalization, identification, introjection, and compliance) self-identity levels (collective, relational, and individual) and also regulatory foci (promotion and prevention) which are intertwined in their model. The authors maintain different motivations underlie each form of commitment (Johnson, Chang, and Yang, 2010). They also indicate that people’s self-concepts are extensive autobiographical structures that imbue information with meaning, organize memory, inform perceptions of themselves and others, and regulate cognition and behavior. Further, Johnson, Chang, and Yang (2010) explain the theory of
regulatory focus which addresses gains, ideals, and accomplishments (promotion) or duties, obligations, and security (prevention).

The motivation-based model proposed by Johnson, Chang, and Yang (2010) claimed that employees can be committed to any number of constituents. However, they focus on commitment to one’s organization and supervisor. An extensive analysis of numerous dimensions within this model facilitates a summary that highlights the motivations underlying different types of commitment. Moreover, the authors maintain that various forms of commitment can be identified by considering various combinations of employee self-identity and regulatory focus. “Understanding these motivations is important because they account for the similarities and differences that have been observed” among affective, normative, and continuance commitment (Johnson, Chang, & Yang, 2010).

**Empowerment**


Conducting an empirical study of individuals on leadership roles, the authors used Bass and Avolio’s (2000) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to measure leadership behaviors and a combined tool based on Conger and Kanungo (1988), Spreitzer (1996), and Menon (2001) to
measure psychological empowerment, the authors tested these constructs against job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Results demonstrated support for the hypotheses as set by Castro, Periñan, and Bueno (2008). Conclusions were summarized as “employees who feel inspired by an attractive objective and a compelling vision and experience a sense of control (choice and impact) have a higher level of satisfaction with their jobs” (Castro, Periñan, and Bueno, 2008). This finding is consistent with previous research (e.g., Fulford and Enz, 1995; Koberg, 1999; Menon, 1995; Thomas & Tymon, 1994). Castro, Periñan, and Bueno (2008) indicate there is a “strong relationship between an employee’s affective commitment to the organization and that person’s experience of empowerment.” This is consistent with other researchers (e.g., Avolio et al., 2004; Fulford and Enz, 1995; Koberg et al., 1999; Menon, 1995; and Thomas & Tymon, 1994).

While some studies, including Castro, Periñan, and Bueno (2008), considered empowerment theory within the construct of Transformational Leadership, a study by Zhang and Bartol (2010) differentiated empowerment theory as independent of Transformational Leadership and considered it separately when discussing the gaps in research (Mumford, Scott, Gaddis, and Strange, 2002; Tierney, 2008). The purpose of the study by Zhang and Bartol (2010) was to construct and test theory that addressed the association between empowering leadership and creativity, including several significant intervening variables.

To develop their theoretical framework, the authors explored three key constructs to explain the relationship between empowering leadership and creativity: psychological empowerment, creative process engagement, and intrinsic motivation. Therefore, they explored the extent to which empowering leadership works through psychological empowerment to ultimately influence employee creativity.
The understanding of psychological empowerment was based in the work of Spreitzer (1995) and is demonstrated in four cognitions: meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact. Zhang and Bartol (2010) indicated that theoretical arguments have suggested psychological empowerment makes an important contribution to employee creativity by positively affecting an employee’s intrinsic motivation (Amabile, 1996; Spreitzer, 1995). However, empirical evidence is lacking to prove this (Shalley et al., 2004). Zhang and Bartol (2010) identified intrinsic motivation as “the extent to which an individual is interested in a task and engages in it for the sake of the task itself”. Therefore, the authors presented intrinsic motivation as the second mediating element connecting empowering leadership and creativity. The third mediating variable considered by the authors in their study was creative process engagement to link psychological empowerment with creative outcomes. This notion was influenced by the research of Drazin, Glynn, and Kazanjian (1999), Mumford (2000), and Shalley and Gilson (2004).

Zhang and Bartol (2010) maintained that current research supports that different forms of leadership are related to employee creativity (e.g., Amabile et al., 2004; George and Zhou, 2007; Shalley and Gilson, 2004; Shin and Zhou, 2003, 2007; Tierney et al., 1999), including LMX (leader-member exchange). Studies provide evidence positive leadership supports creativity while controlling leadership squelches creativity (Amabile et al., 2004). While some studies have shown Transformational Leadership to have a positive impact on employee creativity (e.g., Howell and Avolio, 1993; Jung, Chow and Wu, 2003; Keller, 1992; Shin and Zhou, 2003; Sosik, Kahai, and Avolio, 1998), others have different results (e.g., Basu and Green, 1997; Jaussi and Dionne, 2003; Kahai, Sosik, and Avolio, 2003).
For this reason, Zhang and Bartol (2010) point to empowering leadership with its combination of behaviors to delegate authority to an employee so as to enable the employee to make decisions and implement actions without direct supervision or intervention (Bass, 1985; Jung et al., 2003). The authors maintain that given the nature of creativity, “such delegation helps establish a work context wherein an employee is encouraged and empowered to explore diverse creative alternatives before settling on a viable creative solution (Amabile, et al., 1996).”

Zhang and Bartol (2010) define empowering leadership as the “process of implementing conditions that enable sharing power with an employee by delineating the significance of the employee’s job, providing greater decision-making autonomy, expressing confidence in the employee’s capabilities, and removing hindrances to performance (Ahearne et al., 2005; Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, and Drasgow, 2000; Kirkman & Rosen, 1997).

Zhang and Bartol (2010) suggest that their research makes several important contributions. First, they offer their study constructed and tested a conceptual model with an original integration of empowering leadership theory with creativity theories. Second, their study contributes to leadership and empowerment literature by confirming psychological empowerment as a mediating instrument through which empowering leadership impacts employee creativity. Third, their study demonstrates the relationship of psychological empowerment with both intrinsic motivation and creative process engagement. Fourth, the authors illustrate the importance of creative process engagement in illuminating employee creative outcomes. Fifth, Zhang and Bartol (2010) reveal the mediation of intrinsic motivation between psychological empowerment and employee creativity both directly and indirectly.
**Theoretical Analysis of Motivation and Empowerment Practice**

While the theoretical analysis of motivation by Johnson, Chang, and Yang (2010) provides the broad arcing umbrella and the numerous research studies that explored leadership and motivation in this paper provide the shaping spokes, the theoretical meta analysis by Locke and Latham (2004) provides the floor stand that safely positions the many ideas presented. In this article, the authors compare the numerous theories of motivation (e.g., Argyris, 1957; Herzberg, 1959; Vroom, 1964) and social-cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 1987) that have circulated in common parlance and concluded that the vast plethora of theories each hold a portion of validity when it comes to considering the role of motivation in the work place. And, while none of these are necessarily inaccurate, Locke and Latham (2004) maintain they are flawed, not in so much as they contradict each other, but rather based on the fact that they focus on different aspects of the motivation process.

To remedy this gap in the literature, Locke and Latham (2004) pose what they term a “metatheory” which they further describe as a “process or processes through which we build more valid, more complete, and more practical theories” (Locke and Latham, 2004). To accomplish this goal, the authors pose six recommendations: 1) use the results of existing meta-analysis to amalgamate valid aspects of existing theories; 2) create a “boundaryless” science of work motivation based on the reflections and frustrations of Jack Welch, former CEO of General Electric, who lamented that teams often ignore valid suggestions just because the ideas did not originate within their group; 3) identify how broad-spectrum variables become applied to and are affected by task and situationally specific variables, how they are moderated by situations, and how they influence situational choice and structuring; 4) study subconscious and conscious motivation and the relationship between; 5) use introspection unambiguously as a method of
studying and comprehending motivation; 6) acknowledge the role of free will on human action when formulating theories (Locke and Latham, 2004).

In their conclusion, the authors summarize the purpose of their article was to emphasize the importance of studying work motivation from new perspectives. They further maintain that many related topics have yet to be considered and “certain methods have been underutilized” (Locke and Latham, 2004). They also indicate the issues not covered under their considerations including time and time priorities from the role of leadership. They also identify the inconsistent application of various definitions within the study of work motivation,

As with all studies, and no less true of the ones considered in this project, there are limitations within the studies and theoretical analyses. In all cases, populations are restricted, variance in accessibility plays a role, variables moderated and mediated may pose limitations, data collection and data validity issues can occur, researcher bias and population homogeneity may be contributing issues affecting the outcome of a study. However, in most cases, there was agreement in the results and conclusions drawn appeared logical and supported empirically. Some of the most respected experts in the field were considered in the various research articles and there was a strong inter-referencing of contemporary authors.

Despite the comprehensive review of the available research, there appeared to be no available studies that specifically examined the effects of Transformational Leadership on motivation within the non-profit social service sector. While studies do lend themselves to general applicability (e.g., Bono & Judge, 2003; Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005; Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang & Shi, 2005), none specifically address this unique environment to consider the role of Transformational Leadership to motivate in order to create a climate conducive to social change. It may be valuable to consider the role of leadership to motivate
systems-change within the social nonprofit world with consideration given to numerous variables.

This portion of the literature review is intended to position the theoretical framework as the overarching theme under which numerous research studies could fit offering support for those concepts. Specific trends did emerge including efficacy, regulatory focus, personality, emotional intelligence, values, and leadership. To conclude this section, a review of contemporary metatheories of motivation was positioned to anchor the previous research. Limitations were discussed and recommendations for further study offered.

**Summary**

There exists a marked consistency between the findings of the various articles reviewed. Little to no disagreement surfaced to negate the important correlation between the perceived leadership style and the positive organizational context necessary to support front-line worker empowerment and self-efficacy. Likewise, there was consistency in the research to support the relationship between the front-line worker’s commitment to promoting a service model of empowerment practice and the clients’ subsequent empowerment and self-efficacy. There were, however, no research studies identified which drew the direct link between the multi-level concepts articulated in the research questions intended for this study. With the majority of the studies utilizing qualitative research methods, there is very little empirical evidence based on operationalized processes to support these concepts. While several studies (Anderson, Krajewski, Goffin, & Jackson, 2008; Peterson & Speer, 2000; and Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang, & Shi, 2005) used either quantitative or mixed methods to support leadership theory applied to organizational culture that empowered workers and promoted self-efficacy, and several studies (Ellett, 2008; Morrison, Van Voorhis and Hostetter, 2006) used quantitative
methods to support front-line worker self-efficacy, most studies examining front-line worker relied on focus groups, interviews, and longitudinal observations.

The literature examining leadership style’s effect on worker self-efficacy and collective efficacy supports the hypothesis across each of the studies explored. To the extent that the leader utilized empowerment principles, shared responsibility and shared power, workers functioned with higher levels of self-efficacy. The literature also supported the hypothesis that the front-line worker’s commitment to empowerment practice and awareness of their self-efficacy facilitated the motivation of clients to improve their lives.

The extant literature which explored the construct of spirituality and leadership including journal articles, numerous internet resources, including blogs and postings, and several relevant books were examined for themes and congruence in concepts presented. Several ideations emerged: early on it was obvious that many philosophical and scholarly writers were exploring the topic. It was also clear that while some authors distinguished spiritual leadership as an autonomous concept, others drew their cognitions based on the classical leadership theorists such as Bass and Avolio and tweezed spirituality concepts out of the current language of Transformational Leadership theory and Charismatic Leadership theory. Still other scholars integrated the concepts of Transcendental Leadership and Servant Leadership to offer distinctions and correlative concepts.

What each of these authors contributed, however, was a consistent theme that recognized the important contribution spirituality and principle-centered leadership makes to the organization both for the leader and for the followers. It is this foundation of ethical behavior and altruism that flows out of an interiorized and heightened awareness of the Divine, of purpose, of work as a calling, of concern for the ultimate aspirations and self-actualization of the human
spirit. Ultimately, the spiritual leader becomes an instrument of transformation and healing at the individual level, the group level, and for the organization as a whole. As the spiritual leader journeys through their personal and individualized process of adult and spiritual development with its stages of awakening, transition, recovery, dark night and dawn, concepts reminiscent of John of the Cross and Teresa of Avila, he or she is able to lead followers and the organization through the same journey of enlightenment and shared sense of the transcendent sacred. This is not done in the spirit of preaching or proselytizing, but rather of authentic congruence between words and actions which inspires and motivates for personal life change and self-realization.

The language of spirituality in the workplace and spiritual leadership is drawn heavily from the integrated language of Transformational Leadership, but also from the philosophical and theological masters from every religious tradition. Each of the scholars were quick to point out the distinction between spirituality and religion or religiosity while integrating the same teachings of Jesus, the Buddha, Gandhi, Rumi, numerous saints and sacred texts from each of the major faith traditions. In the end, spiritual leadership theory was condensed to an authentic living of human call to live in harmony with the Divine.

While the themes and considerations were clear among all the articles researched, there exists little empirical research to quantitatively support the conclusions. While the concept papers differed little other than a small number of issues of semantics or vernacular, few referenced any scientific studies that examined the theoretical construct of spirituality and leadership. There is plethora of empirical studies examining Transformational Leadership and motivation theories which could be applied and interpreted through the lens of spiritual leadership. There are a few research articles examining work-life balance. But, an extensive
search for either qualitative or quantitative studies revealed little scientific evidence to support the philosophical consensus.

This reality, therefore, offers recommendations for further study. There are measurement tools such as the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire, the Servant Leadership Behavior Scale, and the Job Development Index that are recognized as valid and reliable which could be integrated and combined in a quantitative study. It was the journal article presented by Fry et al., (2008) when they discussed legacy leadership as a motivating factor for personal change and Dhiman’s (2008) discussion of self-actualization to catalyze personal change that offered a potential launch for the concepts that surround this proposed dissertation.

Having examined leadership from the industrial-organization psychology lens and the lens of spirituality and leadership, the same overarching questions emerge: what relationship does the leadership style have on front-line workers’ level of self-efficacy? This question is consistent with concepts identified as adaptive change, which is a topic Ron Heifetz explores in his contemporary work.

The next chapter will examine the proposed methodology that will be utilized to answer the prevailing question delineated above.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents a summary of the methodology designed and applied to answer the research question for a study about the relationship between perceived leadership styles of immediate supervisors and the level of front-line social service agency workers’ self-efficacy. Approval for this study was granted by the Human Subjects Review Board. See Appendix A. This chapter will restate the research question; explain the research design for the proposed project, anticipated participants, instrumentation to be utilized, the data collection procedures to be applied, and the proposed data analysis.

Research Question

The following research question was explored: What is the relationship between the front-line social service worker’s perception of leadership styles of the social service agency supervisors and the self-efficacy level of front-line social service workers? This research question generated the following hypotheses:

1. Perceived leadership styles relate to the front-line social service worker’s levels of self-efficacy.
2. Transformational and Transcendental/ Spiritual leadership styles will have a stronger relationship to front-line worker levels of self-efficacy than transactional and laissez-faire non-leadership styles.
3. There will be differences in levels of self-efficacy between subgroups based on gender, age, years in relationship to the supervisor, and education level.

Research Design

This study utilized descriptive statistical analysis and several tests of inferential statistics including Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and correlation analysis research design to explore the
relationship between the perceived style of leadership demonstrated by the social service agency leader and the level of self-efficacy of front-line social service agency workers. The design investigated to what extent the front-line social service worker’s perception of his or her immediate supervisor’s leadership style as measured by Bass and Avolio’s (1994) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) relates to the self-efficacy of the front-line social service worker as measured by Schwarzer and Jerusalem’s (1993) General Self-efficacy Scale.

To measure the relationship between perceived Leadership style and level of self-efficacy of front-line workers, I used Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to test if subgroup (leaders’ styles/front-line workers) means are equal and if differences exist between groups; and correlation analysis to test if a relationship exists between leadership style and self-efficacy level. To measure whether or not the follower’s perception of any of the three leadership styles had a relationship to self-efficacy levels of front-line workers, I used correlation analysis.

Participants

The participants were front-line workers from United Way funded partner agencies throughout several Midwest states. Agencies whose United Way allocation is below $25,000 are excluded because less than this level of community investment may indicate the program is not large enough to have the hierarchical structure of supervisors and front-line workers necessary for this study. Only agencies serving within municipalities with populations exceeding 50,000 and poverty rates of 20% or above were used for this study. The front-line workers were both male and female, possessed various types of degrees acceptable within the field including associates, bachelors, and graduate degrees as well as no formal training beyond high school. They ranged in age and represented each of the major ethnic and racial backgrounds, including
Black, White, and Latino/Hispanic. No participants indicated either Asian or Native American heritage, although this was an option for selection.

The following process was used to select participating organizations: an internet search identified the various United Way agencies in each of the metropolitans invited to participate in the study. The metropolitan areas were selected based on poverty rate and population density. These communities met the threshold of at least 20% of the population in poverty and a population density of at least 50,000 residents based on information retrieved from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, September 29, 2010. The contact information for the chief executive officers of these metropolitan United Ways is indicated on the corresponding websites under the “Contact Us” tab. A letter of introduction explaining the purpose of this study, the potential benefits, and the study design was prepared and attached to an email. See Appendix B. This letter also politely requested permission and informed of the intent to contact the United Way funded partners in the appropriate metropolitan service areas. As a courtesy, a link to the internet survey was included in the email sent to the metropolitan United Way chief executive officers.

In the next step, an internet search also identified the United Way funded partner agencies in each of the metropolitan cities where poverty levels are at or above 20% and populations exceed 50,000 residents. Several communities provided a detailed list of partners, programs, funding levels and contact information for these partners on the local United Way home page. This information provided a direct link to facilitate contact with organizational leaders. In other cases, the researcher followed the internet search process to go from listed funded partner to that organization’s internet home page. An examination of the home page supplied the contact information for the organization’s leader. A letter of introduction explaining the purpose of this study, the potential benefits, and the study design was prepared and attached
to an email. This letter also politely requested permission of social service agency leaders to invite their front-line social service workers to participate in the study. See Appendix C. Agency leaders were provided a link to the survey posted on Survey Monkey. They were invited to forward the link to their front-line workers or to share the email addresses of front-line workers so that the researcher could contact the workers directly.

Participants were selected using a random sample method that selected front-line social service agency workers from the available population of United Way funded partners in metropolitan communities. Since an unknown number of United Way funded partner chief executive officers chose to forward the survey to their front-line workers, the researcher only had direct control when contacting front-line workers directly through available email addresses. Therefore, the introductory letter and survey were sent multiple times to United Way funded partner chief executive officers and to front-line workers with available email addresses. The survey remained available for several weeks on the internet link before it was removed to process data.

**Instrumentation**

Three separate instruments were used and integrated in one survey tool: The Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire, The Servant Leadership Behavior Scale and the General Self-efficacy Scale. See Appendix D. All instruments are considered valid and reliable and have been utilized in research for a number of years. Permissions to use these instruments were obtained. Multiple Internet use licenses to use The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) were purchased through Mind Garden, Inc. Access to The Servant Leadership Behavior Scale was granted by Wiley and Sons through the Copyright Clearinghouse. Access to the General Perceived Self-efficacy Scale was granted through the authors Ralf Schwarzer and Matthias Jerusalem. The gold
version of Survey Monkey was purchased online to allow unlimited questions and data transfer into SPSS for analysis.

The Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire as developed by Bass and Avolio (1994) is a standardized tool designed to measure leadership style. For purposes of this study, the leadership style of social service agency leaders as perceived by front-line social service workers was measured by an adoption of The Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire as developed by Bass and Avolio (1994). This tool of 45 items measured responses based on a six-point Likert Scale, with scores ranging from 0 to 270. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire is composed of seven scales to measure (1) genuine concern for others, (2) political sensitivity and skills, (3) decisiveness, determination, and self-confidence, (4) integrity, trustworthiness, honesty, and openness, (5) empowering, develops potential, (6) networker, promoter, and communicator, (7) accessibility and approachability, (8) clarifies boundaries, and (9) encourages critical and strategic thinking. Transformational Leadership is measured through four dimensions: charisma (charismatic leadership), inspiration (inspirational leadership), intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Transactional Leadership is measured through contingent reward and active management-by-exception. The MLQ also measured non-leadership through one dimension of laissez-faire: passive-management-by-exception. However, non-leadership was not considered in this study. The tool was administered through an online survey using Survey Monkey. An aggregated mean score for each leadership style measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was calculated for each participant.

While there are dimensions of Transformational Leadership that appear consistent with transcendent/spiritual leadership, the literature has shown some distinctions between the two leadership styles. While there is parity in the scales of charisma, vision and mission,
transcendent/spiritual leadership considers the individual’s sense of a personal higher calling as a distinguishing characteristic. To consider this aspect of leadership as distinct from Transformational Leadership, an additional tool, The Servant Leadership Behavior Scale, based on the work of Greenleaf (1977), and developed by Sendjaya was used to measure aspects of transcendental/spiritual leadership. Six dimensions of servant leadership were measured by twenty-two questions using a six-point Likert Scale with a range of scores from 0 to 132. Dimensions assessed include: (1) voluntary subordination, (2) authentic self, (3) covenantal relationship, (4) responsible morality, (5) transcendent spirituality, and (6) transforming influence. Twenty-two subscales are used to measure subdimensions related to the six dimensions listed. Voluntary subordination is measured through “being a servant” and “acts of service.” Authentic self is measured through “humility, security, integrity, vulnerability, and accountability.” Covenantal relationship is measured by “acceptance, equality, and availability.” Responsible morality is measured by “moral reasoning and moral actions.” Transcendent spirituality is measured by “religiousness which is a sense of a higher calling, sense of mission, inner consciousness and holistic mindset.” Transforming influence is measured by “vision, trust, role modeling, empowerment, and mentoring.” Each of these dimensions and subdimensions create a composite score for spiritual/transcendental leadership on the continuum of leadership styles. An aggregated mean score for transcendental/spiritual leadership was calculated for each participant.

Front-line worker level of self-efficacy was assessed using the theoretical construct reflected in social cognitive theory as described by Bandura (1977). Identification of an appropriate instrument is a challenge as self-efficacy is measured through discipline specific instruments. It is necessary to identify the theoretical constructs of self-efficacy and determine a
goodness of fit level based on the dimensions of self-efficacy and the accurate measurement of those dimensions by the questions asked. To accomplish this, a tool of 10 self-efficacy items was adapted from Bandura’s Self-efficacy Assessment by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1993) based on the work of Bandura’s (1977) social cognitive theory. The Self-efficacy Scale designed by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1993) measures the degree of a person’s action control or agency. The tool is a standardized ten question scale measuring responses to the following statements based on a seven-point Likert-type assessment of agreement: (1) I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough; (2) If someone opposes me, I can find means and ways to get what I want; (3) It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals; (4) I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events; (5) Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations; (6) I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort; (7) I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities; (8) When confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions; (9) If I am in trouble, I can usually think of something to do; and (10) No matter what comes my way, I am usually able to handle it.

These ten questions are consistent with the dimensions of self-efficacy which Bandura defined as beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute courses of action to produce given attainments, influence the course of action people choose to pursue, how much effort they put forth in given endeavors, how long they will persist in the face of obstacles and failures, their resilience to adversity, whether their thought patterns are self-hindering or self-aiding, how much stress and depression they experience, and the level of accomplishments they realize (Ellett, 2009). The tool was administered through the online survey to front-line workers. Scores ranged from 0 to 60. An aggregated mean score for self-efficacy was calculated for each participant.
An additional set of questions assessed location and demographic characteristics. These characteristics include age, gender, education, and number of years the front-line worker has known the supervisor and the number of years the front-line worker worked under the supervisor.

**Procedures**

The instruments were administered within the various groups with anonymity, through the use of an internet based survey. Agency directors were given the option to either forward the link to the online survey directly or to provide contact email addresses for the researcher to utilize. Front-line social service agency workers were encouraged to access the surveys online through Survey Monkey and complete The Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire and Servant Leadership Behavior Scale to assess their perception of the leadership style of their leader and the General Self-efficacy Scale to assess their own level of self-efficacy. The survey instrument was launched first to Ohio metropolitan United Way funded partner agencies and remained available for six weeks. A second survey launch was released to Chicago, Detroit and Indianapolis and remained available for five weeks. In both launches, multiple email invitations were sent to encourage and invite participation.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis procedures for the research question were standard for a quantitative analysis. Numerous descriptive statistical tests were run, including values of mean, median, mode, and frequency. Further assessments were conducted utilizing correlation and ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) to test for relationships between dependent and independent variables, including demographic characteristics. Data were aggregated and analyzed using SPSS software to interpret results. Additional tests for Normality and Linearity and Levene’s Test for Equality
of Variances to examine Homoscedasticity were not appropriate because ANOVA tests showed no significant differences between groups.

**Assumptions and Limitations**

The success of this study relied on several assumptions. One is that the participants would respond to the survey questions with honesty, openness, and comprehension of the meaning and intent of the questions as presented. There was also an assumption that leaders and front-line social service agency workers would agree to participate in the survey when many are busy with multiple demands. The limitations of the study are numerous: the sample was potentially very large; however it was not feasible to assess all available participants, thus excluding potential individuals who may respond differently. There was a risk that the random selection was biased based on the willingness of the participants.

The inferential tests chosen for this study were appropriate based on the underlying assumptions for those tests. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) examined group differences based on demographic variables of age, gender, race, education level, number of years in relationship with a supervisor, and the number of years under that individual’s supervisory authority. Correlation tests appropriately examined the relationship between perceived leadership styles (Transformational, Transcendental/ Spiritual, Transactional, or Laissez-faire/non-leadership) and the self-efficacy level of front-line workers in social service agencies.

Results of these tests will be examined and summarized in Chapter Four. Results of the descriptive analyses will be presented first followed by results of the inferential analyses.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the front line workers’ levels of self-efficacy and the perceived styles of leadership of their immediate supervisor in nonprofit social service agencies. This chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis first by descriptive statistics and then by the research question and related hypotheses.

Descriptive Statistics

Permission for participation in the present study was sought and granted by several regional offices of The United Way. Of the 450 front line workers invited to participate from seven Midwestern metropolitan cities, 103 responded for a 22.8% response rate. Of the 127 agencies invited to participate, 37 agencies gave consent to access employees directly while 21 agencies indicated they would forward the survey instrument internally. The survey was released first in the four largest Ohio metropolitan areas (Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, and Toledo) with multiple reminders and invitations sent. The instrument remained available to participants for six weeks. Due to the low response rate, a second outreach was extended to include comparable United Way funded agencies in Chicago, Detroit, and Indianapolis. The survey remained available to participants for five weeks. Agency directors who agreed to allow their employees to participate articulated interest in the study and potential results. Agency directors who declined to participate indicated there was insufficient time, low numbers of employees, or lack of interest.

Of the 103 participants in the study, the majority were female \( n=92, \ 89.3\% \), as shown in Table 1. Also, most of the participants were White \( n=93, \ 90.3\% \), as shown in Table 2. Table 3 depicts the age distribution for the participants. The majority of the front line workers are 41 years of age and older \( n = 56, \ 54.3\% \). The next most reported group is 31-40 years of age \( n=
27, 26.2%) and the remaining age range, 21-30 is the smallest (n=20, 19.4%). With respect to the highest level of education attained, the majority of the respondents reported a Bachelor’s degree (n=53, 51.5%), while the next largest group held an Associate degree or less (n=28, 27.2%), and the fewest reported a Graduate level degree (n=22, 21.4%). See Table 4.

Table 1

*Gender of Front Line Workers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

*Race of Front Line Workers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other races</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Age Range of Front Line workers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 years-30 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 years-40 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 years and older</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Education Levels of Front Line Workers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree or less</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 presents the variation in the number of years front line social service workers have been in relationship with the person they indicated as their immediate supervisor. These data were collected in four ranges: less than one year, from one to three years, from three years to five years, and more than five years. The results indicated an even distribution among the participants. The largest group (n=31, 30.1%) reported having been in a relationship, i.e., knowing the person who was their supervisor, for more than five years. The next most frequently reported group indicated that they have been in a relationship with their supervisor for three to five years (n=30, 29.1%), those who knew their supervisor from one year to three years (n=28, 27.2%), and less than one year (n=14, 13.6%). The number of years the front line workers had been supervised by the individual they indicated in this role was collected in four ranges, as well: less than one year, from one year to three years, from three years to five years, and more than five years. Results indicated that the largest group of front line workers had been in a supervision relationship with their supervisor for three to five years (n=33, 32%). Those who had been in a supervision relationship for less than one year had the next highest frequency (n=29, 28.2%). The remaining front line workers had been in a supervision relationship from one to three years (n=20, 19.4%) or for more than five years (n=21, 20.4%). This analysis is presented in Table 6.

Seven metropolitan cities were included in this study, as shown in Table 7. Chicago reported zero participants, while Indianapolis reported the largest number (n=35, 34.0%), Cincinnati
(n=24, 23.3%), Detroit (n=21, 20.4%), Toledo (n=13, 12.6%), Cleveland (n=8, 7.8%), and Columbus (n=2, 1.9%).

Table 5

*Number of Years Front Line Workers Have Known Their Supervisor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1-3 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-5 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

*Number of Years Front Line Workers Have Been Supervised by Their Immediate Supervisor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1-3 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 3-5 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

*Location*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Findings

This section presents the findings of the research. First, I will review the Analyses of Variance and the correlation results of the research question. Then I will review the results of the Analyses of Variance for hypotheses one and two. The research question asked, What is the relationship between the front-line social service worker’s perception of leadership styles of the social service agency supervisors and the self-efficacy level of front-line social service workers?

Results for Hypotheses One and Two

The first two hypotheses were as follows:

1. Perceived leadership styles relate to the front-line social service worker’s levels of self-efficacy.
2. Transformational and transcendental/spiritual leadership styles will have a stronger relationship with front-line worker levels of self-efficacy than transactional and laissez-faire non-leadership styles will have.

Aggregate mean scores were calculated for self-efficacy, Transcendental/spiritual leadership, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, and laissez-faire/non-leadership. The descriptive statistical results indicated the aggregated mean score for self-efficacy based on a six-point Likert scale with six being “significantly agree” (M=4.8180, S=.58807). Laissez-faire/non-leadership scores had the lowest mean but the highest standard deviation (M=2.1036, S=.95661). The other scores were less varied. Transcendental/spiritual leadership showed M=4.8226 (S=.81951), Transformational Leadership had a mean of M=4.7007 (S=.76175), and Transactional Leadership had a mean of M=4.3665 (S=.67482). The results are summarized below in Table 8.
Table 8

*Aggregated Mean Scores for Self-efficacy and Leadership Styles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregated Score</th>
<th>Mean (n= 103)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>4.8180</td>
<td>.58807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership</td>
<td>4.8226</td>
<td>.81951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>4.7007</td>
<td>.76175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>4.3665</td>
<td>.67482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire/Non-Leadership</td>
<td>2.1036</td>
<td>.95661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations were calculated to determine if a relationship exists between leadership style and levels of self-efficacy. Results indicated that there were statistically significant relationships between front line worker self-efficacy and each of the four leadership styles.

Transcendental/spiritual leadership significantly related to self-efficacy levels; r(102)=.257, r-sq=.0660, p=.009, two tailed. Transformational leadership significantly related to self-efficacy levels; r(102)=.254, r-sq=.0645, p=.010, two tailed. Transactional Leadership significantly related to self-efficacy levels; r(102)=.247, r-sq=.0610, p=.012, two tailed. And Laissez-faire/non-leadership significantly and negatively related to self-efficacy levels; r(102)=−.207, r-sq=.0428, p=.036, two tailed. Table 9 shows these results. While there are significant correlations between self-efficacy and each of the four leadership styles, no cause and effect conclusions can be drawn.
Table 9

_Pearson r Correlation Between Leadership Style and Self-efficacy Levels_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>R-Squared</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcendental/Spiritual</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>.010**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire/Non-leadership</td>
<td>-.207</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
<td>.036*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* sig. at 0.05
** sig. at 0.01

**Results for Hypothesis Three**

The third hypothesis for the current study was stated as follows:

3. There will be differences in levels of self-efficacy between subgroups based on gender, age, years in relationship to the supervisor, and education.

   Analyses of Variance were conducted to compare levels of self-efficacy based on gender, race, age, years in relationship to the supervisor, and education. Based on the results, the hypothesis was not supported (fail to reject the null). Comparing self-efficacy with gender showed gender does not significantly impact levels of self-efficacy; F(1,101)=.163, p=0.687 as shown in Table 10. Table 11 shows the descriptive statistics for mean and standard deviation for self-efficacy by gender.
Table 10

*Analysis of Variance for Self-efficacy by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Stat</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>35.217</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>35.274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

*Descriptive Statistical Analysis for Self-efficacy by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7500</td>
<td>.58095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.8261</td>
<td>.59154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.8180</td>
<td>.58807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing self-efficacy with race showed race does not significantly impact levels of self-efficacy; F(1,101)=.010, p=0.920 as shown in Table 12. Table 13 shows the descriptive statistics for mean and standard deviation for self-efficacy by race.

Table 12

*Analysis of Variance for Self-efficacy by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Stat</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>35.271</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>35.274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

*Descriptive Statistical Analysis for Self-efficacy by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>.73409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.819</td>
<td>.57503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.818</td>
<td>.58807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing self-efficacy with age showed age does not significantly relate to levels of self-efficacy; $F(4, 98)=2.324, p=0.062$ as shown in Table 14. Table 15 shows the descriptive statistics for mean and standard deviation for self-efficacy by age.

Table 14

*Analysis of Variance for Self-efficacy by Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Stat</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.056</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>2.324</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>32.218</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>35.274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

*Descriptive Statistical Analysis for Self-efficacy by Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.5500</td>
<td>.69585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.8333</td>
<td>.43853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and over</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.9115</td>
<td>.57401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.8180</td>
<td>.58807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no significant relationship between years in relationship and levels of self-efficacy; $F(3,99)=.495$, $p=0.686$ as shown in Table 16. Table 17 shows the descriptive statistics for mean and standard deviation for self-efficacy by years in relationship.

Table 16

*Analysis of Variance for Self-efficacy by Years in Relationship*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Stat</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>34.753</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>35.274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

**Descriptive Statistical Analysis for Self-efficacy by Years in Relationship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.7321</td>
<td>.57566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between one and three years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.7946</td>
<td>.45671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between three and five years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.9250</td>
<td>.59506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.7742</td>
<td>.69628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.8180</td>
<td>.58807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years in supervisory relationship was not significantly related to levels of self-efficacy; F(3,99)=1.428, p=0.239 as shown in Table 18. Table 19 shows the descriptive statistics for mean and standard deviation for self-efficacy by years in supervision.

Table 18

**Analysis of Variance for Self-efficacy by Years in Supervision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Stat</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33.811</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>35.274</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

*Descriptive Statistical Analysis for Self-Efficacy by Years in Supervision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.8448</td>
<td>.51501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between one and three</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.7500</td>
<td>.68825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between three and five</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.9545</td>
<td>.58113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.6310</td>
<td>.57347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.8180</td>
<td>.58807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of education did not significantly relate to levels of self-efficacy; F(2,100)=.256, p=0.775 as shown in Table 20. Table 21 shows the descriptive statistics for mean and standard deviation for self-efficacy by education level.

Table 20

*Analysis of Variance for Self-efficacy by Education Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Stat</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35.095</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>35.274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

Descriptive Statistical Analysis for Self-efficacy by Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate and less</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agency location was not significantly related to levels of self-efficacy; F(5,97)=1.807, p=0.119 as shown in Table 22. Table 23 shows the descriptive statistics for mean and standard deviation for self-efficacy by location.

Table 22

Analysis of Variance for Self-efficacy by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-Stat</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32.27</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>35.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23

Descriptive Statistical Analysis for Self-efficacy by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.9857</td>
<td>.57504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.7619</td>
<td>.50297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5625</td>
<td>.99777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7500</td>
<td>1.06066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.8854</td>
<td>.43601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>.54006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Statistical analysis supported the research question and both the first and second hypotheses, indicating there is a relationship between self-efficacy levels and leadership styles. Transcendental/Spiritual Leadership, Transformational Leadership and Transactional Leadership showed a positive correlation with levels of self-efficacy. A negative relationship was indicated for Laissez-faire/ non-leadership and self-efficacy levels. Analyses of variance revealed no significant differences in self-efficacy across levels of selected demographic variables (gender, race, age, years in relationship with the supervisor, and education level of the front line worker). Chapter Five will take a deeper look at the results and provide some context within the established literature review as well as personal reflections, implications for practice, recommendations for further research, and conclusion.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the level of front line worker self-efficacy and perceived styles of leadership of immediate supervisors in social service agencies. United Way leaders were contacted for permission to engage funded partner agencies involved in the Agenda for Change™ through the Education Change Initiative. Inspired by previous research in the business sector that examined leadership styles, self-efficacy, and related theoretical constructs of empowerment practice, motivation, and inspiration, this study examined the relationship between perceived leadership styles and self-efficacy levels of front line workers within the non-profit social services. The particular lens of United Way funded partners engaged in comparable work throughout multiple metropolitan cities focused this research within a defined brand that United Way promotes. From a base of potential participants in the targeted population from the invited agencies in seven large metropolitans, 103 front line workers completed the survey. These respondents have a story to tell about commitment to the work that they do with families based on their levels of self-efficacy, their age ranges, and the number of years they have known their supervisor and been supervised by this individual. This story lives quietly in the results of the ANOVA tests and suggests there may be valuable insights that can be inferred from these front line workers. These insights will be discussed later in this chapter.

In this chapter, I will review the salient points of the existing literature reviewed in Chapter 2, examining the leadership styles that this study demonstrated as having a statistically significant relationship to self-efficacy, self-efficacy, and front line social service workers. While the results demonstrated statistical significance, this study did not replicate the results of the business sector. Therefore, I will briefly review a few studies that assist with that quandary, including a discussion of the low response rate. I will reflect on how this study fits with the
previous ones and the unique position it holds as a new study. I will also discuss some perspectives on what I think this study tells the social service sector about leadership and self-efficacy of front line workers, offer suggestions for practice and further research, and end with by the conclusion.

**A Look Back to the Literature**

A number of studies that examined Transformational, Transcendental/ Spiritual, and Transactional Leadership styles and related theories showed results consistent with this study. At this point, Laissez-faire/Non-leadership will not be considered at length since the results of this study were consistent with others (Deluga, 1990; and Shea, 1999) and indicated, not surprisingly, a negative correlation to self-efficacy levels. The current study showed Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership was the most significant leadership style related to self-efficacy and was measured by a separate integrated instrument. Of the three leadership styles measured by the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire styles of Leadership, Transformational Leadership and Transactional Leadership were both positively related to self-efficacy. Therefore, this review of the literature will recall key studies and theoretical analysis of Transformational and Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership.

Transformational Leadership has been studied extensively within the business sector and received both national and international consideration in research (Rukmani, Ramesh, & Jayakrishnan, 2010; Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang & Shi, 2005). A number of studies have linked this popular style to a multitude of favorable organizational and personal characteristics including organizational effectiveness, leader effectiveness, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational culture, satisfaction, extra effort, worker motivation and inspiration, agreeableness, and positive affect (Ilies & Wagner, 2006; Menges, Walter, Vogel, & Bruch,
2011; and Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang, & Shi, 2005). Each of these positive associations of Transformational Leadership serves to support and enhance collective and self-efficacy within organizations. Except for Gellis (2001) who specifically examined Transformational Leadership within the social service sector, albeit from the health care arena, the other studies occurred within the automotive industry (Walumbwa & Hartnell, 2011), the banking industry (Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang & Shi, 2005), higher education (Shea, 1999), or public sectors (Menges, Walter, Vogel, & Bruch, 2011; Rubin, Munz, & Bommer, 2005; Rukmani, Ramesh, & Jayakrishnan, 2010; Vondey, 2008). None of these studies examined Transformational Leadership within the non-profit social service environment as this present research.

Several theoretical analyses (Fry, Matherly, Whittington, & Winston, 2007; and Hayden, Barbuto, & Goertzen, 2008) examined the impact Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership made on organizational culture by creating an inspiring workplace that is firmly grounded in values that are congruent with and within an organization (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2004; and Reave, 2005). For these scholars, Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership is the fundamental bridge that catalyzes creativity, inspiration, and passion in the workplace (Fry, Matherly, Whittington, & Winston, 2007; and Hayden, Barbuto, & Goertzen, 2008). Several key leadership skills are associated with this type of leadership, including showing respect for others, demonstrating fair treatment, expressing care and concern, listening responsively, recognizing the contributions of others, and engaging in reflective practice (Reave, 2005). Leader effectiveness and ethical leadership are also closely related constructs and seen as vital to performance, employee retention, and positive organizational culture (Fawcett, Brau, Rhoads, Whitlark & Fawcett, 2008; Reave, 2005).
A study by Hartsfeld (not dated) with 124 leaders from the aerospace technology field examined the relationship between Transformational and Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership, emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy. Important considerations in Hartfeld’s work indicated that leadership in different levels in an organization has varying effect on employee self-efficacy. Leaders at higher organizational levels can increase employee self-efficacy by clarifying employee’s work roles. Leaders at lower levels in the organization can build employee self-efficacy by giving sufficient social and emotional support to the employees. According to Hartsfeld, this could be attributed to the fact that lower level leaders work more closely with employees to carry out the organizational tasks established by higher-level leaders. A multiple regression analysis showed significance to predict a strong correlation between these variables, demonstrating how leaders can influence followers by going beyond observable leadership behavior to examine the very essence, or spirit of Transformational and Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership.

A study by McElroy (2002) conducted among California’s public child welfare workers which examined self-efficacy showed mean scores for self-efficacy comparable to those of this study. However, in McElroy’s study, workers who were enrolled in school showed a higher mean score for self-efficacy than those not enrolled in school. Interestingly, correlations between self-efficacy and organizational characteristics showed quality of supervision was not significant but quality of administration was. These results indicate the importance of a culture that encourages training and education as significant to self-efficacy and the leadership at the top as more important than the leadership of the immediate supervisor. Additionally, four other empirical studies reinforced the relationship between Transformational Leadership and self-efficacy in the military sector (Dov Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002), undergraduate students in an
academic setting (Shea, 1999), the automotive industry (Walumbwa & Hartnell, 2010), and a variety of organizations in India (Krishnan & Arora, 2008). Conclusions demonstrated direct and significant correlations between leadership and self-efficacy as predictors of high performance, follower development and organizational citizenship behavior; direct and significant correlations between leader social skills, public self-consciousness and even-temperedness and follower organizational citizenship behavior; and relational identification with the supervisor mediated the relationship between Transformational Leadership and self-efficacy, which was then positively related to employee performance. A meta-analysis (van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, De Cremer, & Hogg, 2004) showed several aspects of follower self-concept (i.e., self-construal, self-efficacy, self-esteem, and self-consistency) may be affected by leadership, and may mediate the effects of leadership on follower attitudes and behavior. Each of these identified studies which consider leadership styles and self-efficacy form the underpinning of existing research. The following section discusses where the present study fits into the extant literature.

**Discussion**

Reviewing the literature prepares the foundation for discussion. What did the present research show and what does this mean for leadership practice? The results showed that a relationship does exist between leadership style and self-efficacy levels of front line workers in social service agencies. The results of the current study showed that Transcendental/Spiritual Leadership had a slightly stronger correlation than Transformational Leadership to self-efficacy levels, which is consistent with the research of Reave (2005). This suggests that while leaders may not necessarily need to espouse religion or religious practices within their organizations, followers may detect a spiritual orientation demonstrated by the behaviors and attitudes of their leader (Hayden, Barbuto, & Goertzen, 2008) and this may increase their levels of self-efficacy
(Fawcett, Brau, Rhoads, Whitlark, & Fawcett, 2008). This also suggests the potential for effective leadership within faith-based organizations. Organizations with clearly defined and articulated spiritual missions have a rich opportunity to use the missional language within the context of motivation and inspiration (Fry, Matherly, Whittington, & Winston, 2007; and Reave, 2005). If front line workers detect and respond to a spiritual organizational climate, spiritual practices and articulated values (Reave, 2005), then this may be the fertile ground one can hope for to cultivate levels of self-efficacy. An organizational leader who promotes reflective practice, sometimes referred to as meditation (Reave, 2005), encourages followers to also reflect on the personal spiritual orientation in their lives, to examine their own values, and to assess what motivates or inspires them in their work.

Other Transcendental/Spiritual Leadership studies emphasized ethical and spiritual well-being that relate directly to a spiritual workplace that may not necessarily be a religion-oriented work place (Hayden, Barbuto, & Goertzen, 2008). These scholars identify the evidence of spiritual leadership in terms of altruism, social justice, empathy, and idealism or the common values of humility, charity, veracity, and vision. For these Transcendental/Spiritual leaders, it is less about a particular expression of religion and more of an orientation that flows from an authentically spiritual self and pervades the whole organization with these higher values (see Fry, Matherly, Whittington, & Winston, 2007; Hayden, Barbuto & Goertzen, 2008; and Reave, 2005).

Results of the current study also indicated that Transformational Leadership was correlated to front line workers’ levels of self-efficacy, consistent with the findings of Rubin, Munz and Bommer (2005) and van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, De Cremer, and Hogg (2004). This also demonstrates the inherent value of this leadership style, which encourages the
transformation of personal interests to consider those of the greater good (Krishnan & Arora, 2008). This leadership style and the embedded positive organizational culture support the environment associated with higher levels of self-efficacy and are consistent with other findings (Krishnan & Arora, 2008; Menges, Walter, Vogel, & Bruch, 2011; Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang, Shi, 2005).

There was not a remarkable difference in the present study between the correlation of Transformational Leadership and self-efficacy compared to Transactional Leadership and self-efficacy, suggesting that followers will possess self-efficacy within the scope of either leadership style. While this is not a discussion of cause and effect, it does create the foundation to presume that leaders who function along a continuum of Transformational to Transactional Leadership will be able to cultivate an environment that supports self-efficacy levels of workers. Furthermore, the results indicate that self-efficacy levels of front line workers were relatively high regardless of their leaders’ Transcendental/Spiritual Leadership, Transformational Leadership, and Transactional Leadership styles, perhaps indicating that front line workers are self-efficacious independent of leadership. Or, these findings could indicate that on the continuum of leadership styles, all three styles contribute to self-efficacy levels of front line workers in social services.

The negative correlation to Laissez-faire/non-leadership further indicates the extent to which this style of disengaged leadership is an oxymoron and fails to indicate any leadership at all. Moreover, leaders who function with this leadership style contribute little to enhance the efficacy levels of workers or the organizational culture that supports these individuals.

Additionally, while the correlations between leadership styles and self-efficacy were statistically significant, they were not large. This may indicate that even though self-efficacy is
related to leadership styles, there may be other factors that contribute to levels of self-efficacy, including the personal experiences of the front line worker, the extent to which these individuals share the history and background of the clients they serve, and their own resiliency (Ellett, 2009; Everette, Holmstead & Drisko, 2007; Gellis, 2001; and McElroy, 2002).

Results that showed that group differences among demographic variables did not relate to levels of self-efficacy are really a good thing. Self-efficacy as a social and intellectual construct should be independent of age, gender, race, or education. All should have equal access to this most fundamental concept of self-awareness.

Studies by the leading authors of the leadership research field all demonstrate convincing statistical significance with large sample sizes from a variety of sectors. Only McElroy (2002) looked at self-efficacy within the social service sector and among front line service workers. Other studies of front line social service workers related human caring, self-efficacy beliefs, and professional organizational culture (Ellett, 2009), front line worker perceptions of leadership and empowerment practice (Everett, Homstead, & Drisko, 2007), and leadership’s important relationship to retention, human caring, organizational culture, and self-efficacy (Westbrook, Ellis, Ellett, 2006). Each of these qualitative studies reinforced the significant relationship between leadership’s role and self-efficacy within the social sector.

The other studies examined throughout this current research looked at leadership styles and self-efficacy levels in many sectors. Gellis (2001) examined Transformational and Transactional Leadership in the social service/health care sector, while McElroy (2002) examined self-efficacy in child welfare agencies. The present study bridged the research gap by examining Transcendental/ Spiritual, Transformational, and Transactional Leadership and self-efficacy levels of front line workers in social service agencies. This present study also reveals
something about the challenges of engaging the social service sector in research such as this. Reflection on these challenges follows.

**Social Service Sector Engagement in Leadership Research**

Many valuable studies within the social service sector were qualitative and results were based on interviews and focus groups. This current study was intended to expand previous studies by introducing theoretical constructs of leadership styles and self-efficacy often considered in the business sector and front line social service workers often examined qualitatively. However, while this study showed a correlative relationship between perceived leadership styles and front line worker levels of self-efficacy in the social service sector, there was not as high a correlation with Transcendental/Spiritual Leadership and Transformational Leadership as expected. When this study was offered to leadership of United Ways at both the level of the World Wide Initiative and the various regional levels, it was embraced enthusiastically. Funded partner agencies with consistent missions, visions, and funded programs within the Educational Change Initiative were carefully selected for inclusion and the directors who gave consent offered enthusiastic endorsement of the study as potentially meaningful for their organizations, either as a tool for training or endorsement of current practice.

There were surprises in this study, not least of which was the paucity of participants. When regional United Ways supported this research, expectations soared. One metropolitan United Way which United Way World Wide labeled as a model for the Agenda for Change™ was so enthusiastic it agreed to promote the study by endorsing the project in direct communication to funded partner agency directors. This metropolitan had over 60 Education Initiative funded partners with combined staff members of approximately 500. However, only two front line workers out of a possible 500 completed the survey. Multiple emails were sent to
encourage participation to no avail. Another agency director from Indianapolis copied the researcher on emails sent to a staff of 120 front line workers encouraging participation based on the value of the research project. Several agencies from Indianapolis gave permission to participate. Based on the numbers that came from that metropolis, clearly not all potential participants followed through and completed the survey.

This phenomenon generates a litany of queries. For instance why did so few of the potential participants actually complete the survey? Several authors indicate that the most common reasons for choosing not to participate in surveys include factors of time, lack of interest, the topic or purpose lack individual meaning, privacy issues, insufficient personal benefit, or diversity disconnect (see, e.g., Singer, 2010; Smith, Woo, & Austin, 2010). Since the majority of participants in the survey were white, this at least raises diversity questions not able to be answered by the scope of this project. For social service agencies serving the metropolitan areas, it seems likely, if not provable, that there are more front lines workers reflective of diversity than this study engaged. Smith, Woo, and Austin (2010) indicate that the most frequent reason individuals of diverse backgrounds do not participate in surveys is because they feel the study “does not look like me” (p. 621).

Could we possibly have a social service system whereby the language of self-efficacy and leadership is so foreign that the front line workers simply absent themselves from the dialogue? If this is true then, how can this system do anything to empower those it intends to assist? What is the relationship with front line workers, the supervisors, and the organizational leaders in these agencies? The current study measured race and ethnicity of the front line worker but did not ask if the front line worker shared the same racial background as her or his supervisor. However, even this information would not answer why others chose not to
participate. And, if this is about Education Initiative under the banner of United Way’s branding, what does low participation say about the potential of success for our communities engaged in this campaign? The United Way Agenda for Change™ has two other components in addition to the Education Initiative. These are the Health Change Initiative and the Financial Stability Initiative.

Or could the social service sector profit from understanding the benefit of research as Stoecker (2004) suggests? Stoecker (2004) indicates that a study of Toledo, Ohio, area nonprofits revealed that there are many data and research needs that neither the nonprofits nor funders have the capacity to fill. There is a strong demand for research training among nonprofits, and in some cases funders, to better collect, manage, and analyze the data for which they have the capacity. And, according to Stoecker (2004), there is a need for further discussion around the questions of what kinds of research models and support are needed to establish needs and options on the front end, and outcomes and impacts on the back end of projects. While only Toledo nonprofits were engaged in this research, perhaps the same prevailing capacity issues exist in other regions as well.

Ellett (2009) described the social service sector as disengaged, fragmented, and not always able to retain qualified and committed workers due to many personal and organizational factors including levels of self-efficacy and leadership. Westbrook, Ellis, and Ellett (2006) called those dedicated front line social service workers who do manage to navigate the challenges of working with vulnerable populations within the social service organizational structure “committed survivors” who find support from leaders who exhibit those leadership behaviors and attitudes most consistent with Transformational Leadership or Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership.
Given these insights, one can wonder what personal and organizational factors inhibited or encouraged the type of introspection and use of time necessary for a project of this nature. For learning organizations dedicated to serving the community, modeling social and systems change under the branding banner of United Way’s Agenda for Change™ and the Education Change Initiative, it would seem practically intuitive that front line workers would be eager to demonstrate their own levels of self-efficacy and to reflect on leadership styles.

These challenges of non-participation serve to highlight the significance of those front line workers who did participate. Sixty percent of the respondents indicated they have known their supervisor for more than three years. The participants in this research were characteristically older (over 40), perhaps indicating personal groundedness and experience, a sense of community, settlement and organization in personal life, establishment in the environment, and reflective of adult development and adult education. This is an important indicator of investment in an industry that tends to have a high burn-out or turnover rate within a year to eighteen months. The front line workers who have remained in this challenging field may possess strong intrinsic motivation and sense of personal empowerment (Everette, Homstead, & Drisko, 2007; Spreitzer, 1995), have a strong sense of human caring (Ellet, 2009), or find their personal value in helping others (Early & GlenMaye, 2000). Their self-efficacy may be a result of education or a personal support system such as family or friends (McElroy, 2002). For a variety of reasons, these front line workers demonstrated commitment to their organizations, their leaders, and their work.

Another interesting phenomenon was the number of agencies who declined permission to invite front line workers. Several reasons were supplied, including lack of staff, no time, too many other conflicting duties, and lack of meaning for the organization or for its leadership.
Carman and Fredericks (2008) maintain that nonprofits often think about evaluation as a resource drain and distraction; as an external, promotional tool; and as a strategic management tool. The responses of agency leaders to engage in this study seem to be consistent with those three typologies.

**Implications for Leadership Practice**

Leaders have a profound impact for good or ill on their employees and the organizational culture that their leadership style creates within an agency. This realization has profound implications for leaders. Leaders can examine the results of this study and reflect on their own practice of leadership. Front line worker self-efficacy is an important foundation that previous research shows to be crucial to not only job satisfaction and the intent to remain employed in social services (Ellett, 2005), but also to the sense of empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995) and inspiration (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2005). If leaders reflect on their own motivating factors for being in leadership, they would recognize that their primary responsibility is to lead—lead their organizations, their employees, their clients to something, to some place. Clearly, leadership is as much an art as it is a science. And while the boundaries are often undefined, the formula exists from which to create.

The results indicate that self-efficacy levels of front line workers were high across Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership, Transformational Leadership, and Transactional Leadership styles, perhaps indicating that front line workers are self-efficacious independent of leadership style. Or, this could indicate that on the continuum of leadership styles, all three styles contribute to self-efficacy levels of front line workers in social services. These results may say volumes about the autonomy and personal fortitude of these front line workers who have learned to manage their responsibilities. They may also articulate comparable volumes on the balance
and wholeness of leadership. Both of these realities prepare fertile ground for practical leadership implications which will be discussed here.

Recognizing the important value of an organizational culture created by a Transcendental/Spiritual leader, recommendations for practice include the following. The growing interest in spirituality within the workplace challenges leaders to find ways to express their own sense of being and giving their workers opportunities to do the same. This calls for an environment that is values-orientated, holistic, and balanced. Wellness programs, opportunities to create a sense of community within the workplace, and events that demonstrate the valuing of family begin a culture shift from physical and intellectual tasks to spiritual groundedness (see Dent, Higgins, & Wharff, 2005; Ferguson & Milliman, 2008). Leaders who are accustomed to performance measures and funding sustainability would benefit from a step back into silence, solitude, and self-awareness. Transcendental/Spiritual leaders do not stop worrying about performance measures and funding, but they orient these concerns within the broader perspective of values, purpose, and people, of balance, wellness, wholeness, and ontological sense of being. For some leaders, this may be a drastic personal shift that feels totally foreign (Dent, Higgins, & Wharff, 2005).

If the principle of Kouzes and Posner (1999) is held, that leadership models the way, then leaders need to assess their own values orientation, holistic practice, sense of balance, sense of community, and family. Recognizing that the familiar orientation of leadership is generally from the core of self outward, the leader must be conscious of the fact that one cannot give what one does not have. The shift from egocentric leadership to other-centric leadership cannot occur amid the chaos. Starting with worthwhile leadership books that examine spirituality rather than religiosity in the workplace, seeking counsel from trusted mentors and guides, and taking the
leap of faith into the dark and often frightening world of introspection begins the slow process of personal growth leading to a renewed perspective. Only then can leaders examine the organizational norms that either support or destroy an integrated and values driven workplace that is holistic and balanced. Collins (2001) identified this as people first, strategy second.

Organizations that have been burdened by difficult pasts would benefit from a renewal or retreat experience that allows workers and leaders to let go of what was and embrace a new beginning. The transition to renaissance for the leader may be quiet, individual, and reflective. However, the shift for organizational culture sometimes needs a more tangible and possibly engaging way to bury the past practices and norms that have inhibited individuals from feeling valued, empowered, inspired, or self-efficacious. Writing on a wall that is torn down or burning old employee handbooks with rigid rules before accepting new policy handbooks prepared together with staff that articulate the language of vision, values, balance, harmony can be such events that signal it is a new day. Engaging families in the renaissance experience can signal a drastic shift in recognizing that while a person may work for an organization, that person for good or ill, takes that experience home with them every day. This may affect others who are neglected or mistreated by a work-weary loved one. Families who have shared the day to day challenges of loved ones working in unhealthy environments may find a community healing event beneficial as well (see Dent, Higgins, & Wharff, 2005; Fawcett, Brau, Rhoads, Whitlark, & Fawcett, 2008; and Ferguson & Milliman, 2008).

Leaders who choose to embrace an orientation toward a more Transcendental/ Spiritual style of leadership may do well to signal their conversion process in tangible expressions of care, concern, interest, support, and empowerment along the way, lest workers doubt their motives or authenticity. Similarly, for organizations transitioning to new leadership following a toxic
situation, Boards of Directors may wish to consider seeking out Transcendental/Spiritual leaders for the purpose of creating a climate for healing. Boards can assess this quality by asking values-driven questions in the interview process to identify not only ethical and performance standards, but also those indicators of valuing people as the first investment. De-valued workers cannot show de-valued clients that they matter. Thus, the cycle will continue.

Recognizing the important value of an organizational culture created by a Transformational leader, recommendations for practice include the following. Bono and Judge (2003), Kark et al. (2003) and Walumbwa et al. (2003), along with this current study showed that leaders who emphasize aspects of Transformational Leadership in their practice, including relational identification, enhance followers’ self-efficacy to improve their performance. This has practical implications for organizations. Specifically, this study and others (Bono & Judge, 2003; Kark et al., 2003; and Walumbwa et al., 2008) suggests training leaders to be more transformational may provide useful and significant returns on investment in terms of follower development. Such training opportunities have been shown to be related to increased levels of commitment, motivation, satisfaction, and performance of followers (Walumbwa & Hartnell, 2011).

The study by Krishnan and Arora (2008) linked Transformational Leadership with organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Organizational citizenship behavior refers to discretionary behavior that increases organizational effectiveness by helping coworkers, supervisors, and the organization (see Deluga, 1990). The five common dimensions of OCB include the following: (a) altruism—providing help to others; (b) generalized compliance or conscientiousness; (c) courtesy; (d) sportsmanship—the willingness to forbear minor impositions without fuss or protest; (e) civic virtue—responsible or constructive involvement in the
governance issues of the organization. A practical implication for organizations suggests that perhaps in addition to psychological tests for gauging whether an individual is an appropriate fit for an organization, an organization may seek to recruit or promote managers who will help in enhancing follower OCB. By emphasizing social skills and even temperedness, leaders who exhibit OCB would be seen as more transformational, which would in turn enhance follower OCB (Krishnan & Arora, 2008). Boards of Directors seeking new organizational leaders may wish to consider the far-reaching impact of a transformational leader who would work systematically to change an organization’s culture through OCB practices.

Another practical implication based on the findings of this current study, as well as that of Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang and Shi (2005), suggests that training programs that are designed to increase transformational leadership practices among leaders and self-efficacy among followers at the same time may prove to be an effective strategy to enhance employee commitment and satisfaction. The design of mentoring programs could integrate these two important factors by considering both leadership skill development and how those skills and orientations relate to follower self-efficacy. By shifting leadership training from a leader-centric approach to a follower self-efficacy approach, the training may enhance the leader’s impact on both motivation and performance. Further, leaders may choose to identify continuing education programs for employees that enhance their levels of self-efficacy.

This present study corroborates the existing research including Menges et al. (2011) showing the importance of Transformational Leadership for organizations suggesting that a pronounced Transformational Leadership climate and organizational culture can benefit the organization’s positive affective climate and its workforce development. Therefore, the findings of this study and others (see Bono & Judge, 2004; Menges, et al., 2011; and Spreitzer, 1996)
encourage organizations to create a strong Transformational Leadership climate by developing and fostering these empowering behaviors throughout the hierarchical structure. This implies careful leader selection and retention based on skills and personality (Bono & Judge, 2004), leadership development efforts (Menges et al., 2001), top managerial role modeling (Bass, et al., 1987), and the establishment of appropriate structure and culture (e.g., Krishnan & Arora, 2008; Spreitzer, 1996; and Walumbwa & Hartnell, 2011). And while a Transformational Leadership climate is the responsible role of the leader, followers play an important role in this climate as well (Menges et al., 2001). Followers’ behaviors and attitudes of trust and commitment are investments for organizations, suggesting the importance of training, consideration in hiring and promotion. These considerations also bear upon human resource management activities that build trust including training to improve communication, influence skills to ascertain transparency, and the assignment of clearly defined work responsibilities to avoid misunderstanding and conflict.

This study also showed that Transactional Leadership positively related to self-efficacy levels, suggesting that effective leaders who balance the best practices of each of the styles (Transcendental/ Spiritual, Transformational, and Transactional) promote self-efficacy. Training programs that highlight the positive aspects of each of these styles may equip leaders with skills and leadership practices that foster an integrated and high functioning organization and promote the wholeness of the leader as well as the follower.

Recognizing the important value of an organizational culture that supports the self-efficacy levels of front line social service workers, recommendations for practice include the following. Professional staff development opportunities that assist workers toward self-awareness, understanding of their motivating factors, and appreciation for the value of self-
efficacy may both increase self-efficacy levels as well as position these levels within the greater organizational structure. Based upon the fact as shown in the present study that all three leadership styles related to self-efficacy and the fact that followers assessed their self-efficacy levels as high across multiple styles of leadership, suggests that these followers already possess a strong internalized orientation toward personal achievement. Frequently, leaders will allow themselves the luxury of time away for introspection and self-assessment. Perhaps leaders may consider the return-on-investment afforded by allowing workers the same luxury to reflect, discuss, and receive support from colleagues in the field. Positive and affirming relationships outside of an organization may enhance the quality of relationships within.

Findings of this study and others (Ellet, 2009; Jacobson, 2011) suggest the importance of front line worker self-efficacy in the social service sector. The implied linkages to human caring, organizational structure and culture, employee selection, retention, and continuing professional development highlight the value-add for training and processes that support the self-efficacy levels of front line social service workers, such as mentoring, coaching, and positive supervision. Support programs that foster motivation, empowerment, and inspiration may also enhance front line worker self-efficacy and related job performance.

The implications for practice then are clear: leaders must decide who they are and what kind of leadership they want to establish. Leaders must decide what type of organizational culture and learning environment they want to establish. And they must decide if they are going to be leaders in the true sense of the word and use their position power for positive change that benefits those around them, or not. Those who fund and provide professional development programs in the social service sector may consider the value-add of training that supports both leadership practice and front line worker development.
Recommendations for Further Research

While the research question and accompanying hypotheses of this study were supported by the methodology and while this study fills a void in previous research exploring the relationship between leadership style and self-efficacy within the social service sector, there are numerous opportunities for further research that may address additional questions. This section will pose several recommendations for future research.

It was the philosophical question raised several years ago, “If we have so many programs and services that have existed for years and so many dollars have been poured into these programs from philanthropists, then why don’t we see the lives of the poor improve?”, that precipitated this dissertation. This study did not come even close to the issues, let alone the answers. This present study only examined one small piece: leadership and self-efficacy.

Those large over-arching issues of leadership, organizational culture, front line workers, and clients are foundational to the challenges facing the social service sector. However, the answer to the prevailing challenges rests with leadership. It is leadership’s role to dream the dreams that change systems and circumstances. The value-add of research challenges leaders to apply empiricism to philosophy, to marry science with vision, to elevate innovation to answer error.

The following recommendations for further research begin to tweeze several of the factors that could improve the current study either by asking different questions or asking those same questions differently. By no means can this list be all inclusive. And it certainly cannot explore the philosophical questions directly. But, it can generate the most prized virtue of science: inquiry.
This study, which was limited to United Way funded partners participating in the Education Change Initiative, may be expanded in a number of ways. Maintaining the unique lens of United Way branding with its consistent language of Live United and systems change through advocacy and community engagement, funded partners engaged in either the Health Change Initiative or the Financial Stability Initiative within The Agenda for Change™ may provide an interesting comparison to the Education Change Initiative. Would front line workers with different backgrounds and work responsibilities view their self-efficacy and their supervisors’ leadership styles differently? Would leadership in health related agencies or in agencies focused on family financial stability approach this study differently and perhaps encourage participation at a different level? Additional research may examine self-efficacy from a different perspective to determine if front line workers are self-efficacious in service delivery or in transforming the lives of their clients or their own lives as individuals.

A follow up study with those agencies who originally agreed to participate could examine what actions of the organizational leader encourage or inhibit employees from engaging in a research project that invites introspection. What organizational culture factors mediate the willingness to participate in self-evaluation? How much did United Way negatively influence participation? Could part of the reluctance to engage be a statement of rebellion or resistance against the United Way’s endorsement? This study focused on the front line workers and their immediate supervisors. A similar study that challenges supervisors to look at organizational leaders and organizational culture within the social service sector may seek to explore the relationship between leadership and culture, rather than leadership and self-efficacy.

This study was limited by the particular branding of United Way. Another potential research may consider social service agencies that are not United Way funded partners. Does the
engagement level differ based on membership in federated funding campaigns such as United Way, which is often perceived as demanding, dictating, and alienating toward funded partners? Do leadership styles and self-efficacy levels of front line workers vary among agencies that are faith-based organizations, national, or funded predominantly through private donors rather than restrictive funders?

In the present study, one can wonder what role the leader’s own valuing of education or level of training played in whether organizations chose to engage in this research. This raises the question about leaders’ educational backgrounds. Do we find leaders in social service have different educational backgrounds and formal training than leaders in other sectors such as business, higher education, or government? Do educational backgrounds and formal training predict more effective leadership than those who acquire leadership roles by rising through the ranks? Do front line workers consider the qualifications of a leader, the organizational culture or the reputation of an agency when assessing their level of self-efficacy?

Originally, this study was intended to be a nested hierarchical linear modeling research that would examine the relationship between the style of leadership, the level of self-efficacy, and the sense of personal empowerment on the part of the program participants. That ambitious study was too unwieldy given the limitations of accessing data. However, the fascinating question still remains about the relationship between leadership style, organizational culture, front line worker’s levels of self-efficacy, and the impact that empowers, motivates, and inspires clients. Is it possible to draw a line from leaders to workers who believe they can make a difference to their clients who then move positively along the continuum of improvement in their condition? While fraught with methodology and data collection challenges, such a study could provide a fascinating contribution to assist the social service sector toward identifying effective
organizations committed to making a difference even to the risk of putting themselves out of business.

The present research, which did not generate participation among the minority community, raises the question about diversity and how a researcher may choose to examine the issues of minority participation in a study such as this. If the research of Smith, Woo, and Austin (2010) applies in this study, then it can be inferred that for whatever reason minorities did not recognize themselves in this study. This provides an additional lens for future ethnographic study that explores this phenomenon in our metropolitan social service agencies.

The Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was selected for this study to examine four commonly recognized leadership constructs. However, there are other leadership measures used to quantify different aspects of leadership such as The 360 Leadership Circle™, Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Challenge, The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-XII by Stogdill (1963), The Conger-Kanungo Scale of Charismatic Leadership, Leader prototypicality from van Knippenberg and van Knippenberg (2005), Change leadership by Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, and Liu (2008), Ethical leadership by Brown and Trevino (2006) and Leader member exchange by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) to name a few. These measure other dimensions of leadership including effectiveness, personality, traits, relationships, and other behaviors. While there are similarities across theories and instruments, nuances and differences can enhance the empirical process.

What is exciting when starting down this path with academic abandon, one finds no limit to the variety and combinations for consideration, any of which could produce fascinating results and contribute to the wonder of discovery. Just as other leadership measures could be used in a replicated study, so can other measures to quantify follower variables such as empowerment as
measured by Spreitzer’s Personal Empowerment Inventory and inspiration or motivation as measured by either an established instrument or original one validated as reliable through the testing process.

In addition, there are many types of social service agencies—health, youth, homeless, neighborhood based, faith based, and many types of nonprofits each with a different lens and approach. There are many factors within communities that create their own character. Examining any of these differing aspects generates exciting possibilities for future qualitative and quantitative studies.

**Conclusion**

Leadership, the science and art; leadership, the blend of philosophy and behavior; leadership, the juxtaposition of optimism and reality; leadership is the call that no rational person would choose to volunteer for. And yet, for all its difficulties and ambivalence, it is the opportunity unparalleled in common hours for its potential to impact, to create change, to improve the lives of others. It is the opportunity to dream the dreams of what can be and how to make that happen. It is the opportunity to transform people, problems, and circumstances. It is the opportunity to inspire, empower, and motivate.

However, leadership is not possible without a journey to make and followers along the path. Many days seem to be more of an epic odyssey than a scheduled and deliberate plan. The key question of leadership rests in why others would follow this person into the fog. A leader, no matter how long the practice, is a perpetual learner and a perpetual teacher. No quality educator would stop acquiring new skills and knowledge based solely on years of experience. Similarly, leaders must seek out knowledge to understand themselves and the nature of being human. It is impossible to lead others around the block let alone into the fog without some understanding of
self and others. This research showed the fundamental value of two leadership styles in particular, Transformational and Transcendental/ Spiritual Leadership, as reliable aids that support workers regardless of their industry or sector. Leadership is truly a privilege, a calling and a challenge.
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APPENDIX B

Dear United Way Agency Chief Executive Officers,

“After all these years and all these philanthropic dollars poured into programs, why don’t we see improvement in the lives of vulnerable families?” This question changed my life and created my personal mission and my academic research agenda.

My name is Sister Michele Toth. I am a doctoral candidate conducting research for my dissertation through Bowling Green State University. I have a particular interest in the relationship between the perceived styles of leadership and the level of self-efficacy of those who work directly with social service program participants to motivate clients.

I am currently the chief executive officer for a United Way funded agency in Toledo, Ohio and have many years of experience as a United Way volunteer prior to this position. I have chosen to define my research within the Agenda for Change in Ohio United Way funded partners. Are you curious about the important role of leaders and the self-efficacy level front-line workers in your funded partner agencies to motivate clients? Do you wonder which leadership styles may predict self-efficacy levels to motivate clients? I find these questions fascinating having been in social service and education for over 30 years. I am seeking your permission to contact the various agencies within your jurisdiction to help me answer these questions. Following the national model, I will focus my attention on those agencies involved in the Education Change Initiative.

The purpose of the research is to examine the relationship between the perceived leadership style of the immediate supervisors and the level of front-line worker self-efficacy to motivate clients to improve their lives. I will conduct my research through a survey distributed online to the front-line workers of funded partner agencies within your funding jurisdiction.

I believe this research will be beneficial to funders who must make important decisions to invest limited resources within a vulnerable community and who seek high performing organizations to guarantee impact, to organizational leaders who may consider the importance of organizational culture, and to front-line workers who work with vulnerable families through The Agenda for Change programs who may seek personal renewal. This project may inform practice and motivate systemic change. It may be important to policy makers and to those who design continuing education programs for those in executive leadership positions.

To answer my research questions, I am using three separate measures which may be familiar to you in your own studies. I am using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire by Bass and Avolio, the Servant Leadership Assessment by Greenleaf, and the Self-efficacy Assessment by Bandura as adapted by Schwarzer and Jerusalem. Each of these tools is considered valid and reliable and is often used in research. These instruments will be adopted and integrated into an online survey
using Survey Monkey. The survey will take approximately twenty minutes for front-line workers to complete. It is completely anonymous and confidential, free of any risk or consequence. It is not possible to identify the individual agencies, the immediate supervisors or front-line workers in this study. You will find the survey attached.

Your community was selected because of its current level of poverty and population density. I have examined your list of funded partners and when possible to determine based on information posted on your website identified those partners with funding levels above $25,000 to support Agenda for Change programs. I have also identified the funded partner agency directors. I will be contacting these directors and seeking permission to invite their front-line workers to participate. **Survey participants will have the opportunity to enter their names in a drawing to win a $25.00 cash gift. Ten awards will be randomly drawn by an independent party at the conclusion of the participation period.**

I hope you will be as intrigued by this research project as I have been. This project is a culmination of many years of service and study. I consider myself a long time friend of United Way in my own community and I am very interested in the success of the Agenda for Change. May I count on your support as I continue my research within your community? If you would prefer I not contact any of your funded partner agency directors, I will certainly respect that.

If you have any questions about this proposal, the methodology or the instruments I will use, please feel free to contact me. My personal cell phone number is: 419-290-7655. My direct line at my agency is: 419-244-0078. My email address is: mvtothnd@yahoo.com or mvtoth@providencecentertoledo.org.

I thank you in advance for your consideration and support. I will follow up with you in a week or so to see if you have any questions. Blessings on your work, on your leadership, and your efforts to assist vulnerable families in your community. We share this holy work together.

Peace and all good,

*Sister Michele Töth, fsm, MOL*  
Sister Michele, fsm  
Chief Executive Office of The Providence Center  
Doctoral Candidate in Leadership Studies, BGSU
APPENDIX C

Letter of introduction for United Way Funded Partner Agency Chief Executive Officers

Dear ____________,

“After all these years and all these philanthropic dollars poured into programs, why don’t we see improvement in the lives of vulnerable families?” This question changed my life and created my personal mission and my academic research agenda.

My name is Sister Michele Toth. I am a doctoral candidate conducting research for my dissertation through Bowling Green State University. I have a particular interest in the relationship between the perceived styles of leadership and the level of self-efficacy of those who work directly with social service program participants to motivate clients.

I am currently the chief executive officer for a United Way funded agency in Toledo, Ohio and have many years of experience as a United Way volunteer prior to this position. I have chosen to define my research within the Agenda for Change in Ohio United Way funded partners. Are you curious about the important role of leaders and the self-efficacy level front-line workers in your funded partner agencies to motivate clients? Do you wonder which leadership styles may predict self-efficacy levels and empowerment of workers to motivate clients? I find these questions fascinating having been in social service and education for over 30 years. I am seeking your permission to contact the front-line workers in your agency to help me answer these questions.

The purpose of the research is to examine the relationship between the perceived leadership style of the immediate supervisors and the level of front-line worker self-efficacy to motivate clients to improve their lives. I will conduct my research through a survey distributed online to the front-line workers of funded partner agencies.

I believe this research will be beneficial to funders who must make important decisions to invest limited resources within a vulnerable community and who seek high performing organizations to guarantee impact, to organizational leaders who may consider the importance of organizational culture, and to front-line workers who work with vulnerable families through The Agenda for Change programs who may seek personal renewal. This project may inform practice and motivate systemic change. It may be important to policy makers and to those who design continuing education programs for those in executive leadership positions.

To answer my research questions, I am using three separate measures which may be familiar to you in your own studies. I am using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire by Bass and Avolio, the Servant Leadership Assessment by Greenleaf and the Self-efficacy Assessment by Bandura as adapted by Schwarzer and Jerusalem. Each of these tools is considered valid and reliable and is often used in research. These instruments will be adopted and integrated into an online survey.
using Survey Monkey. The survey will take approximately twenty minutes for front-line workers to complete. It is completely anonymous and confidential, free of any risk or consequence. It is not possible to identify the individual agencies, the immediate supervisors, or front-line workers in this study. You will find the survey attached.

Your agency was selected because you are a partner of the United Way and participate in the Agenda for Change. Your community falls within the threshold of at least 20% of the population is living in poverty and the population density is at least 50,000 residents. I have examined your website and identified your agency’s Agenda for Change programs.

You can show your support of this research project by either forwarding the survey to your workers internally or providing me with email addresses and your approval to contact them individually myself.

Survey participants will have the opportunity to enter their names in a drawing to win a $25.00 cash gift. Ten awards will be randomly drawn by an independent party at the conclusion of the participation period.

I hope you will be as intrigued by this research project as I have been. This project is a culmination of many years of service and study. I consider myself a long time friend of United Way in my own community and I am very interested in the success of the Agenda for Change. May I count on your support as I continue my research within your community? If you would prefer I not contact any of your front-line social service workers, I will certainly respect that.

If you have any questions about this proposal, the methodology or the instruments I will use, please feel free to contact me. My personal cell phone number is: 419-290-7655. My direct line at my agency is: 419-244-0078. My email address is: mvtothnd@yahoo.com or mvtoth@providencecentertoledo.org.

I thank you in advance for your consideration and support. I will follow up with you in a week or so to see if you have any questions. Blessings on your work, on your leadership, and your efforts to assist vulnerable families in your community. We share this holy work together.

Peace and all good,

Sister Michele Toto, fsm
Chief Executive Office of The Providence Center
Doctoral Candidate in Leadership Studies, BGSU
APPENDIX D
INTEGRATED SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Email text to survey participants:

Please click on the link below to participate in the survey

Dear Front-line worker,

Let me tell you about my research project!

My name is Sr. Michele. I am a doctoral candidate writing my dissertation for Bowling Green State University in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. I am interested in United Way's Agenda for Change. A question posed several years ago, “Why if we have all these social programs and philanthropic dollars do we not see positive change in the lives of the poor?” inspires me personally and professionally in the work I do as an agency Chief Executive Officer in a United Way funded nonprofit.

The purpose of this research study is to explore the relationship between the front-line worker’s perceptions of leadership styles and their level of self efficacy to motivate clients to improve their lives as measured through social service program participation.

I am looking at two basic ideas from your perspective: how do you perceive your leader's style of leadership (of your immediate supervisor)? How does this leadership affect your level of feeling that you can do this difficult work of helping vulnerable families?

This study may be beneficial to guide funders in funding decisions, provide academic support for leadership decisions about positive organizational culture, guide in development of ongoing professional development, and possibly provide an emotional lift for you in your dedicated service.

The survey uses three separate instruments to measure leadership styles and self-efficacy. It will take you about 20 minutes to complete. This survey is completely confidential and voluntary. The risks of participation are no greater than those encountered in everyday life. Please know that deciding to participate or not will not impact grades/class standing/relationship to the institution (Bowling Green State University). You are free to withdraw at any time. To protect the anonymity of your responses, you may wish to complete this survey on a personal computer. Be sure to clear browser cache and page history when complete.
Feel free to contact my adviser, Dr. Patrick Pauken at Phone: 419-372-9234 Email: paukenp@bgsu.edu or me at Phone: 419-290-7655 or use my email: mvtothnd@yahoo.com if you have any questions about the research or your participation in the research. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board at 419-372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu, if you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research.

I hope you will assist me to collect meaningful data by answering truthfully. Know that I am grateful for your participation. Thank you for your time.

When you are finished, if you are interested in participating in a prize drawing, please send me an email with your name and email address. All I need to know is that you completed the survey. I will wait until my data collection is finished and then I will ask my Chief Finance Officer to draw 10 (ten!) names who will each receive $25.00 in cash.

Send your information to: mvtothnd@yahoo.com. Thanks!

Gratefully,
Sister Michele, fsm

Please click on the link below to participate in the survey
Dear Front-line worker,

Let me tell you about my research project!

My name is Sr. Michele. I am a doctoral candidate writing my dissertation for Bowling Green State University in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. I am interested in United Way's Agenda for Change. A question posed several years ago, “Why if we have all these social programs and philanthropic dollars do we not see positive change in the lives of the poor?” inspires me personally and professionally in the work I do as an agency Chief Executive Officer in a United Way funded nonprofit.

The purpose of this research study is to explore the relationship between the front-line worker’s perceptions of leadership styles and their level of self efficacy to motivate clients to improve their lives as measured through social service program participation.

I am looking at two basic ideas from your perspective: how do you perceive your leader's style of leadership (of your immediate supervisor)? How does this leadership affect your level of feeling that you can do this difficult work of helping vulnerable families?

This study may be beneficial to guide funders in funding decisions, provide academic support for leadership decisions about positive organizational culture, guide in development of ongoing professional development, and possibly provide an emotional lift for you in your dedicated service.

The survey uses three separate instruments to measure leadership styles and self-efficacy. It will take you about 20 minutes to complete. This survey is completely confidential and voluntary. The risks of participation are no greater than those encountered in everyday life. Please know that deciding to participate or not will not impact grades/class standing/relationship to the institution (Bowling Green State University). You are free to withdraw at any time. To protect the anonymity of your responses, you may wish to complete this survey on a personal computer. Be sure to clear browser cache and page history when complete.

Feel free to contact my adviser, Dr. Patrick Pauken at Phone: 419-372-9234 Email: paukenp@bgsu.edu or me at Phone: 419-290-7655 or use my email: mvtothnd@yahoo.com if you have any questions about the research or your participation in the research. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board at 419-372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu, if you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research.
I hope you will assist me to collect meaningful data by answering truthfully. Know that I am grateful for your participation. Thank you for your time.

When you are finished, if you are interested in participating in a prize drawing, please send me an email with your name and email address. All I need to know is that you completed the survey. I will wait until my data collection is finished and then I will ask my Chief Finance Officer to draw 10 (ten!) names who will each receive $25.00 in cash.

Send your information to: mvtothnd@yahoo.com . Thanks!

Gratefully,
Sister Michele, fsm

To answer the following set of questions, consider your beliefs about yourself and how you feel about your work.

Indicate your responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Mildly disagree</th>
<th>Mildly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Very strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.
2. If someone opposes me, I can find ways means and ways to get what I want.
3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.
4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.
5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know I can handle unforeseen situations.
6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.
8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.
9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of something to do.
10. No matter what comes my way, I am usually able to handle it.

To answer the following set of questions, consider your immediate supervisor, the task related behaviors and the relationship related behaviors that you perceive that this leader demonstrates.
To keep you focused, you may want to write your supervisor’s initials down. You will not be turning these in to anyone.

Indicate your responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Mildly disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Very strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person I am rating…

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts.
2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.
3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious.
4. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.
5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise.
6. Talks about their most important values and beliefs.
7. Is absent when needed.
8. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.
9. Talks optimistically about the future.
10. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her.
11. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets.
12. Waits for things to go wrong before taking action.
13. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.
14. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.
15. Spends time teaching and coaching.
16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.
17. Shows that he/she is a firm believer in “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”
18. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.
19. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group.
20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action.
22. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures.
23. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.
24. Keeps track of all mistakes.
25. Displays a sense of power and confidence.
26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future.
27. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards.
28. Avoids making decisions.
29. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others.
30. Gets me to look at problem from many different angles.
31. Helps to develop my strengths.
32. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.
33. Delays responding to urgent questions.
34. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.
35. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations.
36. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved.
37. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs.
38. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying.
39. Gets me to do more than I expected to do.
40. Is effective in representing me to higher authority.
41. Works with me in a satisfactory way.
42. Heightens my desire to succeed.
43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements.
44. Increases my willingness to try harder.
45. Leads a group that is effective.

To answer the following set of questions, consider your immediate supervisor, the task related behaviors and the relationship related behaviors that you perceive that this leader demonstrates. To keep you focused, you may want to write your supervisor’s initials down. You will not be turning these in to anyone.

Indicate your responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Mildly disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Very strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person I am rating…

1. Considers others’ needs and interests above his or her own.
2. Demonstrates his or her care through sincere, practical deeds.
4. Is ready to step aside for a more qualified successor.
5. Maintains consistency between words and deeds.
6. Is willing to say, “I was wrong” to other people.
7. Gives me the right to question his or her actions and decisions.
8. Accepts me for who I am, not as he or she wants me to be.
9. Treats people as equal partners in the organization.
10. Is willing to spend time to build a professional relationship with me.
11. Involves others in planning the actions that need to be taken.
12. Encourages me to engage in moral reasoning.
13. Focuses on doing what is right rather than looking good.
14. Is driven by a sense of a higher calling.
15. Helps me to find clarity of purpose and direction.
16. Helps me to generate a sense of meaning out of everyday life at work.
17. Promotes values that transcend self-interest and material success.
18. Ensures that people have a clear understanding of the shared vision
19. Allows me to fully express my talents in different and new ways.
20. Leads by personal example.
21. Allows me to experiment and be creative without fear.
22. Provides me candid feedback about my performance.

Please answer these demographic questions about yourself:

1. Are you male or female?
2. Which category below includes your age?
3. What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
4. Are you White, Black or African-American, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific islander, or some other race?
5. Are you Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Cuban-American, or some other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino group?
6. How long have you known your immediate supervisor?
7. How long has the person you consider your immediate supervisor been in this position over you?
8. In which metropolitan city are your services located?

Thank you for participating in this survey! I am so grateful for your time. Please remember to send me your name and email address if you are interested in participating in a prize drawing. I will enter the contact information into a drawing for ten (10) gift awards of $25.00 (twenty-five dollars) each in cash. The names will be drawn randomly by an independent party shortly after I take the survey tool down. I will announce the names of the winners in a separate email to follow.