

The relationship between follower ratings of leadership and the leaders' spirituality

Mark T. Green and Phyllis Duncan

Our Lady of the Lake University, San Antonio, Texas

Stephanie A. Kodatt

Florida International University, Miami

This study analyzed the relationships between leaders' spirituality and how followers, peers, and supervisors perceived those leaders' leadership styles. One hundred and twenty-seven participants in executive leadership training and graduate programs in leadership provided an evaluation packet to two colleagues, two subordinates and a supervisor using the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. The participants in turn completed three instruments on themselves: the *Religious Orientation Scale*, the *Spiritual Well-Being Scale* and the *Daily Spiritual Experiences Scale*. All scores were completed before the onset of the leadership training. The results of a multiple regression analysis found that the higher the leaders' existential spiritual well-being and extrinsic religious orientation the more the followers, peers and supervisors rated the leaders as active, transformational leaders. The higher the leaders' daily spiritual experience score, the less the followers, peers and supervisors rated the leaders as passive-avoidant leaders.

Keywords: spirituality, religiosity, leadership, transformational leadership

INTRODUCTION

Spirituality has been studied for millennia. Prophets from almost all societies have described other worlds and spirits that guide their lives. Because of the often ineffable nature of the spiritual experience, it has most frequently been described through metaphor, analogy or poetry.

The use of metaphor, analogy or poetry to study spirituality provides sufficient polyvalence to enable each individual to find an interpretation that is relevant to her or his unique experiences. Unfortunately, these rich allegorical methods do not allow for researchers of spirituality to compare differences among groups or to correlate with any true confidence spirituality and other variables.

It is only recently that the study of spirituality has moved from the realm of religious figures to social scientists. With this growth in the study of religiosity and spirituality, a variety of quantitative instruments have been developed. In their 2011 review of spirituality instruments used in the study of workplace spirituality, Miller and Ewst created a three-fold typology.

What Miller and Ewst classify as manifestation scales "pertain to the orientation to universal, religious or spiritual values, disclosing specific manifestations, phenomenological experiences without regard to specific traditions, and expressions of a person's values and corresponding motivations." (p. 17). These scales include the *Rokeach Value Survey* (Rokeach, 1973), *Spiritual Well-Being Scale* (SWBS) (Paloutzian and Ellison, 1982; Ellison, 1983), *Duke Religion Index* (DUREL) (Koenig, Parkerson, & Meador, 1997), *Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiosity/Spirituality* (BMMRS) (Fetzer Institute & NIA, 1999), *Spirituality at Work* (SAW) (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000), *Spirit at Work Scale* (SWS) (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2006), *Spiritual Climate Inventory* (SCI) (Pandey, Gupta, & Arora, 2009) and the *Faith at Work Scale* (FWS) (Lynn, Naughton, & VanderVeen, 2009).

What Miller and Ewst classify as development scales "pertain to the level of development within the participant in reference to a range of mature versus immature behavior, and/or nascent or developed

religious/spiritual expectations" (p. 17). These instruments include the *Religious Orientation Scale (ROS)* (Allport & Ross, 1967), *Intrinsic/Extrinsic-Revised (I/E-R) Scale* (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989), *Religious Maturity Scale (RMS)* (Dudley & Cruise, 1990), *Quest Scale* (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991), and the *Spiritual Leadership Scale* (Fry, 2003; Fry, Vitucci, & Cedillo, 2005).

Adherence scales "pertain to authentic adherence of religious, spiritual, or traditional beliefs and the integration or practice of specific religious or spiritual traditions without regard to maturity" (p. 17). These instruments include the *Belief Systems Analysis Scale (BSAS)* (Montgomery, Fine, & James-Myers, 1990) and the *Forgiveness Scale (FS)* (Hargrave & Sells, 1997).

Using quantitative instruments such as those listed, a variety of studies have shown relationships between spiritual well-being and various aspects of general psychological well-being, such as marital satisfaction, physical health, social adjustment and stress management (Adams, Bezner, Drabbs, Zambarano, & Steinhardt, 2000; Ellison & Smith, 1991; Graham, Furr, Flowers, & Burke, 2001; Kanya, 2000; Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982; Roth, 1988; Westgate, 1996; Wolf & Stevens, 2001).

Within the work environment there is also evidence of a relationship between worker spirituality and worker job satisfaction. Robert, Young, and Kelly (2006), for example, found overall spiritual well-being, existential well-being and religious well-being were each significant predictors of job satisfaction in the workplace. Existential well-being accounted for 21% of the variance in job satisfaction. Religious well-being accounted for 3% of the variance in job satisfaction. Bi-variate correlations for both variables were positively correlated. Similarly, Clark et al. (2007) found that spirituality, integration and self-actualization explained 48% of the variation in job satisfaction. Structural path models revealed that integrating one's spirituality in the workplace was more important in establishing job satisfaction than simply being spiritual.

In a different area of research, leadership style has been shown to impact multiple areas of follower performance. Kuoppala, Lamminpää, Liira, and Vainio (2008) conducted a meta-analysis on the relationship between leadership style, job satisfaction and job performance. They found an association between leadership and job satisfaction, but not with job performance. Burke et al. (2006) in a meta-analysis found that the use of task-focused behaviors was moderately related to perceived team effectiveness and team productivity ($r_c = .33, .20$). Person-focused behaviors were related to perceived team effectiveness ($r_c = .36$), team productivity ($r_c = .28$), and team learning ($r_c = .56$). Leadership in which the leader empowers followers accounted for nearly 30% of the variance in team learning.

Transformational leadership has also been consistently shown to result in high follower satisfaction, high follower assessment of the leader's effectiveness, and high follower willingness to give extra effort at work. In the largest meta-analysis of studies that have used the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*, Wang, Oh, Courtright, and Colbert (2011) meta-analyzed 117 independent samples over 113 primary studies.

Transformational leadership was positively related to individual level performance (N = 16,809, estimated corrected mean correlation = .25), task performance (N = 7,016, estimated corrected mean correlation = .21), contextual performance (N = 7,970, estimated corrected mean correlation = .30), creative performance (N = 3,728, estimated corrected mean correlation = .21), and general performance contextual performance (N = 4,017, estimated corrected mean correlation = .18).

Contingent reward was also positively related to individual, task and contextual measures of performance, with estimated corrected mean correlations ranging from .22 to .28. Conversely, both management by exception active and passive were negatively related to individual, task and contextual measures of performance, with estimated corrected mean correlations ranging from -.03 to -.29.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

A variety of studies have found associations between the spiritual well-being of workers and their psychological health and job satisfaction. A variety of studies have also found relationships between the style of leadership used by a leader and the job satisfaction of the follower. This is particularly true for studies that use the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (Bass & Avolio, 2002) as a measure of leadership.

Consequently, the Full Range of Leadership model and its associated instrument, the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*, is likely the most widely taught and studied model of leadership. The body of research regarding transformational leadership indicates that it is very effective at increasing follower satisfaction and extra effort. It is somewhat unclear, however, to what degree the leader's personal religiosity/spirituality

impacts how the followers perceive them as transformational leaders.

METHOD

One hundred and twenty-seven participants in executive leadership training and graduate programs in leadership agreed to participate in the study. The participants provided an evaluation packet to two peers, two followers and a supervisor using the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. The generic term for this assessment is often referred to as a “360 degree” assessment, as the leader is being rated from three different organizational viewpoints.

The evaluation packets that the peers, followers and supervisor completed on each participant were mailed directly to the research team for coding. The participants in turn completed three instruments on themselves: the *Religious Orientation Scale*, *Spiritual Well-Being Scale*, and the *Daily Spiritual Experiences Scale*. All scores were completed before the onset of the leadership training.

LEADERSHIP INSTRUMENTS

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

The *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (MLQ) was developed to determine the degree to which leaders exhibited transformational and transactional leadership. The MLQ has undergone many revisions during the past 20 years. The Form 5X contains five transformational leadership subscales, two transactional subscales, and two passive subscales of leadership that together form what is known as the full range leadership theory.

Bass and Avolio (1990) assert that transformational leaders have a strong set of internal values and ideals and develop followers to their fullest potential. Transactional leaders exchange things of value with subordinates to advance their own, as well as their subordinates’ agenda.

Bass and Avolio (2002) conducted a cross-validation study of the MLQ Form 5X. The study was used to test the convergent and discriminate validities of each subscale through confirmatory factor analysis. The studies consisted of examining nine samples with $N = 2,154$, and a second study using five samples with a total of $N = 1,706$. The two studies combined provided a sample of $N = 3,860$. Reliabilities for the total items and leadership factor subscales ranged from .74 to .94. The validity coefficient for the MLQ was .91 (Bass & Avolio, 2002).

Bass and Avolio conducted a second confirmatory factor analysis using LISRELVII to compare the *Goodness of Fit* (GFI) and the *Root Mean Squared Residual* (RMSR) estimates with the MLQ. The GFI values higher than .90 indicated a better fit between the model and the available data (Bentler & Kano, 1990). The RMSR value was considered a good fit if it was less than .05 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1982). The results of the study indicated that the full range leadership model represented by the MLQ 5X had a goodness of fit (GFI) of .91 and the root mean squared residual (RMSR) was .04. Each was above and below their perspective cut-off criterion respectively.

RELIGIOUS AND SPIRITUAL INSTRUMENTS

The Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWB)

The *Spiritual Well-Being Scale* (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982) is a 20-item instrument composed of two subscales of 10 items each. The Religious Well-Being (RWB) subscale assesses the degree to which individuals report that they experience a satisfying relationship with God. Items of the Existential Well-Being (EWB) subscale relate to a sense of life satisfaction and purpose. The scale is not based on a specific religious or ideological orientation. In addition, the scales have demonstrated good internal consistency and construct validity (Bufford, Paloutzian, & Ellison, 1991; Ellison, 1983; Ellison & Smith, 1991). In a 2001 Factor Analysis, Genia found support for the factorial validity of the SWB scales. Genia reported that the item groupings in her analysis corresponded to the RWB and EWB subscales as designed by the scale’s developers (Ellison, 1983) and that the two scales appear to be measuring unique constructs.

Daily Spiritual Experiences Scales

The Daily Spiritual Experiences Scale “is intended to measure a person’s perception of the transcendent (God, the divine) in daily life and his or her perception of his or her interaction with or involvement of the transcendent in life. The items attempt to measure experience rather than particular beliefs or behaviors”

(Underwood & Teresi, 2002, p. 23). Evidence of construct validity was developed through in-depth interviews and focus groups with individuals from many religious perspectives. The authors also conducted a review of scales that attempted to measure some aspects of spiritual experience and drew as well on a variety of theological, spiritual, and religious writings provided by examination of correlations of the DSES with health and quality of life variables (Underwood & Teresi, 2002).

Religious Orientation Scale (ROS)

The Allport-Ross *Religious Orientation Scale* (ROS) distinguishes intrinsically religious people who are genuinely committed to their faith from the more self-serving extrinsically religious (Allport & Ross, 1967). There is significant support for Allport's assertion that religious individuals with an intrinsic faith are more psychologically adjusted than are those who are extrinsically oriented toward religion (Donahue 1985).

Other studies, however, indicate that the ROS is best described as measuring three factors (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989; Kirkpatrick 1989; Leong & Zachar, 1990; Genia, 1993). While supporting intrinsic religiosity as a unified construct, analysis of independent data sets has suggested that extrinsic religiousness may consist of two distinct components, use of religion for personal benefits (Ep) and use of religion for social reward.

CONSTRUCTS BEING MEASURED

Leadership

Burns (1978) introduced a transformational/transactional leadership model suggesting leaders use a social exchange process with followers to achieve a desired behavior. According to Burns, a transactional leader and follower agree, or transact, on the completion of a given objective for the follower to be rewarded.

Bass (1985) developed five aspects of transformational leadership: (a) idealized influence – attributed, (b) idealized influence - behavioral, (c) inspirational motivation, (d) intellectual stimulation, and (e) individualized consideration (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transactional leadership is comprised of two aspects: (f) contingent reward and (g) management by exception – active. A passive and largely ineffective form of leadership is called passive-avoidant and consists of two aspects: (h) management-by-exception-passive and (i) laissez-faire. Table 1 provides the definitions of each aspect of leadership.

Table 1: Aspects of Leadership Measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

| Leadership Aspect | Definition |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Idealized Influence (Attributed) | Is a facet of transformational leadership, which describes leaders who are exemplary role models for associates. Leaders are admired and respected, and followers want to emulate them (Bass, 1999). |
| Idealized Influence (Behaviors) | Is a facet of transformational leadership, which describes leaders who can be counted on to do the right thing through high ethical and moral standards (Bass, 1999). |
| Inspirational Motivation | Is a behavior facet of transformational leadership, which describes leaders who motivate and inspire followers to commit to the vision of the organization. Leaders with inspirational motivation behave in ways that encourage team spirit, and provide meaning and challenge to their follower's work (Avolio, 1999). |
| Intellectual Stimulation | Is a behavior facet of transformational leadership, which describes leaders who encourage innovation and creativity through challenging the normal beliefs or views of their followers. Leaders with intellectual stimulation promote critical thinking and problem solving to make the organization better (Avolio, 1999). |
| Individual Consideration | Is a behavior facet of transformational leadership, which describes leaders who act as coaches, facilitators, teachers, and mentors to their followers. Leaders with individual consideration encourage followers, provide continuous feedback, and link the follower's current needs to the organization's mission (Avolio, 1999). |
| Contingent Reward | Is a behavior facet of transactional leadership, which describes leaders who engage in a constructive path-goal transaction of reward for performance. Leaders clarify |

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| | expectations, exchange promises and resources, arrange mutually satisfactory agreements, negotiate for resources, exchange assistance for effort, and provide recommendations for successful follower performance (Bass, 1985). |
| Management-By-Exception (Active) | Is a behavior facet of transactional leadership, which describes leaders who monitor followers' performance and take corrective action if deviations from standards occur. They enforce rules to avoid mistakes (Bass, 1985). |
| Management-By-Exception (Passive) | Is a behavior facet of passive-avoidant leadership, which describes leaders who fail to intervene until problems become serious. They wait for mistakes to be brought to their attention before they take corrective action (Bass, 1985). |
| Laissez-Faire | Is a behavior facet of passive-avoidant leadership, which describes the absence of leadership. A person in a leadership role who avoids making decisions and carrying out their supervisory responsibilities exemplifies it. They are not reactive or proactive, but inactive and passive in their leadership role (Bass & Avolio, 1994). |
| Transformational Leadership | Involves a leader-follower exchange relationship in which the followers feel trust, loyalty, and respect toward the leader, and are motivated to do more than originally expected (Bass, 1985). |
| Active Transformational Leadership | Factor analyses of the MLQ often result in a two-factor solution in which contingent reward measures the same higher order construct as individual consideration, inspirational motivation, idealized influence and individual consideration. Active transformation leadership implies the combination of both traditional transformational leadership plus contingent reward. |
| Transactional Leadership | Involves a leader-follower exchange relationship in which the follower receives some reward related to lower-order needs in return for compliance with the leader's expectations (Bass, 1985). |
| Passive-Avoidant Leadership | Passive-Avoidant leadership combines management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire leadership, connoting leadership that either waits for mistakes to be brought to their attention before they take corrective action or that avoids making decisions altogether. |

Religiosity

Extrinsic religious orientation is the method of using religion to achieve non-religious goals. It is often found in people who go to religious gatherings and make claims to certain religious ideologies to establish or maintain social networks while minimally adhering to the teachings of the religion. Individuals high in external religiosity use religion “to provide security and solace, sociability and distraction, status and self-justification” and “using religion for their own ends, with values that are always instrumental and utilitarian” (Allport & Ross, 1967, p. 434).

Intrinsic religious orientation is characterized by those “who view religion itself as an end, a master motive” (p. 434). These individuals embrace a religious creed, internalize it, and attempt to follow it. Their attendance at church may be thought of as motivated by spiritual growth. Those with an intrinsic religious orientation are wholly committed to their religious beliefs, and the influence of religion is evident in every aspect of their lives (Lewis, Maltby, & Day, 2005; Masters et al., 2004).

Spirituality

The existential well-being scale of the *Spiritual Well-Being Scale* measures the individual's environmental relationship meaning and how the conditions that surround people affect the way they live. The *Religious Well-being Scale* measures the individual's relationship with a higher power (God) in regards to commitment, behavioral interaction, communication, cooperation, level of friendship, or degree of intimacy. Items on the *Daily Spiritual Experiences Scale* address concepts such as perceived relationship with the transcendent, inspiration, inner harmony, awe, gratefulness and mercy.

Table 2: Aspects of Spirituality and Religiosity Used in this Study

| Religious and Spiritual Dimension | Definition |
|--|---|
| Extrinsic Religious Orientation | The method of using religion to achieve non-religious goals. It is to provide security and solace, sociability and distraction, status and self-justification. (Allport & Ross, 1967) |
| Intrinsic Religious Orientation | Viewing religion itself as an end and a master motive. These individuals embrace a religious creed, internalize it, and attempt to follow it. Their attendance at church may be thought of as motivated by spiritual growth. (Allport & Ross, 1967) |
| Existential Well-being | The individual's environmental relationship meaning and how the conditions that surround people affect the way they live. |
| Religious Well-being | The individual's relationship with a higher power (God) in regards to commitment, behavioral interaction, communication, cooperation, level of friendship, or degree of intimacy. |
| Daily Spiritual Experiences | The frequency of experiences such as perceived relationship with the transcendent, inspiration, inner harmony, awe, gratefulness, and mercy. |

PRELIMINARY FACTOR ANALYSES

Because 14 scales were used in this study, an exploratory factor analysis was first conducted using Principal Component Analysis to determine which scales loaded together on a single component. Four components were found that had an Eigenvalue greater than one. The first component, which was labeled *Active Transformational Leadership* had an Eigenvalue of 4.37 and explained 31.19% of the variance in scores. Table 3 shows that the first six scales of the *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* loaded on this component with an Eigenvalue vector score greater than 0.6 or less than negative 0.6. The second component was labeled *Spirituality*. The scales from both spirituality instruments completed by the leaders loaded on this component with an Eigenvalue of 2.25. The third component was labeled *Passive-Avoidant Leadership* and consisted of Management by Exception Passive and Liaise-Faire leadership. This component had an Eigenvalue of 1.58. The final component was labeled *Religiosity*, and consisted of the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiosity scales of the *Religious Orientation Scale*. Fittingly, the Eigenvalue vector scores loaded in opposite directions.

The results of the exploratory factor analysis indicate that the types of instruments used appear to be measuring independent constructs. The *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire* (components 1 and 4) is measuring active and passive leadership. The *Spiritual Well-Being Scale* and *Daily Spiritual Experiences Scale* loaded together on component 2 and appear to measure a different construct that the *Religious Orientation Scale* that loaded on component 4. Based on the results of the factor analysis, the question of whether the leader's spirituality and religiosity influence their followers' views of how they lead can be analyzed using the scales from the SWBS, DSE and ROS as predictor variables and scores for Active and Passive-Avoidant leadership as the criterion variables.

Table 3: Results of an Exploratory Factor Analysis

| Scales Used | Active Leadership | Spirituality | Passive-Avoidant Leadership | Religiosity |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Idealized Influence - Attributed | .856 | -.013 | -.139 | .007 |
| Idealized Influence - Behavioral | .870 | .092 | .112 | -.010 |
| Inspirational Motivation | .765 | .152 | .146 | -.012 |
| Intellectual Stimulation | .678 | .013 | .040 | .130 |
| Individual Consideration | .758 | .093 | .285 | -.076 |
| Contingent Reward | .834 | -.068 | .096 | -.119 |
| Spiritual Well-Being Religious | -.123 | .687 | .229 | .131 |
| Spiritual Well-Being Existential | -.339 | .673 | .216 | .480 |
| Daily Spiritual Experiences | -.145 | .747 | .201 | .055 |
| Management by Exception - Passive | -.289 | -.588 | .621 | .031 |
| Liaise-Faire | -.256 | -.423 | .736 | .223 |
| Internal Religious Orientation | -.115 | .435 | .304 | -.648 |
| External Religious Orientation | .296 | -.092 | -.234 | .695 |
| Management by Exception - Active | .401 | .031 | .470 | .135 |

Note: Management by Exception – Active failed to load on any component.

RESULTS

Active Transformational Leadership

A multiple regression was run using the predictor variables of the company size, leader's age and gender, Spiritual Well-Being Religious Score (SWBR), Spiritual Well-Being Existential Score (SWBE), Daily Spiritual Experiences Score (DSE), Religious Orientation – Intrinsic Score (ROSI) and Religious Orientation – Extrinsic Score (ROSE). The criterion variable was the 360-degree rating of the leader's active transformational leadership style. This score was created by calculating the mean of the five different ratings each leader received. Table 4 provides the results of the most parsimonious model found for predicting active transformational leadership.

Table 4: Spiritual and Religious Predictors of Ratings of Active Transformational Leadership

| | R | R Square | R Square Change | F Change | Beta-Weight | Partial Correlation | Sig. |
|----------|-----|----------|-----------------|----------|-------------|---------------------|------|
| 1 SWBE | .27 | .07 | .07 | 9.79 | .39 | .35 | .00 |
| 2 Gender | .38 | .15 | .07 | 10.69 | - | - | .00 |
| 3 ROSE | .47 | .22 | .07 | 11.73 | 1 | 123 | .00 |

Note: (1) SWBE Spiritual Well-Being Existential, (2) SWBE, Gender, (3) SWBE, Gender, ROE Religious Orientation – Extrinsic.

The leader's spiritual well-being existential score explained 7% of the variance in how the participants' followers rated them on active transformational leadership ($R^2 = .07$, $\beta = .39$, $r_p = .35$, $p = .00$). The Beta weight

was .39, and the partial correlation, controlling for the effects of the other independent variables, was .35. These indicate that the higher the leaders scored on existential spiritual well-being, the higher their followers, peers and supervisors rated them as active, transformational leaders. Sample items from the existential spiritual well-being scale include: "I know who I am, where I came from, or where I'm going; I am very fulfilled and satisfied with life; I enjoy much about life and I believe there is some real purpose for my life."

The leader's gender explained an additional 7% of the variance in how the participants' followers rated them on active transformational leadership ($\Delta R^2 = .07, p = .00$). Female leaders ($M = 3.1$) were rated as more actively transformational than male leaders ($M = 2.9$).

The leader's extrinsic religious orientation score explained an additional 7% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .07, \beta = .27, r_p = .28, p = .00$). Here the more the leaders' religiosity was extrinsically oriented, the more actively transformational they were rated by their followers, peers and supervisors. Allport and Ross (1967) define an extrinsic religious orientation as "using religion for their own ends, with values that are always instrumental and utilitarian" (p. 434). Sample items on the ROSE include: "The church is important as a place to formulate good social relationships; the primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection; one reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community; and a primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity."

Passive Avoidant Leadership

A multiple regression was also run using the same predictor variables with the criterion variable of the 360-degree rating of the leaders' passive avoidant leadership style. Only one predictor was significant. The higher the leaders' *Daily Spiritual Experiences* scores, the lower the followers, peers and supervisors rated their leaders as passive avoidant leaders.

Table 5: Spiritual and Religious Predictors of Ratings of Passive-Avoidant Leadership

| | R | R Square | F | Beta-Weight | Partial Correlation | Sig. |
|-------|-----|----------|------|-------------|---------------------|------|
| 1 DSE | .22 | .05 | 6.24 | -.22 | -.22 | .01 |

DISCUSSION

Table 6 provides a summary of the significant findings in this study.

Table 6: Summary of Significant Findings

| <i>Spiritual and Religious Predictors of Ratings of Leadership</i> | SWBE | ROSE | DSE |
|--|---|---|---|
| Predictors of Active Transformational Leadership | | | |
| Active Leadership | $R^2 = .07$ $B = .39$ $r_p = .35$ | $R^2 = .07$ $B = .27$ $r_p = .28$ | |
| Predictors of Passive-Avoidant Leadership | | | |
| Passive-Avoidant Leadership | | | $R^2 = .05$ $B = -.22$ $r_p = -.22$ |

The spiritual/religious predictors of active leadership were the two extrinsically oriented aspects of religiosity and spirituality. The SWBE measures existential satisfaction with life and one's surroundings. To some degree, this instrument likely overlaps with the emerging area of emotional intelligence. Harms and Credé's 2010

meta-analysis, for example, found that emotional intelligence is significantly related to transformational leadership.

The ROSE likely overlaps with the Big-Five personality traits of extraversion and neuroticism. Sample items from the ROSE include: "The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships; a primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity and one reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community." Bono and Judge's (2004) meta-analysis of the relationship between personality and ratings of transformational leadership and found that extraversion was strongly positively related, and neuroticism was negatively related to both transformational and overall effective leadership.

Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt and van Engen's (2003) meta-analysis of 45 studies which compared men and women on measures of transformational leadership found that women are regularly rated higher on transformational and effective leadership than men. Consequently, the finding in this study that women were rated higher on actively transformational leadership was expected.

The *Daily Spiritual Experiences* scale scores of the leaders were negatively related to passive avoidant leadership, but unrelated to active leadership in both the multiple regression and a simple bi-variate correlation. This implies that followers are likely observing spiritual indicators from their leaders that they interpret positively, but not as indicators of active transformational leadership.

One striking observation was that with the "intrinsic" measures of religiosity and spirituality, the ROSI, SWBR and the DSE were unrelated to perceptions that leaders were actively transformational. The religious orientation intrinsic scale contains items such as "It is important for me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation" and "The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services." The spiritual well-being religious scale includes items such as "I have a personally meaningful relationship with God." The *Daily Spiritual Experiences Scale* includes items such as "I feel deep inner peace or harmony" and "I desire to be closer to God or in union with God."

The extrinsically oriented measures, SWBE and ROSE are likely much more easily understandable by followers than the more private and often unexplainable intrinsic spiritual/religious experiences. Leaders who attend church functions for social and fellowship reasons and who have a strong sense of who they are, are easy for followers to "read." Conversely, leaders whose spirituality is much more introspective, and even perhaps private, are more difficult for followers to read.

Lord and Maher (1991) suggest that when leaders' values are not shared by followers, communication problems are more apt to occur, even in production oriented communications such as giving instructions for a task. Kouzes and Posner (1993) state that trust in leaders is founded upon the constituent's ability to predict the leader's behavior. Bass and Avolio (1994) state that transformational leadership is contingent upon the follower's trust in the leader, and two of its components are idealized influence and spiritual motivation. Idealized influence involves the follower's desire to adopt and model the values of the leader and spiritual motivation energizes the follower through the leader's values to work more diligently.

When the spiritual values of the leader tend to be private, the followers may be unclear or unaware of exactly what their leader believes. This seems to be the case in this study. If the leaders' intrinsic spirituality/religiosity were a detriment to the leaders' leadership styles, negative Beta weights and partial correlations should have been found. Instead, these measures were unrelated to the followers, peers and supervisors perceptions of how actively transformational the leaders were.

Conversely, when the leaders' "more easily interpretable" spiritual/religious values are anchored in established religious ceremonies revolving around a religious center such as a mosque or church it is likely easier for the followers to believe they understand the leaders' spiritual or religious values.

Put simply, if a follower and leader begin to discuss spirituality and the leader indicates something such as "For me it is a deeply personal thing... difficult to describe. I feel a union with God, especially in private prayer," the follower probably doesn't react negatively, but also doesn't seem to associate the behavior with active leadership. If a follower and leader begin to discuss spirituality and the leader indicates something such as "I attend mass at St Mary's Parish... and I really enjoy singing in the choir," the follower can easily envision those activities. Additionally, those descriptions are clearly more perceptually active and social in the image portrayed. Followers in this study associated that type of "easily interpretable" spiritual/religious values with being an actively transformational leader.

Dr Mark Green is a Professor of Leadership Studies at Our Lady of the Lake University in the United States. He holds a PhD in Educational Administration, an MBA, an MS in Information Systems, an M.Ed, and an MA in Theology. He teaches leadership in his university's doctoral program in leadership studies, and has chaired over 40 doctoral dissertations in the field of leadership. Prior to his career in academe, he served as a US military officer with assignments that included the Pentagon and the Army Medical Department Center.

Dr Phyllis Duncan is an Assistant Professor of Leadership Studies at Our Lady of the Lake in the United States where she teaches leadership in the university's doctoral program, chairs dissertations, and is coordinator of the Leadership Studies PhD program. She holds a PhD in Education with a concentration in Organization Leadership, an MBA and an MS in Industrial Engineering. Prior to her career in academe, she held senior executive leadership positions in businesses including CEO, COO, and Senior Vice President in corporate organizations. email: PADuncan@Lake.Ollusa.Edu

Dr Stephanie Kodatt is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Health Policy and Management at Florida International University in the United States. She holds a PhD in Leadership Studies, an MBA, and a BS in Marketing. She teaches management and leadership in her university's master's program in health policy and management. Prior to joining Florida International University, Dr Kodatt was an Assistant Professor of Marketing and Management at Northern State University in the United States. email: skodatt@fiu.edu

Editor's note: US spelling has been retained in this article.

REFERENCES

- Adams, T.B., Bezner, J.R., Drabbs, M.E., Zambaratio, R.J., & Steinhardt, M.A. (2000). Conceptualization and measurement of the spiritual and psychological dimensions of wellness in a college population. *Journal of American College Health, 48*, 165-180.
- Allport, G.W. & Ross, J.M. (1967). Religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 432-443.
- Alport, G.W., & Ross, M.J. (1967) Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 432-434.
- Ashmos, D. & Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at Work. A Conceptualization and Measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 9*(2), 134-145.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development, 4*, 231-272.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (2002). *Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X)*. Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden.
- Batson, C.D. & Schoenrade, P.A. (1991). Measuring religion as quest: 2. Reliability concerns. *Journal for the scientific Study of Religion, 30*, 430-447.
- Bentler, P.M., & Kano, Y. (1990). On the equivalence of factors and components. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 25*(1), 67-74.
- Bono, J. & Judge, T. (2004). Personality and Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 901-910.
- Bufford, R.K., Paloutzian, R.F. & Ellison, C.W. (1991). Norms for the Spiritual Well-Being Scale. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 19*, 56-70.
- Burke, C.S., Stagl, K.C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G.F., Salas, E. & Halpin, S.M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly, 17*(3), 288-307.
- Clark, L., Leedy, S., McDonald, L., Muller, B., Lamb, C., Mendez, T., Kim., S. & Schonwetter, R. (2007). Spirituality and job satisfaction among hospice interdisciplinary team members. *Journal of Palliative Medicine, 10*(6), 1321-1328.
- Donahue, M.J. (1985). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality*

and *Social Psychology* 48, 400-419.

Dudley, R.L. & Cruise, R.J. (1990). Measuring religious maturity: A proposed scale. *Review of Religious Research*, 32(2), 97-109.

Eagly, A.H., Johanneson-Schmidt, M.C. & van Engen, M.L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 569-591.

Ellison, C.W. (1983). Spiritual well-being: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 11, 330-340.

Ellison, C.W. & Smith, J. (1991). Toward an integrative measure of health and well-being. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 19, 35-48.

Fetzer Institute. (1999). *Multidimensional measurement of religiousness/spirituality for use in health research*. Bethesda, MD: Fetzer Institute, National Institute of Aging. pp. 1-95. Retrieved from <http://www.fetzer.org/images/stories/pdf/MultidimensionalBooklet.pdf>

Fry, L.W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 693-727.

Genia, V. (2001). Evaluation of the Spiritual Well-Being Scale in a sample of college students. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 11(1), 25-33.

Genia, V. (2003). Psychometric Evaluation of the Alport-Ross I/E Scales in a religiously heterogeneous sample. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 32(3), 284-290.

Gorsuch, R.L. & McPherson, S.E. (1989). Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E revised and single item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28, 348-354.

Graham, S., Furr, S., Flowers, C. & Burke, M.T. (2001). Religion and spirituality in coping with stress. *Counseling and Values*, 46, 2-13.

Hargrave, T.D. & Sells, J.N. (1997). The development of a forgiveness scale. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 23, 1, 41-62.

Harms, P.D. & Credé, M. (2010). Emotional Intelligence and Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 17(1), 5-17.

Hettler, T. & Cohen, L. (1998). Intrinsic religiousness as a stress-moderator for adult protestant churchgoers. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 26(6), 597-609.

Joreskog, K. & Sorbom, D. (1982). Recent developments in structural equation modeling. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19(4), 404-416.

Kamya, H.A. (2000). Hardiness and spiritual well-being among social work students: Implications for social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 36, 231-241.

Kinjerski, V. & Skrypnik, B.J. (2006). Measuring the intangible: Development of the Spirit at Work Scale, in M. Weaver (ed.), Best Paper Proceedings of the Sixty-fifth Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management (CD), ISSN 1543-8643. A1:A6.

Kirkpatrick, L.A. (1989). A psychometric analysis of the **Allport-Ross** and Feagin measures of intrinsic-extrinsic religious orientation. In M. L. Lynn & D. O. Moberg (Eds.), *Research in the social scientific study of religion: Vol. 1*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Koenig, H.G., Parkerson, G. & Meador, K.G. (1997). Religion Index for Psychiatric Research: A 5-item measure for use in health outcome studies. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 154(6), p. 885-886.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (2000). *Leadership practices inventory: Psychometric properties*. Retrieved October 1, 2008 from http://media.wiley.com/assets/56/95/lc_jb_psychometric_properti.pdf

Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (2000). *Leadership practices inventory: Psychometric properties*. Monte Sereno, CA: Kouzes and Posner International.

Kuoppala, J., Lamminpää, A., Liira, J. & Vainio, H. (2008). Leadership, job well-being, and health effects: A systematic review and a meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational & Environmental Medicine*, 50(8), 904-915.

Laher, S. (2007). The relationship between religious orientation and pressure in Psychology I students at the University of the Witwatersrand. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 37(3), 530-551.

Leong, F.T. & Zachar, P. (1990). An evaluation of **Allport's** Religious Orientation Scale across one Australian and two United States samples. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 50, 359-368.

Lewis, C., Maltby, J. & Day, L. (2005). Religious orientation, religious coping and happiness among UK adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38, 1193-1202.

- Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K. & Galen, S.N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformation and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385-425.
- Lynn, M., Naughton, M. & VanderVeen, S. (2009). Faith at Work Scale (FWS): Justification, Development, and Validation of a Measure of Judaeo-Christian Religion in the Workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(2), 227-243. <http://search.ebscohost.com>, doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9767-3.
- Masters, K.S., Hill, R., Kircher, J., Benson, T.L.L. & Fallon, J. (2004). Religious orientation, aging and blood pressure reactivity to interpersonal and cognitive stressors. *Annals of Behavioural Medicine*, 28(3), 171-178.
- Miller, D. & Ewest, T. (2011). The Present State of Workplace Spirituality: A literature review considering context, theory and measurement/assessment. Paper presented at the 2011 Academy of Management Annual Meeting.
- Montgomery, D.E., Fine, M.A., & James-Myers, L. (1990). The development and validation of an instrument to assess an optimal Afrocentric worldview. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 17, 37-54.
- Navara, G. & James, S. (2005). Acculturative stress of missionaries: Does religious orientation affect religious coping and adjustment? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 39-58.
- Paloutzian, R.F. & Ellison, C.W. (1982). Loneliness, spiritual well-being, and the quality of life. In L. A. Peplan & D. Pearlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy*.
- Paloutzian, R.F. & Ellison, C.W. (1982). Loneliness, spiritual well-being and quality of life. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy* (pp. 224-237). New York: Wiley Interscience.
- Pandey, A., Gupta, R.K. and Arora, A.P. (2009). 'Spiritual Climate Inventory' *Pfeiffer Annual for Consulting*, San Francisco, U.S.A.
- Piedmont, R.L. (1999). Does spirituality represent the sixth factor of personality? Spiritual transcendence and the Five-Factor Model. *Journal of Personality*, 67, 985-1013.
- Posner, B.Z. & Kouzes, J.M. (1988). Development and validation of the leadership practices inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48, 483-496.
- Posner, B.Z. & Kouzes, J.M. (1993). Psychometric properties of the leadership practices inventory-updated. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 191-199.
- Robert, T.E., Young, J.S. & Kelly, V.A. (2006). Relationships between adult workers' spiritual well-being and job satisfaction: A preliminary study. *Counseling and Values*, 50, 165-175.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Roth, P.D. (1988). Spiritual well-being and marital adjustment. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 16, 153-158.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Underwood, L.G. & Teresi, J. (2002). The daily experience scale: Development, theoretical description, reliability, exploratory factor analysis, and preliminary construct validity using health related data. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 24(1), 22-33.
- Wang, G., Oh, I.S., Courtright, S.H., & Colbert, A.E. (2011). Transformational Leadership and Performance Across Criteria and Levels: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Research. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(2), 223-270.
- Westgate, C.E. (1996). Spiritual wellness and depression. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 75, 26-35.
- Whiston, S.C. & Brecheisen, B.K. (2002). Annual review: Practice and research in career counseling and development-2001. *Career Development Quarterly*, 51, 98-154.
- Wolf, C.T. & Stevens, P. (2001). Integrating religion and spirituality in marriage and family counseling. *Counseling and Values*, 46, 66-75.