

The Spirit of Transformational Leadership: Emotions or Cognition?



Michael Hartsfield, Ph.D.
School of Leadership Studies
1000 Regent University Drive
Virginia Beach, VA 23464
Phone: 757 226-4609
Fax: 757 226-4634
michha4@regent.edu

Abstract

Transformational leadership theory is well documented and the subject of considerable research. Four components, known as the four I's, make up transformational leadership; (a) charisma or idealized influence, (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration. Most transformational leadership research has focused on leadership behavior related to these four components, but little has been done to gain a deeper understanding of the spirit of transformational leadership that motivates this behavior. This study uses empirical research carried out with leaders in a major U.S. corporation to determine the strength of the relationship of spirituality, emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy to transformational leadership. The results of a stepwise regression show that, while all three constructs correlate to transformational leadership, emotional intelligence and self-efficacy are highly significant in their relationship to this leadership style and, therefore, have potential to be strong motivators of transformational leadership.

The Spirit of Transformational Leadership: Emotions or Cognition?

The U.S. airline industry has struggled since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, D.C. The stumbling economy and decreased air travel have brought severe hardship to many U.S. air carriers, but one airline continued to prosper during these financially troubled times. While the airline industry lost an estimated \$9 billion in 2002 and laid off thousands of workers (“Making The Best,” 2003), Southwest Airlines protected jobs and continued to prosper, reporting earnings of \$75 million in the third quarter of 2002 (Donnelly, 2002).

Southwest Airlines’ ability to succeed when so many other airlines are struggling to survive can be attributed, in large part, to corporate leaders who understand that leaders must do more than just manage as they equip followers to deal with uncertainty and take on more responsibility. To be successful in this role, leaders must become change agents who inspire, motivate, and energize followers to attain higher levels of performance and responsibility, as has been modeled at Southwest Airlines. This kind of leadership is what Bass (1985) called transformational leadership.

Transformational leadership theory has emerged as one of the dominant leadership paradigms. It is well documented and the subject of considerable research (Avolio & Bass, 1988; Bass, 1990; Bass & Avolio, 1993). Four components, known as the four I’s, make up transformational leadership; (a) charisma or idealized influence, (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration. Most transformational leadership research has focused on these four components and how they impact what transformational leaders do.

This paper goes beyond the “doing” of leadership to better understand the “being” of leadership. The research outlined in this paper was carried out with 125 leaders in a major U.S. corporation. The purpose of the study was to measure the impact of spirituality (Beazley, 1997; Briskin, 1998; Fairholm, 2001; Handy, 1998; Moxley, 2000), emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995, 1998; Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999; Sosik & Megerian, 1999), and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986, 1997; Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001) on transformational leadership. This empirical research was, in essence, looking at three constructs that can be associated with the very spirit of leadership and not simply the behavior of those in leadership.

This paper discusses the results of the study with an emphasis on the correlation found between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy. This relationship between an affective and cognitive construct in the context of transformational leadership has implications for future leadership study. Is the decision to function as a transformational leader motivated by emotions or purely a cognitive process?

Literature Review

This literature review looks first at previous research on transformational leadership to understand its impact on followers and entire organizations. Special attention is given to research that examines the deeper connection transformational leaders seem to have with followers. This naturally leads to a review of literature dealing with the three internal dynamics of transformational leadership—spirituality, emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy—to see if previous research supports a theoretical or conceptual relationship between these internal dynamics and transformational leadership.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership theory emerged from the work of Bass (1985), who built on Burns' (1978) original concept of transforming leaders. This theory sought to explain the unique connection between leaders and followers that results in extraordinary performance and accomplishments in both individual followers and entire organizations (Yammarino & Dubinsky, 1994). Transformational leadership goes beyond follower's immediate needs, which can be met through transactional rewards, to deeper issues of follower development that move followers from concerns for mere existence to concerns associated with achievement and growth (Avolio et al., 1991). Transformational leadership theory is now well documented and has been the subject of considerable research (Avolio & Bass, 1988; Bass, 1990; Bass & Avolio, 1993).

One of the most prominent developments in the investigation of transformational leadership is the confirmation of its utility for increasing organizational satisfaction, commitment, and effectiveness (Bass, 2000). Empirical research by Masi and Cooke (2000) compared the impact of transformational leadership and transactional leadership on follower motivation, empowerment, and commitment to quality. They found transformational leadership tends to empower and motivate followers while transactional leadership, which focuses on rewards or the threat of withholding rewards (Bass & Avolio, 1990), tends to suppress follower commitment to both quality and productivity.

The inspirational nature of transformational leadership was confirmed in a study by Berson, Shamir, Avolio, and Popper (2001), who measured the inspirational strength of the vision statements of 141 leaders. Their factor analysis showed that optimism and confidence were the dominant themes defining the inspirational strength of a vision

statement. Leaders perceived by followers and/or peers as transformational produced vision statements that were rated to be more inspirational in terms of optimism and confidence. Transactional leadership, however, was only marginally related to optimistic and confident vision casting for followers by the leader.

Rather than focus on managing day-to-day operations, transformational leaders work to maintain and communicate a group, department, or organizational vision. Transformational leaders are interested in developing followers and they move people from basic security concerns to deeper concerns associated with personal and corporate growth and development (Avolio et al., 1991). Followers of transformational leaders often exert extra effort, form higher performing work groups, and receive higher ratings of effectiveness and performance (Bass, 1985; Yammarino & Bass, 1990; Yammarino et al., 1993). Transformational leadership's ability to increase individual and group performance is not limited to military, production, or service organizations. As Bass (2000) suggests, transformational leadership has similar effects in learning institutions and is considered necessary to deal with the myriad of problems facing schools in the 21st century. Bass' conclusion is confirmed in research showing teachers were more highly motivated if they perceived their school's principal to be a transformational leader (Ingram, 1997).

As the literature has shown, the operation of transformational leadership factors in a leader can have a profound impact on followers, but this literature has not addressed the source or motivations of this transformational leadership behavior. Is transformational leadership the result of leader traits or the result of leader behavior learned and developed over time? Avolio et al. (1991) suggest transformational leadership does not just happen

by chance but is the result of certain antecedent conditions that contribute to transformational leadership development. These conditions include a combination of experiences including the leader's early experiences with role models and the leader's current life experiences, both at work and away from work. This is consistent with Haas' (1992) observations about historical political leaders. Haas says Gandhi, Lenin, and Eleanor Roosevelt all had personalities as diverse as their backgrounds. "Yet, they encountered experiences in their early lives that seem to have molded them for their future leadership roles" (p. 43). McCall (1998) relates this concept of leadership development to executive level leaders. He says "...executive leaders are both born and made but mostly made, based on a significant amount of research showing that executives do learn, grow, and change over time" (p. 4). It can, therefore, be concluded that leadership, including transformational leadership, is the product of developmental experiences in the leader's life, from childhood up to the present.

The transformational leader's ability to connect with followers on a deeper level suggests a need to better understand the internal motivations of the transforming leader. Unlike the external rewards of transactional leadership, the transformational leader must connect with the deeper needs of the follower to successfully inspire, encourage, and motivate.

Spirituality

An understanding that people come to work with more than just their bodies and minds is growing in organizations. People also bring their unique innate talents and abilities. This growing interest in these often difficult-to-define intangibles has created a search for the meaning of spirituality and the role it plays in the workplace (Leigh, 1997).

While it is widely accepted that a spiritual dimension exists beyond the realm of mind and body, a clear definition of this spirituality is not as widely accepted. Definitions of spirituality fall into two categories: (a) those with religious or faith-based connotations and (b) those with secular connotations.

Religious spirituality. Religious spirituality is often experienced in the context of structured beliefs and organized practices determined by “religious professionals (theologians, philosophers, denominational officials, clergy) and the institutions they perpetuate (churches, synagogues, temples, synods, councils, and the like)” (Lippy, 1994, p. 7). Over the last half century, traditional religious affiliation, understood as membership in an organized religious group and active participation in that organized group, has become less important to Americans (Lippy). This does not mean, however, that interest in spirituality has diminished in the last 50 years. Many of these experiences are taking place outside organized religion as people exercise their spirituality in relationship to a transcendent reality. An example of this is Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), which does not explicitly speak of God, but encourages people to call on a “Higher Power” for an inner strength to break free from addictions (B., 1997, p.57).

Secular spirituality. Spirituality has been defined as “the essence that separates human beings from all other creatures” (Fairholm, 2001, p.41). According to the Fairholm, this definition refers to an inner awareness that allows us to integrate ourselves into the world, which makes understanding spirituality critical to understanding organizational life and leadership. In this context, it could be called psychological spirituality.

“Spirituality is the awareness that there is something more to life than just our narrow, ego-oriented view of it” (Ritscher, 1998, p. 68). This understanding is empowering because it takes life beyond superficiality. If only physical, mental, and emotional energies are encouraged in the workplace, opportunities for vitality and new energy may be totally lost by individuals and organizations. Ignoring the spiritual is denying the very personality of the organization.

It would be easy to make spirituality and religion synonymous, but much literature on spirituality makes a clear distinction between the two (Leigh, 1997; Ritscher, 1998; Vaill, 1998). Religion is an organization that provides spiritual experiences to groups of people. Spirituality is individualistic and operates in a person privately without reliance on an organization (Ritscher).

Hicks (2002) offers a different point of view on this proposed opposition between spirituality and religion. He suggests separating the two actually creates a challenge for the leadership scholar who acknowledges the whole person in the workplace. While many consultants are now emphasizing spirituality in the workplace, much of this proposed spirituality has been severed from its religious foundations (Cavanagh, 1999). This thinking makes spiritual language and symbols permissible in the workplace, while religious talk and action is deemed unacceptable based on the well established doctrine of separation of church and state to which most organizations adhere. It is this dichotomy between spirituality and religion that creates a challenge for leaders and leadership scholars

Little research has specifically addressed spirituality and transformational leadership (Jacobsen, 1994; Zwart, 2000). The Jacobsen study, using a Delphi Study

model of research, found a strong inference that spirituality and transformational leadership are related aspects of human experience. However, this relationship was not confirmed in the Zwart study. Empirical research by Zwart in private, public, and nonprofit organizations found no link between spirituality and transformational leadership. These contradictory results emphasize the need for more research on the proposed link between spirituality and transformational leadership.

All organizations have spirit, but in many cases, it has been suppressed by leaders more intent on “doing” than on “being” (Ritscher, 1998). Leaders faced with the challenge of stirring the spirit of an organization often struggle with the question, “How do I do it?” when the question should be “How to be it” (Ritscher, p. 69).

Transformational leadership is “leadership that draws on a spiritual force and hence cuts through to a deeper level and is more effective in creating a vital and effective business” (p. 69).

Although spirituality is defined in many ways, it is clear that spirituality, whether attributed to a divine work or the thoughts and beliefs springing from the human soul, is not about knowledge and skills, but identity, purpose, and heart. A leader who understands these distinctly personal components of an organization can encourage the development of trust and vision to “cultivate optimal change, creativity, common cause, and optimal actualization of opportunity” (Spitzer, 2000, p. 13). These same attributes are also associated with transformational leadership.

Hypothesis 1: A positive correlation exists between spirituality and transformational leadership.

Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence involves the ability to manage one's emotions, to empathize with other people, and to cope with emotional relationships (Harrison, 1997). High performing organizations tend to have high levels of emotional intelligence among their constituents and strong links between their emotional capabilities and skills (Goleman, 1995). "An emotionally intelligent organization's culture emphasizes relationship building, empathy and social responsibility, attributes that enhance trust, commitment and connection between a new hire and the organization" (Book, 2000). Emotional incompetence can prevent individuals from reaching their full potential. "The more complex a job is, the more emotional intelligence matters" (Smigla & Pastoria, 2000).

Goleman (1995) popularized the concept of emotional intelligence in his book *Emotional Intelligence* in which he discussed four components of emotional intelligence: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, and empathy. "Self-awareness means having a deep understanding of one's emotions, strengths, weaknesses, needs, and drives" (Goleman, 1998, p. 95). People with a high degree of self-awareness not only recognize their feelings but also understand how their feelings affect other people. Self-awareness extends to a person's understanding of his or her values and goals, which means a leader who is self-aware may possess a greater sense of purpose and meaning (Sosik & Megerian, 1999).

The second component of emotional intelligence is self-regulation, which Goleman (1995) also referred to as "managing emotions." Handling feelings so they are appropriate is an ability that actually builds on self-awareness. A self-regulating

individual can shake off anxiety, gloom, or irritability and effectively deal with negative consequences or failures. Self-regulation allows a leader to be sensitive and understanding of subordinates without succumbing to the vulnerability of criticism and the need to defend self-esteem (Riggio, Murphy, & Pirozzolo, 2002). In an organizational setting, self-regulation “prevents the individual from holding the organization responsible for every frustration and conflict on the job and, thus, prevents the erosion of commitment that results from indiscriminate faultfinding” (Abraham, 1999, p. 213).

Goleman’s (1995) third component of emotional intelligence is motivation, which brings achievement by harnessing feelings of enthusiasm, zeal, and confidence. “If there is one trait that virtually all effective leaders have, it is motivation” (Goleman, 1998, p. 101). An individual who exhibits the emotional traits of enthusiasm and persistence can, in the face of setbacks, perform above expectations and inspire others to do the same. Achievement motivation combined with self-regulation allows an individual to remain optimistic even in the face of setback or failure (Goleman).

The fourth component of emotional intelligence discussed by Goleman (1995) is empathy. “People who are empathic are more attuned to the subtle social signals that indicate what others need or want” (Goleman, p. 43). Empathy allows an individual to recognize and respond to the changing emotional state of other people resulting in sensitivity and social self-confidence (Sosik & Megerian, 1999). The first three components of emotional intelligence—self-awareness, self-regulation, and motivation—determine how well people manage themselves. Empathy, however, is the emotional intelligence component that determines how individuals relate to other people (Smigla & Pastoria, 2000). This empathic ability to read the emotions of others is the foundation for

truly individualized consideration, one of the characteristics of the transformational leader (Riggio et al., 2002).

Research linking emotional intelligence to transformational leadership (Sosik & Megerian, 1999) found that leader self-awareness was the emotional intelligence component most strongly related to transformational leadership. This research also found the ability to manage one's emotions was related to an individual's ability to function as a transformational leadership.

In summary, the literature suggests a relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. For example, self-regulation allows a leader to be sensitive and understanding of subordinates without succumbing to the vulnerability of criticism and the need to defend self-esteem (Riggio et al., 2002). This is important when considering the deeper connection between leader and follower required by a transformational approach to leading. A conceptual correlation can easily be made between the four I's of transformational leadership and the components of emotional intelligence as defined by Goleman (1995). Therefore, the literature supports a theoretical relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership.

Hypothesis 2: A positive correlation exists between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership.

Self-Efficacy

A review of the literature shows that only a few studies have examined the impact of self-efficacy on leadership or leadership effectiveness (Chemers et al., 2000; Chen & Bliese, 2002; McCormick, 2001). "Perceived self-efficacy refers to beliefs in ones capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given

attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Over the past decade, research has shown that self-efficacy is related to various work-performance measures, such as the performance of managers (Wood & Bandura, 1989), the ability of newcomers to adapt to a new organizational setting (Saks, 1995), and the ability to acquire new skills (Mitchell, Hopper, Daniels, George-Falvy, & James, 1994). Efficacious people are likely to put forth sufficient effort to produce successful outcomes, while inefficacious people are likely to cease their efforts prematurely and fail at the task before them (Bandura).

Self-esteem and self-efficacy are often used interchangeably, making it easy to assume they are synonymous. Bandura (1997), however, makes a clear distinction between the two concepts. Self-efficacy involves a person’s perception of their capability to carry out a task, while self-esteem is a person’s perception of their self-worth.

According to Bandura, there is no established relationship between one’s capabilities and whether one likes or dislikes oneself. This was supported by Chemers et al. (2000) in a study carried out among military cadet leaders. They found that objective observers associated leadership efficacy with high leadership potential, while general self-esteem was not seen as an independent predictor of leadership performance. In essence, when looking for leadership potential, an individual’s confidence in their ability to carry out a task is perceived as more important than that individual’s self-image.

Relating the construct of self-efficacy to leadership creates a conceptual framework for understanding how self-confidence can play a vital role in the successful performance of leadership duties. This could account for the often reported connection between a sense of self-assurance in a leader and leadership success (McCormick, 2001). “Leadership self-efficacy is critical to the leadership process because it affects the goals a

leader selects, leader motivation, development of functional leadership strategies, and the skillful execution of those strategies” (p. 30). In this way leader self-efficacy has a direct impact on individual and organizational outcomes, which in turn, have a direct impact on the efficacy of the followers.

In a study to determine the key predictors of employee efficacy in organizations, Chen and Bliese (2002) focused on the role of leadership because they felt leadership is key to employee motivation in organizational settings. They looked at the role of leadership as a predictor of both employee self-efficacy and collective efficacy. Collective efficacy is analogous to self-efficacy and is defined as “a group’s shared belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 477).

Results of the Chen and Bliese (2002) study show that leadership at 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. 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.

An ongoing debate in self-efficacy research deals with different conceptualizations of the construct. Is self-efficacy situation specific, or is it a generalized trait an individual takes into any situation? Bandura (1997) treats self-efficacy as task specific and contends “perceived self-efficacy is concerned not with the number of skills you have, but with what you believe you can do with what you have

under a variety of conditions” (p. 37). According to Bandura, possessing knowledge and skills is less important than being able to integrate them into a proper course of action necessary to successfully execute a specific task.

Other researchers (Eden, 1988; Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998; Chen, Gully, Whiteman, & Kilcullen, 2000) have proposed self-efficacy is a more trait-like construct. Generalized self-efficacy is “one’s estimates of one’s capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to exercise general control over events in one’s life” (Judge et al., p.19). Unlike task specific self-efficacy, generalized self-efficacy is relatively unchanging across situations. This is evident in the research of Judge et al. that found general self-efficacy effects job satisfaction independent of the attributes of the job itself.

Chen, Gully, and Eden (2001) contend that the research on which Bandura (1997) based his arguments did not use valid general self-efficacy measures. Using a newly validated general self-efficacy measure, Chen et al. found a strong and positive correlation between task specific self-efficacy and general self-efficacy. General self-efficacy was actually a predictor of task specific self-efficacy. The tendency to feel efficacious across a variety of tasks and situations spills over into specific tasks and situations (Eden, 1988). Both general and task specific self-efficacy denote one’s ability to achieve desired outcomes, but they are distinctive in that general self-efficacy is a motivational trait, while task specific self-efficacy is a motivational state (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997).

As the debate concerning the trait or task orientation of self-efficacy continues, it is clear that self-efficacy in leaders is one of the key cognitive variables regulating leader

functioning in dynamic environments. This proposition is based on the fact that self-efficacy “affects the goals a leaders selects, leader motivation, development of functional leadership strategies and the skillful execution of those strategies” (McCormick, 2001, p. 30). These findings could be significant to understanding the relationship of leader self-efficacy and transformational leadership, since a transformational leader provides a role model and increases the collective efficacy of employees by instilling values and promoting collective action (Shamir, 1990).

Hypothesis 3: A positive correlation exists between self-efficacy and transformational leadership.

Conclusion

Previous research has, to at least some degree, related spirituality, emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy to leadership. All three have been shown to be important in carrying out the responsibilities inherent in leadership. While these leadership characteristics may be evident in many forms of leadership, they are nowhere more evident than in transformational leadership, which focuses on the internal motivation of the follower. For this reason, it is important to empirically test this proposed relationship between transformational leadership and these three constructs.

Method

The sample used in this research was a convenience sample consisting of 124 leaders from a large corporation that specializes in defense and aerospace technology. This corporation employs 77,500 people worldwide and had revenues of \$16.9 billion in 2001. Research participants were recruited from one single division of the corporation

and were predominantly male. The sample consisted of professional exempt salaried personnel in supervisory, management, or director level positions. Employees at supervisory levels function as team leaders or in other leadership roles.

Measures

All of the predictor and criterion variables were assessed using reliable and valid self-report measures. The criterion variable, transformational leadership, was measured using the transformational subscales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Since the focus of the study concerned the relationship of transformational leadership and the three predictor variables, only the subscales measuring transformational leadership were used. Internal reliabilities reported in the literature have ranged from $\alpha = .74$ to $.94$.

Spirituality was measured using the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWBS) developed by Paloutzian and Ellison (1991; Hill & Hood, 1999). In this research, only the ten items that measure existential well-being were used, since the emphasis of this study is the social psychological dimension of the leader/follower relationship. The internal consistency reliability coefficients, based on data from over 900 respondents across seven different studies ranged from $.89$ to $.94$.

Emotional Intelligence was measured using the Emotional Intelligence Scale (EI Scale), which was constructed and validated by Wong and Law (2002). This is a 16-item measure that was purposively designed to be a practically short yet psychometrically sound measure of emotional intelligence. In the initial developmental study, the results showed acceptable internal reliabilities ranging from $.83$ to $.90$.

Self-efficacy was measured using the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSE) (Chen et al., 2001). This instrument falls into the category of general self-efficacy and not task-specific self- efficacy. A general self-efficacy scale was used because, “Individual’s appraisal of their efficacy in a given domain is based in part on a judgment of their general self-regulatory capabilities” (Chen et al., p. 78). This validated instrument has internal reliabilities for the four subscales ranging from $\alpha = .86$ to $.90$.

The Social Desirability (SD) Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) was used to measure the tendency of respondents to give socially desirable responses. It was important to control for this type of response bias in this research, since all the instruments used are self-assessment measures and individuals in roles of leadership may feel obligated to respond in a socially desirable manner. This is a validated instrument with an internal reliability of $\alpha = .72$ (Loo & Thorpe, 2000).

Procedure

Data were collected using an online survey created in SurveySuite, a Web-based survey generation tool. The SurveySuite questionnaire included all the survey items and response options found on the traditional paper and pencil survey, but it offered the speed and convenience of electronic data gathering. The Web address for the survey was sent only to those in the organization who fit the leadership profile established for this study. Completed surveys went directly to SurveySuite and were password protected until retrieved for analysis. The survey responses were summarized as an Excel file and returned to the researcher for analysis.

Results

Data were analyzed using an intercorrelational analysis of all variables followed by a stepwise regression to determine the amount of variance in the dependent variable that can be attributed to each independent variable. The intercorrelations between the predictor and criterion variables and the reliabilities of the scales used to operationalize these constructs are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1

Correlations and Coefficient Alphas for Predictor and Criterion Variables

	1	2	3	4
MLQ	(.89)			
EI	.56**	(.88)		
NGSE	.52**	.52**	(.84)	
SWBS	.36**	.36**	.29**	(.81)
Social Desirability	.24**	.41**	.25**	.33**

Note. Numbers in the diagonal refer to Cronbach α .

n = 124

**p < .01, two-tailed

The correlation coefficients obtained showed a correlation between the independent variables; spirituality, emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy, and the dependent variable, transformational leadership. As a result, Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2, and Hypothesis 3 were all supported.

Other significant correlations included the correlation between EI and self-efficacy ($r = .52, p > .001$) and EI and spirituality ($r = .36, p > .001$) and self-efficacy and spirituality ($r = .29, p > .001$), which raise interesting questions about the nature of the EI, and spirituality constructs. Overall, this pattern of intercorrelations supported the hypothesized relationships between the three independent variables and the dependent

variable with the Cronbach alphas for all the variables being adequate. Nunnally (1978) suggested that internal consistency reliabilities of .80 are sufficient for applied research. The reliabilities for both predictor and criterion variables obtained here satisfy this criterion.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Following the correlational analyses, the hypotheses were tested using a stepwise regression analysis whereby spirituality, self-efficacy, and emotional intelligence were regressed on transformational leadership in order to determine the amount of variance in the dependent variable attributed to each independent variable. Results of the regression analysis are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Stepwise Regression Analysis

	R ²	Adjusted R ²	β	ΔR^2
Step 1				
Emotional Intelligence	.309	.303	.346**	.309**
Step 2				
Self-Efficacy	.383	.383	.297**	.074**
Step 3				
Spiritual Well Being	.403	.403	.153*	.020*

n=124

* $p > .05$

** $p > .001$

In Step 1, emotional intelligence was entered into the equation, in Step 2 self-efficacy, and in Step 3 spiritual well being. The independent variables explained a significant amount of variance in the dependent variable ($R^2 = .40, p > .01$). The standardized regression coefficients demonstrated that the three predictor variables accounted for 40% of the variance in transformational leadership.

For Hypothesis 2, emotional intelligence significantly predicted transformational leadership ($\beta = .34, p > .001$). Likewise, for Hypothesis 3, self-efficacy significantly predicted transformational leadership ($\beta = .29, p > .001$) and finally, for Hypothesis 1, spirituality accounted for a very small proportion of the variance in transformational leadership ($\beta = .15, p > .05$). Finally, all changes in R^2 were significant.

The correlation analysis showed a strong correlation between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy, raising concerns about multicollinearity.

Discussion

One of the weaknesses of transformational leadership theory is the ambiguity of the underlying influence processes for transformational leadership (Yukl, 1999). This present research takes a step forward in understanding how transformational leaders influence followers by going beyond observable leadership behavior to examine the very essence, or spirit of transformational leadership.

Conceptually, it is not surprising that emotional intelligence and self-efficacy emerged as the dominant predictors of transformational leadership, since an individual in tune with his or her emotions and feelings would, conceivably, be more likely to understand their own abilities and strengths and therefore be more efficacious in their role of leader. An efficacious leader would likely be better equipped to deal with the commitment and vulnerability inherent in transformational leadership.

Self-efficacy emerged as the second most powerful predictor of transformational leadership behind emotional intelligence, with over 38% of the variance in the criterion variable explained by these two predictor variables. Followers are more likely to experience inspirational motivation and idealized influence if they sense the leader

operates with confidence to accomplish stated tasks (Sosik & Megerian, 1999). This is why personal efficacy is considered a key attribute of transformational leaders (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).

Practically, this study has implications for organizations that employ, or plan to employ, a transformational style of leadership. Results of this study show that by measuring emotional intelligence and self-efficacy an organization can more clearly determine who is a transformational leader, or at least who has the propensity to function in a transformational leadership manner.

Recommendations for Future Research

The relationship between self-efficacy, a cognitive construct, and emotional intelligence, which is often treated as a matter of the heart rather than the mind, presents some challenges for the theoreticians working in the area of leadership. Future research is necessary to answer the question this study raises concerning the role emotions and cognition play as true motivators of transformational leadership.

In sum, the results of this empirical study are offered as a first investigation into the internal dynamics and highly complex internal world of the leader. As such, this research invites a multidisciplinary dialogue from fields as diverse as psychology, religion, political science, history, and sociology, as well as the application of equally diverse research methods and designs from both the quantitative and qualitative traditions.

References

- Abraham, R. (1999). Emotional intelligence in organizations: a conceptualization. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 125(2)*, 209.
- Avolio, B.J., & Bass, B.M. (1988). Transformational leadership, charisma and beyond. In J.G. Hunt, B.R. Baliga, H.P. Dachler, & C.A Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas* (pp. 29-50). Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Avolio, B.J., Waldman, D.A., & Yammarino, F.J. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: the four I's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 15(4)*, 9-16.
- B., D. (1997) *The good book and the big book*. Kihei, HI: Paradise Research Publications, Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar-On emotional quotient inventory: Technical manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7(i3)*, 18.

- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1990). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychological Press.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions*, pp. 49-88. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Beazley, H. (1997). Meaning and measurement of spirituality in organizational settings: development of a spirituality assessment scale. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 58(12), 4718A. (UMI No. AAT 9820619)
- Berson, Y., Shamir, B., Avolio, B. J., & Popper, M. (2001). The relationship between vision strength, leadership style, and context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 53-73.
- Book, H.E. (2000). One big happy family. *Ivey Business Journal*, 65(1), 44.
- Briskin, A. (1998). *The stirring of soul in the workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Cavanagh, G. F. (1999). Spirituality for managers: Context and critique. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12(3), 186-199.
- Chemers, M.M., Watson, C.B., & May, S.T. (2000). Dispositional affect and leadership effectiveness: a comparison of self-esteem, optimism, and efficacy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 26(3), 267-277.

- Chen, G., & Bliese, P.D. (2002). The role of different levels of leadership in predicting self-and collective efficacy: evidence for discontinuity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 549-556.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*(1), 62-83.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., Whiteman, J., & Kilcullen, R. N. (2000). Examination of relationships among trait-like individual differences, state-like individual differences, and learning performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(6), 835-847.
- Crowne, D. P. & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*, 349-354.
- Donnelly, S. (2002, October 28). One airline's magic. *Time, 160*(18), 45-47.
- Eden, D. (1988). Pygmalion, goal setting, and expectancy: Compatible ways to boost productivity. *Academy of Management Review, 13*(4), 639-652.
- Fairholm, G. W. (2001). *Mastering inner leadership*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Friedman, H.H., & Langbert, M. (2000). Abraham as a transformational leader. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(2), 88-95.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gardner, W.L., & Cleavenger, D. (1998, August). The impression management strategies associated with transformational leadership at the world-class level: A psychohistorical assessment. *Management Communication Quarterly, 12*(1), 3-41.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.

- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- Guzo, R.A., Yost, P. R., Campbell, R. J., & Shea, G. P. (1993). Potency in groups: articulating a construct. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 87-106.
- Haas, H. G. (1992). *The leader within*. New York, NY: Harper Business.
- Handy, C. (1998). *The hungry spirit*. New York, NY: Broadway Books.
- Harrison, R. (1997). Why your firm needs emotional intelligence. *People Management*, 3(1), 4.
- Hicks, D. A. (2002) Spiritual and religious diversity in the workplace. Implications for leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 379-396.
- Hill, P.C. & Hood, R.W. (Eds.) (1999). *Measures of religiosity*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.
- Ingram, P.D. (1997). Leadership behaviors of principals in inclusive educational settings. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35, 411-427.
- Jacobsen, S. E. (1994). Spirituality and transformational leadership in secular settings: a Delphi study. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 56(03), 1019A. (UMI No. AAT 9524570)
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: the role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1), 17-34.
- Kuhnert, W.K., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 648.

- Leigh, P. (1997). The new spirit at work. *Training & Development*, 51(3). Retrieved January 17, 2002, from ABI/Inform.
- Lippy, C. H. (1994) *Being religious American style*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Loo, R., & Thorpe, K. (2000). Confirmatory factor analysis of the full and short versions of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(5), 628-635.
- Lowe, K., Kroeck, K., & Sivasubramaniam, N (1995). *Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic review*. Working paper.
- Making the best of a bad situation: A little ingenuity went a long way-even in battered industries. (January 13, 2003). *Business Week*, p. 70.
- Masi, R.J., & Cooke, R.A., (2000). Effects of transformational leadership on subordinate motivation, empowering norms, and organizational productivity. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 8(1), 16-47.
- Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D.R., & Salovey, P. (1999, December). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27(4), 267.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D.R. (1997). *Emotional IQ test. CD-ROM version*. Richard Viard (producer). Needham, MS: Virtual Entertainment.
- McCall, M. W. (1998). *High Flyers: Developing the next generation of leaders*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- McCormick, M.J. (2001). Self-efficacy and leadership effectiveness: applying social cognitive theory to leadership. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(1), 22-33.

- Mitroff, I. I., & Denton, E. A. (1999). A study of spirituality in the workplace. *Sloan Management Review*, 40(4), 83-92.
- Mitchell, T. R., Hopper, H., Daniels, D., George-Falvy, J., & James, L.R. (1994). Predicting self-efficacy and performance during skill acquisition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 506-518.
- Moxley, R. S. (2000). *Leadership and spirit*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd. Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill
- Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C. W. (1991). *Manual for the Spiritual Well-being Scale*. Nyack, NY: Life Advance, Inc.
- Riggio, R. E., Murphy, S.E., & Pirozzolo, F. J. (Eds.). (2002). *Multiple intelligences and leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ritscher, J. A. (1998). Spiritual leadership. In Adams, J. D. (Ed.), *Transforming Leadership* (pp. 67-91).
- Ross, S.M., & Offermann, L.R. (1997). Transformational leaders: Measurement of personality attributes and work group performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(10), 1078-1086.
- Sala, F. (2002). *Emotional competence inventory (ECI) technical manual*. Hay Group: Philadelphia.
- Schutte, N., Malouff, J., Hall, L., Haggerty, D., Cooper, J., Golden, C., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of individual intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 167-177.

- Slater, W., Hall, T. W., & Edwards, K. J. (2001). Measuring religion and spirituality: Where are we and where are we going? *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, *29(1)*, 4-21.
- Smigla, J.E. & Pastoria, G. (2000). Emotional intelligence: some have it, others can learn. *The CPA Journal*, *70I(6)*, 60.
- Soper, E. D. (1938). *The religions of mankind*. New York, NY: The Abingdon Press.
- Sosik, J. J., Avolio, B. J., Kahai, S. S. (1997). Effects of leadership style and anonymity on group potency and effectiveness in group decision support system environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82(1)*, 89-103
- Sosik, J. J., & Megerian, L.E. (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance: The role of self-other agreement on transformational leadership perceptions. *Group & Organization Management*, *v24n3*, 367-390.
- Spitzer, R. J., (2000). *The spirit of leadership: optimizing creativity and change in organizations*. Provo, UT: Executive Excellence Publishing.
- Vaill, P. B. (1998). *Spirited leading and learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leaders and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: an exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 243-274.
- Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of Management Review*, *14(3)*, 361-384.
- Yammarino, F.J., & Bass, B.M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among Naval officers. In K.E. Clark & M.B. Clark

- (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 975-995). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Learning.
- Yammarino, F.J. & Dubinsky, A.J. (1994). Transformational leadership theory: using levels of analysis to determine boundary conditions. *Personnel Psychology, 47* (4), p. 787.
- Yammarino, F.J., Spangler, W.D. & Bass, B.M. (1993). Transformational leadership and performance: A longitudinal investigation. *Leadership Quarterly, 4* (1), 81-102.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of the conceptual weakness in transformational and charismatic leadership theory. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*, 285-305
- Zwart, G. A. (2000). The relationship between spirituality and transformational leadership in public, private, and nonprofit sector organizations. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(06), 2464A. (UMI No. AAT 9977752)